Fighting for the Faith:

Pierre du Moulin's Polemical Quest

By

Daniel Borvan

Keble College

University of Oxford

A Thesis Submitted to the

Faculty of Theology and Religion

University of Oxford

For the Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Trinity Term 2019

Short Abstract

This thesis examines Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant polemics in the early decades of the seventeenth century through the lens of the ecclesiastical activity and polemical method of Pierre du Moulin (1568–1658), with a particular focus on his treatise debate with Cardinal Jacques Davy du Perron (1556–1618). I argue that in his early polemical writings and debates, du Moulin displayed respect for the Church Fathers and church tradition but also showed a willingness to be openly critical of the Fathers when warranted. During this period, du Moulin staunchly displayed his firm ecclesiastical commitment to the French Reformed churches. However, du Moulin's ecclesiastical activity and polemical methodology shifted after 1610 when he gained international recognition. In that year, du Moulin wrote in defence of King James VI and I of Scotland and England and inserted himself into the Oath of Allegiance controversy. After James expressed dissatisfaction with du Moulin's handling of the Church Fathers in the volume, the French pastor softened his approach. His subsequent works, particularly those written on behalf of James, critiqued the Fathers in a more veiled manner. Du Moulin also altered his ecclesiastical activity after 1610 by becoming more ecumenical, partnering with King James in an effort to reunite Christendom. In a surprising move for a Calvinist, du Moulin initially accommodated Arminians in his plan for reunion, but shifted his position during the leadup to the Synod of Dort. Du Moulin also attempted to remain loyal to the French Reformed churches and their presbyterian government while maintaining his patronage relationship with King James, a strong supporter of episcopal polity. Though primarily a work of intellectual history, this thesis also places du Moulin's ecclesiastical activity and polemical treatises in the broader political and ecclesiastical currents of both France and early Stuart England during the first three decades after the promulgation of the Edict of Nantes.

Long Abstract

This thesis examines Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant polemics in the early decades of the seventeenth century through the lens of the ecclesiastical activity and polemical method of Pierre du Moulin (1568–1658), with a particular focus on his treatise debate with Cardinal Jacques Davy du Perron (1556–1618). Du Moulin rose to prominence as pastor of the Paris congregation of the French Reformed churches in the years following the issuing of the Edict of Nantes (1598) and became one of the primary polemicists for the Reformed churches in France in the seventeenth century. Although the wars of religion between Catholics and Protestants in France had subsided, the war of treatises was heating up. Du Moulin also inserted himself into theological debate beyond France when he entered the Oath of Allegiance controversy in 1610. A treatise conflict erupted between Catholics and Protestants after King James VI and I of Scotland and England issued the Oath of Allegiance (1606) following the failed Gunpowder Plot (1605). King James commissioned Pierre du Moulin to write multiple treatises on his behalf, including two against Cardinal du Perron.

This thesis examines Pierre du Moulin's ecclesiastical activity and his polemical method during the timeframe from his initial writings to the end of the Oath of Allegiance controversy. I argue that du Moulin developed as a churchman and polemical theologian due to international influences, along with his desire to expand his international reputation, and that he altered his use of the Church Fathers to accommodate these influences. In his early polemical works, du Moulin displayed respect for the Church Fathers and church tradition but also showed a willingness to be openly critical of the Fathers when warranted. According to du Moulin, only *sola Scriptura*, not the Fathers, was sufficient to serve as judge of theological controversies. During this period, du Moulin staunchly displayed his firm ecclesiastical commitment to the French Reformed churches. However, du Moulin's ecclesiastical activity and polemical methodology shifted after 1610 when he gained international recognition. That year, du Moulin wrote *Defense de la Foy Catholique* in defence of King James against the Dominican theologian Nicolas Coeffeteau. After James expressed dissatisfaction with du Moulin's handling of the Church Fathers in the volume, the French pastor softened his approach. His subsequent works, particularly those written on behalf of James, critiqued the Fathers in a more veiled manner. Nevertheless, du Moulin did not alter his theology or abandon the mainstream Reformed method of using *sola Scriptura* to defend the Reformed position and to attack their opponents' views. Instead, he viewed the Church Fathers not as vindication *par excellence* of the Reformed confession but as reliable secondary authorities in support of the Reformed interpretation of Scripture.

The few existing treatments by scholars of Pierre du Moulin's life and theology often misunderstand his connection to the Reformed tradition, his use of the Church Fathers in anti-Catholic polemics, and his patronage relationship with King James. For example, Brian Armstrong published multiple works on du Moulin, including a lengthy bibliography of the pastor's works, but focused primarily on du Moulin's conflict with Moïse Amyraut, the professor of theology at the Reformed academy at Saumur. In his psychologising treatment of du Moulin, Armstrong theorised that the pastor possessed an 'upper-class mentalité and lifestyle' that drove his thoughts and actions. Armstrong then read du Moulin's actions and writings through that lens. Also, Lucien Rimbault's 1966 biography, *Pierre du Moulin 1568–*

1658: Un Pasteur Classique à l'âge classique, focuses on du Moulin's pastoral care and theology but lacks a critical treatment of his polemical writings. Sally Anne Wagstaffe's 1992 thesis made a significant contribution to the study of Roman Catholic and Protestant polemics in Paris in the early seventeenth century and provided serious analysis of many of du Moulin's major works. However, Wagstaffe neglected to address King James's *Declaration* against Cardinal Du Perron, simply noting that du Moulin was its author. Also, she did not explore how the political and ecclesiastical contexts in France and England helped to shape du Moulin's activity and thought, and she misunderstood du Moulin's use of Scripture and the Church Fathers. W. Brown Patterson has produced the most significant work on the failed ecumenical project of King James and du Moulin, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, in addition to his multiple essays on the subject, but he has not undertaken a close analysis of du Moulin's polemical treatises. Finally, Elisabeth Labrousse published multiple essays on du Moulin and his family but misrepresented du Moulin as having an authoritarian perspective on ecclesiastical polity. This thesis seeks to address these misconceptions of both Pierre du Moulin's ecclesiastical activity and his theological method.

This thesis moves chronologically through du Moulin's life, showing how his polemical methodology, particularly his use of the Church Fathers, developed over time. After an introductory chapter, Chapter 2 addresses the difficult and tragic circumstances of du Moulin's youth that directly influenced his polemical thought and ecclesiastical activity. Chapter 3 covers du Moulin's life and polemical activity during his first decade in Paris (1599–1609). It surveys the political climate in France in the years following the issuing of the Edict of Nantes (1598) and introduces Jacques Davy du Perron, du Moulin's most formidable French Catholic opponent. This chapter also surveys du Moulin's polemical writings of the period and introduces Isaac Casaubon, du Moulin's onetime parishioner who staunchly opposed his pastor's treatment of the Church Fathers. Chapter 4 addresses the Oath of Allegiance controversy and the treatise wars between Catholics and Protestants, as well as du Moulin's relationship with King James VI and I of Scotland and England. James's response to du Moulin's defence of the king against Bishop Nicolas Coeffeteau altered the pastor's use of the Church Fathers in subsequent works. This chapter also covers Casaubon's treatise debate with du Perron over the title of Catholic and addresses du Perron's exchange with King James and du Moulin. Chapter 5 addresses du Moulin's polemical activity against some of his Protestant opponents. His ecclesiastical commitments led to some serious disagreements, particularly over the use of the Church Fathers and the makeup of the ancient church. The pastor faced off against Bishop Lancelot Andrewes over du Moulin's criticism of episcopal government and against the anti-Calvinists in the Arminian Controversy. Chapter 6 investigates du Moulin's final response to du Perron, with a focus on their respective approaches to history and their use of the Church Fathers. First, I explain the French and English political climates during the final years of the Oath of Allegiance controversy. Second, I offer a re-evaluation of challenges to du Moulin's commitment to presbyterian government and explain his unusual activity by examining the context of his life at the time. Third, I compare and contrast du Moulin's argumentation with contemporary Reformed theologians, including Lancelot Andrewes, William Whitaker, and Jean Daillé. Finally, the thesis closes with a conclusion that summarises and reflects on my primary arguments. Appendix 1 contains a lengthy comparison of du Moulin's citations of the Church Fathers with those of Daillé.

Revisions

This thesis differs significantly from the original version, including the title, the primary focus of the thesis, and much of the content. The original version examined the relationship of Pierre du Moulin and King James and the ideas that it produced. The current version examines Pierre du Moulin's ecclesiastical activity and his polemical method during the timeframe from his initial writings to the end of the Oath of Allegiance controversy and seeks to address the misconceptions of scholars concerning these matters. Almost the entirety of Chapter 2 in the original version, which dealt with King James's relationship with Roman Catholics, has been eliminated. Some of the background material on the Oath of Allegiance controversy from the original Chapter 2 appears in the current Chapter 4. The material covering James's ecclesiastical background from the original Chapter 3 has been eliminated. Some of the content related to the interaction between du Moulin and James appears in Chapter 4 of the current version. Most of the material related to du Moulin's ecclesiastical commitment found in the original Chapter 3 appears in Chapter 6 of the current version, with some additional analysis. Much of the content of Chapter 4 in the original version is contained in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 of the current version, with some additional analysis, and the table comparing du Moulin and Jean Daillé appears in Appendix 1 of the current version. The majority of the material on the French polemical background contained in Chapter 3 and Chapter 6 of the current version is new. Much of the original Chapter 5, which addressed William Whitaker's influence on du Moulin, is contained in the current Chapter 6, with some additional analysis. Nearly all of the material addressing du Moulin's polemical works from 1598–1619 in the current version is new. Much of the material related to du Moulin's conflict with Lancelot Andrewes contained in the original Chapter 2 is contained in the current Chapter 5, with some additional content. The majority of the material related to Isaac Casaubon in the current Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 is new.

Acknowledgements

I have had the wonderful privilege of receiving supervision from two of the leading scholars of Early Modern European History. This thesis began under the oversight of Irena Backus at the University of Geneva. Professor Backus' skills as a historian, though profound, were matched by her impeccable character and generosity. She was a remarkable lady. Her tragic illness in 2014 led me back to the oversight of Diarmaid MacCulloch, the supervisor of my 2012 MSt dissertation. Professor MacCulloch is the Platonic form of supervisor: thoroughly knowledgeable of each thread of the complex tapestry of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, yet meticulous enough to correct the placement of a comma in a footnote. He possesses the unique ability to see the big picture and each pixel simultaneously.

At Oxford, I have benefitted from many brilliant conversation partners. Sarah Apetrei and the other participants in the Church History Workshop were always quick to provide a keen insight or a laugh, or both. I am grateful to the members of the John Owen Society, including Ed Brooks, Mark Earngey, Richard Snoddy, Richard Brash, Andrew Turnbull, Kirby Applegate, Rich Duncan, and others for stimulating discussions of Reformation theology and history, as well as great friendship. Keble College and its staff provided excellent support for my post-graduate studies. The Sloane Robinson Scholarship and grants from the Keble Association enabled me to pursue my research and attend conferences in multiple cities in Europe and North America.

A number of friends and colleagues have offered helpful suggestions, criticism, and camaraderie over the years. I am thankful for Zach Purvis and Joshua Forrest, my companions during my first year in Oxford. Paul Levy, Andy Young, Kevin Bidwell, Andy Pearson, Steve Parks, Casey Carmichael, Dan Saxton, Marty Klauber, Jared Beaird, Adam Duker, David Booth and MVPC, and members of TAC in Oxford, amongst many others, helped me along the way.

Archivists and librarians at many institutions gave invaluable assistance. These include Oxford's Bodleian Libraries and various college libraries, the British Library, the London Library, The Institute of Historical Research, The Warburg Institute, The National Archives, The National Archives of Scotland, and the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Finally, I am most grateful to my wife Marcy, who has made innumerable sacrifices to enable me to pursue my academic career.

Contents

Short Abstract 2
Long Abstract 3
Revisions 6
Acknowledgements 7
Abbreviations 9

1. Introduction: An Underappreciated Career 11

2. Du Moulin's Early Life and Polemical Influences 26

3. Du Moulin's French Polemical Period (1599-1609) 53

4. An International Crisis: The Oath of Allegiance Controversy (1609–1615) 103

5. Intra-Protestant Polemics over the Use of the Fathers (1612-1619) 167

6. Du Moulin's Final Activity in the Oath of Allegiance Controversy (1615-1627) 195

7. Conclusion 260

Appendix 269

Bibliography 287

Abbreviations

AHSI	*Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*
APS	*Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, 1127–1707*, ed. Thomas Thomson and Cosmo Innes, 12 vols (Edinburgh, 1814–1875)
BSHPF	*Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*
BUK	*Booke of the Universall Kirk: Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland, 1560–1618*, ed. Thomas Thomson, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1839–45)
CH	*Church History*
CHR	*Catholic Historical Review*
CSPScot	*Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547–1603*, ed. Joseph Bain, et al., 13 vols in 14 parts (Edinburgh, 1898–1969)
CSPSpan	*Calendar of Letters and State Papers Relating to English Affairs preserved in, or originally belonging to the Archives of Simancas*, ed. Martin A. S. Hume, 4 vols (London, 1892–1899)
CSPVen	*Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy*, ed. Horatio F. Brown, et al., 38 vols (London, 1864–1947)
EHR	*English Historical Review*
HJ	*Historical Journal*
HLQ	*Huntington Library Quarterly*
HMC	*Historical Manuscripts Commission*
HT	*History Today*
JBS	*Journal of British Studies*
JEH	*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*
JES	*Journal of Ecumenical Studies*
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

PRRD	Richard Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: the Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725.* 2nd edn, 4 vols (Grand Rapids, 1987–2006)
RH	*Recusant History*
SHR	*Scottish Historical Review*
SP	*State Papers*
TAPS	*Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*
TNA, Salisbury	*Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House*, ed. M. S. Giuseppi, et al., 24 vols. (London, 1888–1976)
TNA	*The National Archives of the United Kingdom*
TJ	*Theological Journal*
WTJ	Westminster Theological Journal

Chapter 1

Introduction: An Underappreciated Career

In the autumn of 1620, the prominent French Reformed minister Pierre du Moulin nearly lost his freedom. Edward Herbert, ambassador for King James VI and I of Scotland and England in Paris, pleaded with du Moulin to write to the king requesting that he aid his son-in-law, the Elector Palatine and so-called King of Bohemia, in the early days of the Thirty Years War. Du Moulin, who pastored the French Reformed congregation in Paris, had been corresponding with James for more than ten years and had produced multiple theological treatises on behalf of the king. He also had visited James in England in 1615. Du Moulin, however, had never inserted himself into a volatile political situation involving James.

Du Moulin later recorded that he refused Herbert's initial request because 'this business was too high for a man of low condition like me.'[1] Herbert replied that du Moulin's letters 'were always very acceptable to his Majesty and might work very much upon him.'[2] Deluded by ego or naïveté, du Moulin complied with Herbert's request and delivered the letter to the ambassador's secretary. Du Moulin then travelled to Alès to preside over the Reformed Synod. The letter never reached James's hand.

The council of the French king intercepted du Moulin's letter and ordered his arrest for petitioning a foreign monarch to engage in war on behalf of Protestants.[3]

---

[1] P. du Moulin, 'Autobiographie de Pierre du Moulin' in *BSHPF*, 71 (Paris, 1858), 471: 'cette affaire estoit trop grande pour un homme de basse condition comme moy'.
[2] Peter du Moulin, 'The Authors Life', in Pierre du Moulin, *The Novelty of Popery* (London, 1662), ****3r.
[3] Lucien Rimbault speculated that George Villiers, the future Duke of Buckingham, was responsible for the interception of the letter but offered no proof. Rimbault, *Pierre du Moulin, 1568–1658: Un Pasteur classique à l'âge classique* (Paris, 1966), 78.

Herbert blamed du Moulin for the intercept. William Boswell, Herbert's secretary, reported to Robert Naunton, James's secretary of state, that 'he [Herbert] was told by a personage of good qualitie that 301 [Comte de Tillières] gave advertisment of a lettre which 185 [du Moulin] should write into England. It hath byn since discovered, that 185 hath either by his owne carelesnes, or perchance vanitie, suffred some copies to come into such hands, that now the State takes notice of it.'[4] After receiving word that he was a wanted man, du Moulin snuck into Paris at night and met with Herbert, who advised him to flee for his life. Without returning to his home, du Moulin left Paris and the church he had pastored for more than twenty years and escaped to Sedan, a city of refuge for Reformed Protestants. Du Moulin remained in Sedan for the majority of his remaining years.

Du Moulin's ambition and confidence had garnered him international influence and financial gain. However, these passions had clouded his judgement in sending the letter to James and led him to the lowest moment of his life. He lost his congregation and the primary means of providing for his family. He could no longer participate in the primary activities of the French Reformed churches (e.g., synods), and he almost lost his life.

Paradoxically, this very same ambition and confidence led to du Moulin's resurgence. The pastor wrote James less than a year after his exile proposing that he move his family to England.[5] Two years later, James invited du Moulin to relocate. The king had commissioned the pastor to issue a response to Cardinal Jacques Davy du Perron's volume against him and believed that England offered 'more leisure and

---

[4] Boswell to Naunton, 20/30 Jan 1621, TNA SP 78/69 f. 18*v*. In a subsequent letter to Naunton, Boswell wrote: 'My Lord Ambassador saith, yt. Mons. Du Moulin is much to blame to accuse any but himself for publishing of his lres, as my Lo. Ambr. formerly signified to your Honr.' Boswell to Naunton, 30 Jan/9 Feb 1621, TNA SP 78/69 f. 39*r*.

[5] Du Moulin to James I, 27 Aug/6 Sept 1621, TNA SP 78/69 f. 174.

helps' for the completion of the project.[6] Du Moulin accepted the king's invitation and remained in England until shortly after James's death in 1625.

Du Moulin published his reply to du Perron, one of the most celebrated works of his long career, in 1627. He fulfilled his commitment to James, even though the king had been dead for two years. Du Moulin remarked: 'This great king having given me the honour to employ my pen for his defence during his lifetime, I would be ungrateful to his memory if I abandoned his cause after his death.'[7]

This account of exile and resurgence displays the struggle for consistency in the life of Pierre du Moulin. A dedicated churchman and husband and father, he also was a fiery polemicist with grand visions for achieving theological and ecclesiastical prominence. He failed to achieve his goal of becoming one of the leading figures in a reunited Christendom, but he did become a respected leader within both the French Reformed churches and international Calvinism.

Pierre du Moulin was the pre-eminent figure in the French Reformed churches in the first half of the seventeenth century. His theological treatises, devotional works, and collections of sermons appeared in more than twelve hundred separate editions or printings. Brian Armstrong estimated that du Moulin was published more frequently than any Calvinist writer during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with the only possible exceptions being John Calvin and Theodore Beza.[8] The focus of attention in this thesis is du Moulin's polemical works, with particular attention to his volumes against Cardinal du Perron. Du Moulin did

---

[6] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', *****v–*****2r.
[7] P. du Moulin, *Nouveauté du Papisme* (Sedan, 1627), *iij: 'Ce grand Roy durant sa vie m'ayant fait l'honneur d'employer ma plume pour sa defense, je serois ingrat à sa memoire si s'abandonnois sa cause apres sa mort.'
[8] B. Armstrong, *Bibliographia Molinaei* (Geneva, 1997), XI.

not reach the theological heights of fellow Reformed Protestants John Owen or Francis Turretin, but he does rank as one of the foremost polemicists of his era.

In his 1985 work covering polemics during the time when the Edict of Nantes was in force, Jacques Solé noted that French Protestantism during that period has 'hardly been the subject of prolonged attention', but is 'readily confined in the confessional or theological ghetto without granting to it the honour of having contributed, in a decisive manner, to the intellectual evolution of the century.'[9] Historians have focused more attention on French Protestantism of the seventeenth century in general and on du Moulin in particular in the years since Solé's writing, but there remains much work to be done in this field. A study of du Moulin's ecclesiastical and theological development in the tumultuous thirty-year period after the Edict was promulgated can inform our overall understanding of the intellectual and cultural evolution of that era. Thus, I hope to contribute to the developing body of scholarly literature on the history of Reformed-Catholic polemics of the seventeenth century, the use of the Church Fathers, the Protestant and Catholic approaches to church tradition, and Reformed church government.[10]

Since du Moulin's body of work is so extensive, I limit the scope of this thesis to his early polemical writings and his treatise debate with Cardinal du Perron, roughly 1600–1630. The originality of this thesis lies not in the discovery of previously unknown material but in its revision of du Moulin's role as a French Reformed churchman and polemicist.

---

[9] J. Solé, *Le débat entre protestants et catholiques français de 1598 a 1685*, 4 vols (Lille, 1985), 1:2: 'Etudiée dans les seules perspectives d'une hagiographie traditionnelle, puis soumise à l'analyse aiguë de la naissante sociologie historique, sa pensée religieuse n'a guère fait l'objet d'une attention prolongée. On l'enferme volontiers dans le ghetto confessionnel ou théologique sans lui accorder l'honneur d'avoir contribué, de façon décisive, à l'évolution intellectuelle du siècle.'

[10] Throughout the thesis, '(T)radition' is capitalised when referring to the Roman Catholic doctrine and lowercase when referring to the Reformed doctrine.

Scholarship on Pierre du Moulin

Despite his numerous writings and profound influence on the French Reformed churches, Pierre du Moulin has not received much attention from scholars. Brian Armstrong published more on du Moulin than any historian to date, including a lengthy bibliography of du Moulin's works.[11] He gave some attention in a brief essay to the pastor's role in the Oath of Allegiance controversy involving King James but did not pursue its influence on du Moulin's activity or thought beyond a concise treatment of the subsequent ecumenical project of James and du Moulin to reunite Christendom.[12] Armstrong primarily focused on du Moulin's battles with Moïse Amyraut, professor at the Reformed academy at Saumur, over hypothetical universalism.[13]

No substantial biography of Pierre du Moulin exists. The project is made more difficult by the unreliability of his autobiography, which was not published widely until the nineteenth century.[14] Whatever insights might be gained from the work are overshadowed by du Moulin's dramatic accounts of fighting off multiple would-be assassins like a Calvinist superhero. His exaggerations leave the reader in doubt as to which parts are honest recollections and which are fanciful tales. His son, Peter du Moulin, a minister in the Church of England and chaplain to King Charles II, included a biography of his father with his 1662 English translation of *Nouveauté du Papisme*.[15] Though more reliable than du Moulin's autobiography, the work presents the pastor as something of a Protestant saint, complete with a spotless record against Roman Catholic apologists and a permanent pious demeanour in the face of hostility.

---

[11] Armstrong, *Bibliographia Molinaei*.
[12] Armstrong, 'Pierre du Moulin and James I: the Anglo-French programme', in M. Magdelaine, M-C. Pitassi, R. Whelan, and A. McKenna, eds., *De l'humanisme aux lumières* (Paris, 1996), 15–29.
[13] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy* (Madison, WI, 1969).
[14] Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 171–82, 333–44, 465–77.
[15] Peter du Moulin, 'The Authors Life', in du Moulin, *Novelty of Popery* (London, 1662).

Both works are appropriate for their time and should not be held to the standards of modern historiography.

Two biographical works from the nineteenth century rely heavily on du Moulin's autobiography and Peter's biography without providing much insight.[16] Lucien Rimbault's 1966 biography, *Pierre du Moulin 1568–1658: Un Pasteur Classique à l'âge classique*, highlights du Moulin's pastoral care and theology.[17] Rimbault offered an alternative to scholars who focused exclusively on du Moulin as polemicist and showcased the works written to benefit the French Reformed churches. The biography does not present the definitive portrait of du Moulin, however, and lacks a critical treatment of du Moulin's polemical writings. C. Verdouw published a brief biography in Dutch that offers minimal insight.[18] Gordon Tait's 1955 doctoral thesis on du Moulin attempted 'to record the facts of his life in a complete fashion for the first time' but did not intend to present a detailed treatment of the pastor's theology or methodology.[19] J. Van der Meij wrote a fine essay on du Moulin's time in Leiden prior to his introduction to King James.[20] Elisabeth Labrousse produced multiple essays on the du Moulin family and briefly addressed du Moulin's position on church polity.[21]

Sally Anne Wagstaffe made a significant contribution to the study of Roman Catholic and Protestant polemics in Paris in the early seventeenth century with her 1992 thesis at the University of Durham, particularly with her explanations of the

---

[16] E. Armand, *Essai sur la vie de Du Moulin* (Strasbourg, 1846); G. Gory, *Pierre du Moulin: Essai sur sa vie, sa controverse et sa polémique* (Paris, 1888).
[17] Rimbault, *Pierre du Moulin* (Paris, 1966).
[18] C. Verdouw, *Pierre du Moulin: Hugenotenpredikant in de strijd* (Houten, 2005).
[19] G. Tait, 'Pierre du Moulin (1568–1658), Huguenot Theologian' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 1955), iii.
[20] J. Van der Meij. 'Pierre du Moulin in Leiden, 1592-1598', *Lias*, 14.1 (1987), 15-40.
[21] Labrousse, 'Great Britain as Envisaged by the Huguenots', in I. Scouloudi, ed., *Huguenots in Britain and their French Background* (Basingstoke, 1987), 143–57; idem, 'Marie Du Moulin éducatrice', BSHPF, 139 (1993), 255–68; idem, 'L'oeuvre de Pierre II Du Moulin', *Annuaire de l'Ecole des hautes études*, 4e section, 104 (1971–72), 529–38.

different methods of argumentation used by the various polemicists.[22] Although she did not focus exclusively on du Moulin, she did provide serious analysis of most of his major works, including *Nouveauté du Papisme*. However, Wagstaffe did not include analysis of King James's *Declaration* against Cardinal Du Perron, simply noting that du Moulin was its author. Wagstaffe ably demonstrated how the Parisian political and ecclesiastical contexts influenced du Moulin's public and written debates but did not explore how the political and ecclesiastical contexts in France and England helped to shape du Moulin's activity and thought. She acknowledged the importance of du Moulin's alignment with King James from the death of King Henri IV to shortly after Louis XIII assumed his personal rule (1610–1616), but did not recognise that James's patronage continued to play a central role in du Moulin's life until the king's death in 1625 and influenced the pastor to pursue a similar arrangement with King Charles.

W. Brown Patterson produced the most significant work on the failed ecumenical project of King James and du Moulin, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*, in addition to his multiple essays on the subject.[23] He provides a fine treatment of the Oath of Allegiance controversy and the repercussions felt by all of Western Europe. Patterson addresses du Moulin's treatise debate with du Perron but does not aim to provide a thorough analysis. He also does not offer a detailed explanation of some aspects of du Moulin's ecclesiastical activity during the controversy.

---

[22] S. A. Wagstaffe, 'Forms and methods of religious controversy in Paris: with special reference to Pierre du Moulin and his Catholic opponents' (unpublished PhD thesis, Durham University, 1990).
[23] W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997); Patterson, 'James I and the Huguenot Synod of Tonneins of 1614', *HTR*, 65 (1972), 241–70; Patterson, 'Pierre du Moulin's Quest for Protestant Unity, 1613–1618' in R. N. Swanson, ed., *Unity and Diversity in the Church* (Oxford, 1996), 235–49.

Scholars of early modern Roman Catholic and Reformed Protestant polemics have addressed Pierre du Moulin's works in broader treatments of the subject. Jean-Louis Quantin offers valuable contributions to research in the use of the Church Fathers by theologians in the Church of England in the seventeenth century in his 2009 volume.[24] He provides keen insights into the thought of Cardinal du Perron but moves too quickly past du Moulin on his way to the more celebrated work by Jean Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des Saincts Peres*. In doing so, Quantin overlooks both the influence that du Moulin had on Daillé and du Moulin's place as a transitional figure in Reformed Protestant polemics. Anthony Milton delivers an astute assessment of du Moulin's role in the treatise wars of the early seventeenth century.[25] His depiction of the English political and ecclesiastical context provides the reader with a deeper understanding of du Moulin's thought and action, particularly with regard to church polity. The scope of the work, however, prevented Milton from thoroughly assessing du Moulin's theological contributions. Jacques Solé provided an excellent thematic overview of the debate between Catholics and Protestants from 1598 to 1685.[26] Sylvio Hermann De Franceschi's massive *La Crise Théologico-Politique du Premier Âge Baroque* gives an extensive treatment of the Roman Catholic and Protestant conflicts of the early seventeenth century, including the Oath of Allegiance controversy, the clash between the Gallicans and 'Le Parti Zélé', and the debates between Jesuitism and 'Catholicisme Antiromain'.[27] Franceschi skilfully addresses the theological issues at the centre of these conflicts but does not intend to provide an analysis of each theological treatise produced during this period. He gives attention to du Moulin's polemical works, but the breadth of the work prevents him

[24] J-L. Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford, 2009).
[25] A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed* (Cambridge, 1995).
[26] Solé, *Le débat entre protestants et catholiques français de 1598 a 1685*.
[27] S. H. De Franceschi, *La Crise Théologico-Politique du Premier Âge Baroque* (Rome, 2009).

from exploring them in detail. Rémi Snoeks focuses on the eucharistic controversy between Catholics and Protestants.[28]

Statement of the Problem

In his psychologising treatment of du Moulin, Bryan Armstrong theorised that the pastor possessed an 'upper-class mentalité and lifestyle' that drove his thoughts and actions.[29] Armstrong then interpreted du Moulin's life and thought through that lens. When Armstrong addressed du Moulin's presbyterian polity he concluded that the pastor secretly preferred episcopal government because it was more authoritarian.[30] With only minimal evidence presented, he concluded that du Moulin was 'authoritarian through and through, by nature, by birth, and by the positions he held.'[31] Elisabeth Labrousse drew similar conclusions in her treatment of du Moulin's position on church polity.[32]

Gordon Tait portrayed du Moulin in a more favourable light: 'There is the very real element of inspiration and example from the life of Pierre Du Moulin. His life was a noble one, and its narration moves and challenges the reader as the years and the events go by. It is not enough to wish that there were more such men of God in the Reformed Church of France today. His life speaks to any Christian in any land, and its message is that we all must be men of action, under God.'[33] Tait did offer some critique of du Moulin, but overall he read the pastor through the most sympathetic lens possible.

---

[28] R. Snoeks, *L'argument de tradition dans la controverse eucharistique entre catholiques et réformés français au XVIIe siècle* (Louvain–Gembloux, 1951).
[29] Armstrong, 'The Changing Face of French Protestantism: The Influence of Pierre du Moulin', in R. Schnucker, ed., *Calviniana* (Kirksville, MO, 1988), 139.
[30] Armstrong, 'Influence of Pierre du Moulin', 140.
[31] Armstrong, 'Influence of Pierre du Moulin', 139.
[32] Labrousse, 'Great Britain as Envisaged by the Huguenots', 143–57.
[33] Tait, 'Pierre du Moulin', 237.

The evidence of his life and work shows that Pierre du Moulin was neither a saint, nor an 'authoritarian through and through'. He was a divided man. On the one hand, according to his son, the 'sad condition of the Reformed Churches did totally possess his thoughts and cares.'[34] As a pastor and theologian he dedicated himself to serving the French Reformed churches. On the other hand, he was a pragmatist seeking to support his large family and to expand his international influence. He even attempted a clandestine exit from the French Reformed churches in an attempt to improve his family's financial position.[35]

Du Moulin's use of Scripture and tradition has been misrepresented by scholars. Tait noted that 'in 1610 Du Moulin was much more disposed to using the Fathers for support than in 1600', but he offered no further explanation of the matter. In her observation of the similarities between du Moulin and William Whitaker, du Moulin's professor at Cambridge, Sally Ann Wagstaffe locates their doctrine of Scripture outside of mainstream Reformed Protestant theology and considers it detrimental to the standing of the Church Fathers.[36] However, both Whitaker and du Moulin stood in the mainstream of Reformed Protestant understanding of Scripture and the Church Fathers going back to John Calvin.

Jean-Louis Quantin claimed that 'Daillé's list of doctrinal errors into which the Fathers had fallen, both singly and collectively, was of unprecedented comprehensiveness and remained unsurpassed.'[37] He cited Daillé's chapter: 'Que les Peres se sont abusez en divers poincts de la Religion, et à part et plusieurs ensemble.'[38] Quantin did not notice, however, that du Moulin delivered a list of

---

[34] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ****4*r*.
[35] See Chapter 4.
[36] Wagstaffe, 'Forms and methods of religious controversy in Paris', 140.
[37] Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 232.
[38] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 341–415: 'That the Fathers have erred in various points of Religion, both individually and several together'.

heterodox teaching by the Fathers that included the majority of Daillé's examples and many more.[39]

This thesis seeks to address these misconceptions of both Pierre du Moulin's ecclesiastical activity and his theological method.

Statement of the Thesis

This thesis examines Pierre du Moulin's ecclesiastical activity and his polemical method during the timeframe from his initial writings to the end of the Oath of Allegiance controversy. I argue that du Moulin developed as a churchman and polemical theologian due to international influences, along with his desire to expand his international reputation, and that he altered his use of the Church Fathers to accommodate these international influences.

Du Moulin rose to prominence in international Calvinism through his patronage relationship with King James, the most powerful Protestant monarch in Europe. The pair's plan for the reunion of Christendom garnered much attention from Protestants and Roman Catholics. The plan called first for an international Protestant synod and the composition of a joint confession. Du Moulin stipulated that the confession must avoid issues that were not necessary to salvation, including issues related to the Arminian controversy, such as free will and predestination. He subsequently issued *Anatome Arminianismi*, one of the most scathing treatments of Arminianism to come out of the Calvinist camp.[40] Du Moulin's position on Arminians thus transitioned from regarding them as potential partners in the reunion of Christendom to seeing them as unrepentant heretics.

---

[39] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 175–86.
[40] P. du Moulin, *Anatome Arminianismi* (Leiden, 1619).

Du Moulin took ministerial vows to uphold the presbyterian form of government of the French Reformed churches and was tasked by his church to attack the legitimacy of the Roman Catholic episcopate.[41] The Church of England received some collateral damage in du Moulin's assault. He soon distanced himself from these arguments after he learned that the work had 'grieved the soul' of King James. The king commissioned his favourite court preacher, Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, to deal with his wayward beneficiary.[42] Du Moulin then attempted to return to James's good graces without jeopardising his standing in his presbyterian Church. However, the pastor evidently was willing to leave his Church in 1624 when he requested that James name him bishop of Gloucester.[43]

Du Moulin upheld the Reformed understanding of *sola Scriptura* and was hesitant to use the Church Fathers in his sermons and treatises. The renowned classicist Isaac Casaubon had little respect for du Moulin's position: 'Jam quod idem Molineus, omnes Veterum libros suæ doctrinæ contrarios respuit, ut πεδαλεμαίυς, cui mediocriter docto fidem faciet?'[44] Du Moulin's position, said Casaubon, judged Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, and all the Fathers to be deluded.[45] Du Moulin, however, adjusted his position between 1600–1610, as Tait rightly noted. By the end of the Oath of Allegiance controversy, he was prepared to argue that Reformed Protestantism closely resembled the church of the first five centuries, at least in terms of what was necessary for salvation. Du Moulin never wavered in his rejection of a patristic authority as 'juge des controverses', but he did expand his use

[41] P. du Moulin, *De la Vocation des* Pasteurs (Sedan, 1618).
[42] 'Lanceloti Episcopi Wintoniensis responsiones ad Petri Molinaei . . .', in Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 175–6.
[43] TNA SP 78/61 f. 129.
[44] Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 350: 'Now, because the same du Moulin rejects all the books of the ancients that are contrary to his doctrine, so that he may give credence to one only moderately learned?'
[45] Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 350.

of the Fathers in polemical contexts, likely through the influence of Casaubon, Andrewes, and others. Casaubon and Andrewes are used as conversation partners in this thesis to contrast du Moulin's approach and to show how he responded to interactions with them. In the end, du Moulin followed the mainstream Reformed approach of using *sola Scriptura* to defend the Reformed position and to attack that of his opponents, while viewing the Church Fathers not as vindication *par excellence* of the Reformed confession but as reliable secondary authorities in support of the Reformed interpretation of Scripture.

Overview of Chapters

This thesis moves chronologically through du Moulin's life. Chapter 2 addresses the financial distress and tragic circumstances of his childhood that shaped du Moulin's polemical thought and ecclesiastical activity. It examines the influence of John Rainolds, William Whitaker, and John Calvin on du Moulin's use of the Church Fathers. The chapter also corrects misunderstandings of du Moulin's use of humanism and reason in his theology. Du Moulin has been mischaracterised by Brian Armstrong as a rationalist who abandoned the French humanism of John Calvin in order to combat the Arminians. Rather, du Moulin's works demonstrate that he used elements of both scholasticism and humanism in order to support his primary authority, *sola Scriptura*.

Chapter 3 covers du Moulin's life and polemical activity in his first decade in Paris. It surveys the political climate in France in the years following the issuing of the Edict of Nantes (1598), which gave the French Reformed some level of religious freedom and allowed du Moulin's Parisian congregation to flourish. It introduces Jacques Davy du Perron, du Moulin's most formidable French Catholic opponent. Du

Perron broke from typical post-Tridentine Catholic methodology with his novel approach to *consensus Patrum*, and the debate between du Perron and Philippe du Plessis de Mornay before King Henri IV at Fontainebleau set the tone for Catholic and Protestant polemics during the era of the Edict of Nantes. This chapter surveys du Moulin's polemical writings of the period, with a focus on how he used the Church Fathers. It also introduces Isaac Casaubon, du Moulin's onetime parishioner who staunchly opposed his pastor's treatment of the Church Fathers.

Chapter 4 addresses the Oath of Allegiance controversy and the treatise wars between Catholics and Protestants, as well as du Moulin's relationship with King James VI and I of Scotland and England and their plan for the reunion of Christendom. This chapter examines du Moulin's polemical work against Bishop Nicolas Coeffeteau and his first trip to England as a guest of King James. It covers Casaubon's exchange with du Perron over the title of Catholic and addresses the cardinal's speech at the meeting of the Estates General along with du Moulin's response to the speech on behalf of James. It closes with du Perron's posthumous reply to King James.

Chapter 5 covers du Moulin's polemical activity against some of his Protestant opponents. The pastor faced off against Bishop Lancelot Andrewes over du Moulin's criticism of episcopal government. He tried to display his commitment to the presbyterian polity of the French Reformed churches without upsetting his benefactor, King James. It also addresses his writings against Conradus Vorstius and Jacob Arminius and the Remonstrants. Despite the struggles he had with his Reformed Protestant contemporaries over their different approaches, du Moulin still exhibited many similarities with them in his treatises against Roman Catholics and Arminians.

Chapter 6 examines du Moulin's final activity in the Oath of Allegiance controversy. It provides a brief survey of the political climate in France under King Louis XIII and the political and religious climate in England at the time of du Moulin's writing of his final response to du Perron. It also re-evaluates challenges to du Moulin's commitment to presbyterian government and explains his unusual activity by examining the context of his life at the time. It examines du Moulin's final work against du Perron, *Nouveauté du Papisme*, and demonstrates that he stood in the mainstream of Reformed Protestant polemics in his treatment of the Church Fathers but nuanced or obfuscated his position in order to maintain favourable relations with King James, King Charles I, and the Church of England. It tabulates the role played by William Whitaker in shaping the application of du Moulin's theology and polemical methodology. Finally, the chapter examines the influence of du Moulin on his fellow French Reformed polemicist, Jean Daillé.

Chapter 2

Du Moulin's Early Life and Polemical Influences

Brian Armstrong commented that du Moulin's 'versatility and contribution to the scholarly world of language study, philosophy, and theology is still imperfectly known.'[1] A brief introduction to du Moulin's life and context is necessary for a full picture of his character and thought, for despite being arguably the most prominent French Reformed Protestant of the seventeenth century, he remains relatively unknown or often misunderstood by many historians.

Pierre du Moulin's tumultuous childhood and impoverished early adulthood, in addition to his theological education, shaped his later life and career. His motivations and ecclesiastical activity during his ministry should be re-evaluated in light of events in his personal life and his theological influences. Contrary to Brian Armstrong's claim that the pastor was motivated by an 'upper-class mentalité and lifestyle', du Moulin desired to give his children the stable environment that he never had and remain faithful to the teaching of his Reformed forefathers, including John Calvin, John Rainolds, and William Whitaker who expressed reverence for the Church Fathers while rejecting their usefulness as judges of contemporary theological controversies.[2]

Son of a Preacher

j

[1] Armstrong, *Bibliographia Molinæi*, vii.
[2] Armstrong, 'The Changing Face of French Protestantism: The Influence of Pierre du Moulin', in R. Schnucker, ed., *Calviniana* (Kirksville, MO, 1988), 139.

Pierre du Moulin was born in October 1568 at the home of the elder brother of Philippe du Plessis-Mornay. In fact, du Moulin was born in the same room as the renowned Reformed Protestant statesman. The du Moulins liked to trace their relations to the royal families of both France and England. Armstrong claimed that much of du Moulin's 'character can be understood only in the light of his noble heritage.'[3] Du Moulin's father, Joachim, had been born into a Roman Catholic family, but his schoolmaster in Paris convinced him of the Reformed faith. Joachim's convictions were so strong that 'neither the proffer of worldly advancement, nor his Mothers severity threating to forsake and disinherit him could turn him from his holy purpose.'[4] Joachim was disinherited at his mother's death, and he struggled for decades to support his family on the meagre income of a pastor. Despite the rumours of the day that Pierre was the son of an apostate friar, Joachim had never spent time in a monastery. Pierre praised his father for his 'honourable conversation, his brave mind in his continual afflictions for the Gospel which he bore cheerfully, his fervent zeal, his vigilance in his calling, his pleasing and affable behaviour which he seasoned with a meek gravity. These, I say, were as far from the air of the Cloyster as the Heaven is from the Earth, and the Mass from the Gospel.'[5]

Due to persecution, Joachim and his family were forced to flee from persecution to the Mornay home in Normandy at the outbreak of the third French religious war in the autumn of 1568. In 1570, the du Moulins settled in Soissons, where Joachim pastored the Reformed Protestant congregation. The St Bartholomew's Day Massacre in 1572 had a profound effect on the family. Pierre's maternal grandfather was martyred, 'leaving to his Posterity the honour to be the seed

[3] Armstrong, 'Influence of Pierre du Moulin', 135.
[4] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', **4.
[5] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', **5.

of a Martyr, which is no small nobility.'[6] Joachim, a target for Roman Catholic zealots, left his four children in the care of a Catholic farmwoman, while he and his wife fled to Sedan. Pierre hid under a bed when the Catholic soldiers entered the farmhouse, and his sister nearly smothered him while attempting to quiet his whimpering.

Pierre received his education at the recently founded college at Sedan, while his father pastored the Reformed church at Soissons. Joachim was forced to seek refuge from persecution in Sedan on several occasions. Pierre's mother died when he was five years old in 1573, and his father remarried the following year. When Pierre was twenty years old in 1588, he went to study at the universities in England, an opportunity typically afforded only to the wealthy. Far from capitalising on their noble heritage, the du Moulins were mired in poverty, and Pierre needed to make his own way. His father had initially sent him to Paris to find work, but the persecution of Protestants in that city forced Pierre to escape to England.[7]

Pierre du Moulin's character and actions over the remaining course of his life should be understood in light of his surviving the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre and his family's extreme poverty, not his noble heritage, as Armstrong suggested. Pierre's enduring enthusiasm for anti-Catholic polemics and his relentless attacks in each of his works most likely resulted from his traumatic experiences when he was only four years old, when he was preserved 'from the rage of Satan and the world.'[8] His anti-Catholic bitterness was undoubtedly deepened during his time studying in England when he received news that his younger brother in France had been captured by the Catholic League and buried alive.[9] Some of Pierre's career moves, particularly

---

[6] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', **5.
[7] Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 176.
[8] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', **6.
[9] Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 178–9; Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', **6.

his attempts to gain an international reputation, surely were motivated, at least in part, by a desire to improve his family's financial position and to spare his children from the economic hardships that he faced as a youth. The chaos of his upbringing—the persecution, the forced exile, his father's frequent absences, and the death of his mother when he was only five—drove him to seek stability for his own wife and children.

England

When du Moulin arrived in London, he connected with the Huguenot congregation in the city and filled the pulpit on multiple occasions. He survived in England on the financial gifts that were sent to him by the churches in France. A representative of the Reformed congregation at Paris asked du Moulin if he would be interested in serving a re-established congregation there. Du Moulin graciously declined the offer to pastor a congregation that did not yet exist and could not pay him. The individual informed du Moulin that the congregation would be re-established soon and assured him that they had the necessary funds. Du Moulin accepted this condition and was promised fifty *éscus* per year, 'which was a sufficient sum to live honestly.'[10] This negotiation reveals that financial security stood near the forefront of du Moulin's thinking, even as a young man without a family. This desire would remain prominent for the rest of his life. The extreme poverty that du Moulin experienced as a child and as a young man in England drove him to the prioritise financial security for himself and his family above almost everything else in his life, even his theology on occasion.

Huguenot refugees found du Moulin work with Henry Constable, an English poet and courtier to Elizabeth I familiar with France through his service in the 1580s

[10] Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 179: 'qui estoit une somme suffisante pour vivre honnestement'.

with the English ambassador Sir Edward Stafford. Constable was himself a Protestant polemicist: in 1589, he published an answer to Cardinal Robert Bellarmine's *Responsio ad praecipu capita apologiae*.[11] Perhaps significantly, this was couched in terms as if written by a Roman Catholic. Sent by the queen with 4,000 troops to aid Henri IV in 1591, Constable now declared his allegiance to Catholicism, refused to return to England, and later befriended Jacques Davy du Perron.[12] Constable's conversion surely weighed on du Moulin, the budding Protestant polemicist, and he might have had Constable on his mind when he attempted to thwart another conversion of a Protestant polemicist, Isaac Casaubon, at the hands of du Perron.[13]

During this volte-face, du Moulin was still in England, but fortunately not dependent on Constable: prior to his conversion, Constable had recommended him to the Countess of Rutland, who hired the young Frenchman to tutor her son at Cambridge.[14] This position enabled du Moulin to continue his own studies and matriculate at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, where he heard the lectures of William Whitaker, 'homme de grand sçavoir', and possibly at Oxford under John Rainolds (Reynolds).[15]

John Rainolds

[11] H. Constable, *Examen pacifique de la doctrine des Huguenots* (London, 1589).
[12] Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 178–9.
[13] See Chapter 3.
[14] J. Venn and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, 2 parts in 10 vols (Cambridge), Part I, vol. iii. 197; du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 179; du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***4; Eugène Haag and Émile Haag, *La France Protestante* . . ., 10 vols (Paris, 1846–59), v. 801.
[15] Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 179; J. Venn and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, 2 parts in 10 vols (Cambridge, 1924), Part I, vol. iii. 197; du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 179; du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***4; Eugène Haag and Émile Haag, *La France Protestante* . . ., 10 vols (Paris, 1846–59), v. 801.

According to both Protestant biographer John Quick and an anonymous biography published in the year of du Moulin's death, the Frenchman studied at Oxford under John Rainolds.[16] However, the archives of Queen's College, where Rainolds lectured in theology, and Corpus Christi College, where Rainolds served as president, contain no documentation of Pierre du Moulin. Even if they never met, du Moulin undoubtedly was familiar with Rainolds, one of the leading Puritans of his day, and his work. The Frenchman also exhibited some similar characteristics to the Oxford don in his polemical writings.

John Hart, a Jesuit missionary imprisoned in England, was sent by Francis Walsingham to Oxford to dialogue with John Rainolds, and their discussions were published in 1584. Rainolds upheld the mainstream Protestant view of *sola Scriptura* but used the Church Fathers to support his own positions and to attack those of his opponent. He found Augustine particularly useful against Hart.[17] Rainolds exhibited a fearlessness that many of his fellow Protestants did not possess when he devalued the authority of the Fathers. He said that 'although the Fathers were men indued of God with excellent gifts, and brought no smal light to understanding of the Scriptures: yet learned men in our daies may give a right sence of sundrie places thereof which the Fathers saw not, yea against the which perhaps they consent.'[18] Rainolds was unafraid to disagree with the Fathers, even when it appeared that they had a consensus, if he thought that they misinterpreted Scripture.

Rainolds argued that even if the consensus of the Fathers carried special authority, it was impossible to prove. With regard to the exposition of Scripture, Hart

---

[16] J. Quick, 'The Life of Monsr. Peter du Moulin Minr. Of Paris', *Icones Sacrae Gallicanae* (MS transcript, Dr Williams's Library, London), 3; *Sommaire de la Vie de M^r^ Moulin* . . . (Charenton, 1658), A ij.
[17] J. Rainolds, *The Summe of the Conference betweene John Rainoldes and John Hart* (London, 1598), 27–9, 35, 43, 46–7, 49–50, 53.
[18] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, 37.

had claimed that 'we allow onely of the churches exposition.' Rainolds responded, 'What is (I pray you) the churches exposition?' Hart replied, 'That which all the Fathers make with one consent.' Rainolds was incredulous:

> Which all the Fathers make? We had need to have bodies like the bodies of Dakes, and memories as strong as steele, to endure to reade, and be sure to remember of every exposition, so much, as may ascertaine us, that all the Fathers make it. Hath any man living read them all? Nay, have all the men living read them? Nay, can they shew them? Can they get them? I had almost said, can they name them?[19]

No one could know the consensus of the Fathers, if there was one, because no one had accessed or read all the Fathers. Rainolds inquired as to 'who can avouch of any poynt in question, that not one or two, but all the Fathers held it: not onely helde it, but also wrote it: not onely wrote it, but also taught it: not darkly, but plainely: not seldome, but commonly: not for a short seasons, but continually.'[20] Hart then adjusted his position and advocated the adoption of the exposition of Scripture espoused by the majority of known Fathers. Rainolds countered that Hart's approach to 'following the greater number of the Fathers in expounding the Scriptures, is but a leaden rule, not fit which should be used to square out stones by, for building of the Lords temple.'[21] Thus, according to Rainolds, the consensus of the Fathers was a myth intended to draw attention away from the clear teaching of Scripture. Du Moulin made similar arguments in his own polemical works.[22]

Rainolds used Hart's own weapon, the Vincentian Canon ('quod ubique, quod semper quod ab omnibus creditum est'), against him, asserting that Vincent's conclusion was, 'although the Scriptures alone be sufficient for all poyntes of faith, yet is it not sufficient to have a shew of the wordes, but we must also have the

---

[19] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, 36.
[20] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, 150.
[21] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, 43.
[22] See Chapter 5.

substance of the sense, that is, the truth and naturall meaning of the Scriptures.'[23] Rainolds claimed that Vincent 'affirmeth that Scripture is sufficient alone, against heretikes, so that it be taken in the right sence. . . . Wherefore, if you will take the golde of Vincentius, you must graunt, that Scripture alone is sufficient to trie the truth from errour, and to maintaine the Catholike faith against heresie.'[24] The Vincentian Canon, however, did not prevent heresies that 'are spread abroad, and waxed olde, . . . because they, by long continuance of time, have had long occasion to steale away the trueth.'[25] Du Moulin also challenged the Vincentian Canon, but in a more subtle manner than Rainolds.[26]

In addition to his understanding of *sola Scriptura*, Rainolds believed that the Fathers could not be used as judges of theological controversy because heretics 'endevour to corrupt the writings of the Fathers.'[27] The Roman Catholic Church claimed antiquity and universality, but, Rainolds said, it was 'more likely therefore, by Vincentius, that you, who by long continuance of time, have had long occasion to steale away the trueth, should corrupt the Fathers, then we who have not had it.'[28] Du Moulin similarly warned of the corruption of the Fathers and, therefore, their unreliability as judges of controversy.[29]

William Whitaker

Of all his theological professors at Sedan and Cambridge, du Moulin singled out William Whitaker in his autobiography.[30] In his 1662 biography of his father, Peter

---

[23] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, 143.
[24] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, 146.
[25] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, 150.
[26] See Chapter 6.
[27] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, 150.
[28] Rainolds, *Summe of the Conference*, 152.
[29] See Chapter 6.
[30] Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 179: 'homme de grand sçavoir.'

du Moulin also highlighted Whitaker.[31] Additionally, Isaac Casaubon provided clear proof that du Moulin accessed Whitaker's writings. While working in the royal library in Paris, Casaubon recorded on 24 April 1610: 'Presté a Monsr. du Molin Vittaker de Rom. Pontif.'[32] Du Moulin himself cited his former professor in *Du Iuge des Controverses*, a 1630 volume in which he targeted Cardinal Bellarmine and others. When addressing chapter six of Bellarmine's *De Verbo Dei*, du Moulin included the margin note: 'VVittaker. Sed ipsi forsan ne quidem Deum crederent nisi propter Ecclesiam.'[33] Du Moulin drew this from Whitaker's *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura*, the same work he used to combat du Perron in *Nouveauté du Papisme*.[34]

William Whitaker was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1580.[35] He replied in Latin to English Jesuit Edmund Campion's *Rationes Decem* the next year.[36] Following the discovery of an English translation of Campion's work in the home of an English Catholic, Richard Stocke published an English translation of Whitaker's reply in 1606. Stocke served as chaplain to Lord Knowles, King James's Lord Treasurer and a member of the privy council. In the dedication to Lord Knowles, Stocke recalled informing his benefactor that Campion had been answered in Latin by 'one of the most glorious lights of our English Church, Doctor Whitaker. . . . You wished for the more benefit of the generall, that it might be turned into

---

[31] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***4.
[32] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 735. Casaubon likely referred to *Praelectiones doctissimi viri Builielmi Whitakeri . . . in quibus tractatur Controversia de ecclesia . . .* (Cambridge, 1599). The only other works Casaubon records du Moulin borrowing were a book by Juan de Mariana and a volume on Augustine. Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 702.
[33] Du Moulin, *Du Iuge des Controverses . . .* (Sedan, 1630), Aij.
[34] Whitaker, *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura* (Herborn, 1590), 301.
[35] For Whitaker's life, see A. Assheton, *An Account of the Life and Death of William Whitaker* (London, 1772); J. Verheiden, *History of the Moderne Protestant Divines* (London, 1637), 356–64; T. Fuller, *The Holy State* (London, 1663), 59–62; F. G. M. Broeyer, 'Traces of the Rise of Reformed Scholasticism in the Polemical Theologian William Whitaker', in W. J. van Asselt and E. Dekker, eds., *Reformation and Scholasticism* (Grand Rapids, 2001), 155–180.
[36] Whitaker, *Ad Rationes decem Edmundi Campiani Iesuitae . . .* (London, 1581). Fuller considered Campion 'fitter for a trumpeter than a soldier' because he could not 'bend his fist to dispute.' Fuller, *The Holy State*, 60.

English.'[37] Whitaker went on to write against Catholic apologists John Durie (or Drury), Nicholas Sanders, William Rainolds, and Thomas Stapleton.[38] He was named Master of St John's College, Cambridge in 1587 and was made a canon of Canterbury cathedral in 1595, the year of his death.[39]

Whitaker most notably displayed his skill as a theologian and polemicist in his engagement with Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, the 'chiefe Goliath' of the Roman Catholic Church.[40] In contrast to his previous exchanges with Stapleton, which had been acerbic, Whitaker treated Bellarmine with fairness and respect.[41] He considered the cardinal to be 'a man doubtlessly learned, with a blessed genius, an acute judgment, and manifold reading; one, in addition, who typically deals more openly and simply than the rest of the papists customarily do, better drives home his arguments, and sticks closer to the subject at hand.'[42] Bellarmine, in return, so esteemed Whitaker that the cardinal reportedly kept a portrait of his English rival in his study. When asked why he owned a picture of a heretic, Bellarmine replied that although Whitaker was a heretic and an adversary, he was a worthy adversary.[43] However, du Moulin did not exhibit the decorum of his mentor in his own polemical writings.[44]

---

[37] Whitaker, *An Answere to the Ten Reasons of Edmund Campian . . .* (London, 1581), 3*r*.
[38] Whitaker, *Responsio ad decem illas rationes* (London, 1583); *Ad Nicolai Sanderi demonstrationes quadraginta . . .* (London, 1583); *An Answere to a Certeine Booke written by M. William Rainolds . . .* (London, 1585); *Adversus Thomae Stapletoni . . .* (Cambridge, 1594).
[39] For Whitaker's controversial leadership of St John's, see P. Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, 169–200. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Pierre du Moulin also became a canon of Canterbury. See E. Hasted*, History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*, 12 vols (Canterbury, 1797–1801), xii. 68, 76.
[40] Verheiden, *Moderne Protestant Divines*, 358.
[41] James Brodrick described Stapleton as writing with a 'pen dipped in gall'. Brodrick, *Robert Bellarmine*, 84.
[42] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, Aiii: '. . . sane doctum, ingenio felice, iudicio subtili, lectione multiplici praeditum, qui soleret etiam apertius ac simplicius agere, quam reliqui consueuerunt Papistae, & argumentum pressius urgeret, & arctius ad causam adhaeresceret.'
[43] Verheiden, *History*, 359–60.
[44] See Chapter 4.

Whitaker produced *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura*, aimed primarily at Bellarmine, in 1588. The initial volume of Bellarmine's *De Controversiis* was published in 1586, but Whitaker had begun his reply prior to that time by working from a manuscript of Bellarmine's lectures that he had acquired.[45] He engaged the cardinal in three more works published posthumously.[46] In the dedication of the *Disputatio*, directed to English secretary of state William Cecil, Whitaker described Bellarmine as one 'celebrated by his own as an invincible combatant, with whom none of our men has dared to contend, to whom no one could respond, if any one should expect that he can conquer him, he is considered insane.'[47] Whitaker thus portrayed himself as David taking on Goliath.[48] He claimed to be eager to undertake the controversy with Bellarmine but recognised that the task would double his workload—a burden he accepted.[49] Whitaker unwittingly predicted the battle between Catholics and Protestants of the seventeenth century when he declared that 'there will be no end of writing and disputing, no settlement of the controversies, no agreement among Christians, until, setting aside all factional allegiances, and adopting the most impartial will and disposition towards investigating truth, we devote ourselves completely to that issue in which the controversy lies.'[50]

---

[45] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, Aiii, Aix.
[46] Whitaker, *Praelectiones . . . controversia de ecclesia . . .* (1599); *Praelectiones . . . controversia de conciliis* (1600); *Praelectiones . . . controversiam de romano pontifice* (1608).
[47] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, Aiii: 'athleta invictissimus a suis celebratur, quocum nostrum nemo congredi ausit, cui respondere nullus possit, quem vincere si quis se posse speret, ab his insanus habeatur.'
[48] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, Bii. William Ames, who wrote four volumes against Bellarmine, also claimed that the mention of the cardinal's name provoked men to picture Goliath, the terroriser of Israel. Ames, *Bellarminus Enervatus* (Oxford, 1629), i.*2.
[49] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, Axi. William Camden claimed that Whitaker had 'much weakened his body with study'. *History of the most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth* (London, 1688), 507.
[50] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, Avi: 'Nullus enim erit finis scribendi & litigandi, nulla Controversiarum decisio, nulla Christianorum Concordia, quousque positis, partium studiis, & suscepta aequisma investigandae veritatis voluntate ac mente, in id toti incumbamus, in quo Controversiae momentum consistir.'

Most contemporary scholars have overlooked Whitaker's influence on du Moulin. Sally Anne Wagstaffe, however, observes similarities between the Cambridge professor and du Moulin:

> Both were convinced opponents of Arminianism, both argued pre-eminently in a scholastic manner, featuring rational deductions made from scripture much more strongly than historical arguments and both advocated scripture as the sole source of doctrinal truth to a degree which was regarded by certain other notable contemporary Protestant theologians as detrimental to the standing of the early church fathers.[51]

Wagstaffe cites George Tavard's *Holy Writ or Holy Church* in support.[52] Unfortunately, neither Wagstaffe nor Tavard identifies a notable contemporary Protestant theologian who targeted Whitaker for undermining the standing of the Church Fathers.[53] Tavard also attempted to pit John Jewel against Whitaker with regard to the development of doctrine.[54] Tavard failed to mention, however, that Whitaker's entry into anti-Catholic polemics was a Latin translation of Jewel's *Reply to Harding's Answer* in 1578.[55] Whitaker certainly did not follow Jewel at every point, but his methodology and conclusions were closer to Jewel's than Tavard admitted.[56]

Whitaker stood in the mainstream of Reformed Protestant understanding of Scripture going back to John Calvin, and his *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura* was recognised as a definitive work well into the eighteenth century.[57] Wagstaffe notes that du Moulin and Whitaker both opposed Arminianism. Du Moulin indeed

---

[51] Wagstaffe, 'Forms and methods of religious controversy in Paris' (Unpublished PhD thesis, Durham University, 1990), 140.
[52] Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church*, 238–40.
[53] Compare with J. Mullinger's evaluation that 'no English divine of the sixteenth century surpassed Whitaker in the estimation of his contemporaries.' Mullinger, *St. John's College* (London, 1901), 75.
[54] Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church*, 239.
[55] J. Jewel, *Ioannis Iuelli . . . aduersus Thomam Hardingum volumen alterum, ex Angl. conuersum a G. Whitakero* (London, 1578).
[56] Whitaker considered Jewel to be 'exceptional' (*eximio*) and 'most learned' (*doctissime*). Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 235, 269.
[57] Muller, *PRRD*, ii. 108.

aggressively attacked Arminianism and Whitaker certainly countered English precursors to Arminianism, but the latter died well before Arminius's own theological positions divided international Reformed circles.[58] Wagstaffe also correctly identifies Whitaker and du Moulin as arguing pre-eminently in a scholastic manner. This is hardly unique, though. Most Reformed Protestant theologians and polemicists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries used scholastic methodology, including Arminius.[59] Du Moulin, nevertheless, displayed Whitaker's influence in a more significant manner than merely using scholastic methodology and opposing anti-Calvinism. The Frenchman would use Whitaker to greatest effect in his most significant anti-Catholic polemical work, *Nouveaute du Papisme*.[60]

Du Moulin's time in England profoundly influenced him by exposing him to the English Church, promoting his familiarity with the English language, and developing his theology under Whitaker and possibly Rainolds. Jean Hotman, no friend of du Moulin, informed Isaac Casaubon that du Moulin had 'learned his best theology in England', likely referring to du Moulin's time of study at Cambridge under Whitaker.[61] In addition to Rainolds and Whitaker, du Moulin, like all Reformed Protestant theologians, was influenced by John Calvin.

John Calvin

Some contemporary scholars have minimised the influence of John Calvin on Reformed Orthodox theologians in general and du Moulin in particular. However, the scholarly perspective of du Moulin's approach to Calvin and his work, particularly his use of the Church Fathers, must be re-evaluated in light of du Moulin's polemical

[58] Du Moulin, *Anatome Arminianismi*.
[59] See Muller, *PRRD*, i. 60–73.
[60] See Chapter 6.
[61] BL, Burney MS. 367, f. 23*r*: 'appris sa meilleure théologie en Angleterre.'

context. In his work on the intra-Reformed debates led by Pierre du Moulin and Moises Amyraut over the nature of the divine decree, Brian Armstrong claimed that

> the orthodox were completely surprised and confused by Amyraut's appeal to Calvin. It does not seem too much to say that these orthodox theologians were not well read in Calvin and so were unprepared to counter the tremendous mass of relevant Calvin material marshalled by Amyraut. Nor does it seem that the reason for this relative ignorance of Calvin is difficult to determine. The answer is most certainly to be sought in the scholasticism which began with Beza, Martyr, and Zanchi and which by the seventeenth century held sway in Reformed theology. The theology of Calvin was simply not attractive to the mind set which accompanied and characterized this scholasticism. The authorities of the orthodox were much more frequently Beza, Martyr, or Zanchi – or even St. Thomas. It is not mere coincidence that du Moulin, for instance, in his various discussions of the topics of providence and predestination never once so much as alludes to Calvin but does more than once quote St. Thomas. And it is to be observed that this rejection of Calvin was by no means unconsciously done.[62]

Jacques Solé considered John Cameron, Amyraut's mentor at Saumur and the object of some of du Moulin's most heated rhetoric in the controversy, 'Successeur authentique de Calvin'.[63] Presumably, then, du Moulin would be a 'successeur inauthentique' of Calvin.

In contrast to Armstrong's comments, du Moulin pointed out that Roman Catholics accused the Reformed of removing from 'our calendars the Virgin Mary and the Apostles in order to put Luther and Calvin in their places.'[64] Catholics also charged that Luther and Calvin are 'Maistres, Patriarches, Apostres, etc.' of the Reformed.[65] Did du Moulin idolise Calvin, as the Catholics charged, or did he reject Calvin in favour of Beza and other scholastic theologians, as Armstrong and others have charged? Du Moulin certainly distanced himself and the French Reformed churches from Calvin in order to uphold the doctrine of *sola Scriptura* against Roman

---

[62] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 188.
[63] Solé, *Le débat*, 1:175.
[64] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloe*, 9–10: 'nos Calendriers la vierge Marie et les Apostres pour y mettre Luther et Calvin.'
[65] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloe*, 10.

Catholic accusations, but his theology remained directly in line with Calvin, even if he did not acknowledge his dependence on the Genevan reformer. Du Moulin questioned:

> What has Calvin done more than another, why must he be treated more rigorously? Why is he called our Apostle? Since there have been so many others among us who have fought the abuses and the traffic of Rome as much as him, and before him? Let us posit the case that this good man fell short, that his knowledge failed in some places, his memory in others, what does this do to our differences? Are we taught in our churches to read his writings carefully or to yield to him? Does he want to be believed in everything? And does he not always send us back to Holy Scripture, in which what is clear (as St Augustine said) sufficiently contains all that concerns the faith and the manner of living well? It does not happen that we receive a man to judge in the cause of God; and the truth things that Calvin said we believe, not because he said them, but because they are in the word of God. Yet, how much would Calvin be wrongfully accused if we were not obligated to defend him? Let our adversaries think of him what they please, nevertheless we will hold ourselves to the word of God.[66]

Roman Catholics attempted to portray the French Reformed as relying upon Calvin more than Scripture. Du Moulin and the French Reformed could hold no credibility in their attack on Catholic theologians' dependence on Tradition over Scripture if they were seen to be venerating Calvin as a source of authority apart from Scripture. Therefore, du Moulin and many of his Reformed contemporaries refrained from including an abundance of Calvin's quotations in their works, especially their polemical works. This is not to say that they were not heavily influenced by Calvin.

---

[66] Du Moulin, *Cartel de deffy du sieur de Bouju* (Geneva, 1625), 101–2: 'Mais qu'a faict Calvin plus qu'un autre, pourquoi il doive estre traitté plus rigoureusement? pourquoi sera-il appellé nostre Apostre? veu qu'il y en a eu tant d'autres entre nous qui ont combatu les abus, et le trafic de Rome autant que lui, et devant lui? Posons le cas que ce bon homme ait failli, que le sçavoir lui ait manqué en quelques endroicts, la memoire en d'autres, que fait cela à nos differents? sommes nous appris en nos Eglises de lire soigneusement ses escrits, ou de nous en rapporter à lui? lui-mesmes veut-il estre creu en tout? et ne nous renvoye-il pas tousjours à l'escriture saincte, en laquelle ce qui est clair (comme dit S. Augustin) contient suffisamment tout ce qui concerne la foi, et la reigle de bien vivre? Ja n'advienne que nous recevions un homme pour juge en la cause de Dieu: et les choses veritables que dit Calvin nous ne les croyons pas pource qu'il les dit, mais pource qu'elles sont en la parole de Dieu. Pourtant combien que Calvin soit accusé à tort, si ne sommes nous pas obligez de le deffendre: que nos adversaires pensent de lui ce qu'il leur plaist, cependant nous nous tiendrons à la parole de Dieu.

They surely were. They merely avoided an overt display of dependence in order to maintain their claim of *sola Scriptura*.

Du Moulin defended Calvin at various points against Roman Catholic assaults, perhaps most notably against the criticism of Jean Arnoux in *Bouclier de la Foy*. Du Moulin corrected Arnoux's misinterpretations of Calvin, including the charge that Calvin and du Moulin claimed that 'all the works of the faithful are worthy of death'. Du Moulin considered this charge 'slanderous'.[67] Du Moulin also used Calvin against his Protestant opponents, especially Arminians. For example, in support of his position on the propagation of the sin of Adam to his posterity du Moulin quoted Calvin from Book II of the *Institutes*.[68] Also, du Moulin defended Calvin against Johannes Arnoldus Corvinus's charge, based on an alleged margin note in Book I of the *Institutes*, that the Genevan taught of God's willing that a man should not believe in Christ. Du Moulin stated that Arnoldus's 'sick mind vomited out this position against us'; in fact, no such note existed in the *Institutes*.[69] Finally, du Moulin referenced Calvin, Girolamo Zanchi, Philip Melanchthon, Martin Bucer, Wolfgang Musculus, and David Pareus in support of his position on election and reprobation.[70]

Calvin's Method

Both du Moulin and Calvin used the Church Fathers in their polemical writings. In one of his earliest polemical works, the 'Prefatory Address to King Francis' in the 1536 edition of the *Institutes*, Calvin displayed the use of the Fathers that he would implement in many of his later writings. Calvin began his defence of Reformed

---

[67] Du Moulin, *Bouclier de la Foy*, 217: 'toutes les œuvres du fidel sont dignes de mort'; 'calomnieux'.
[68] Du Moulin, *Anatome Arminianismi*, 60.
[69] Du Moulin, *Anatome Arminianismi*, 160: 'virus postquam animus ęger in nos euomuit.'
[70] Du Moulin, *Anatome Arminianismi*, 91.

theology with the doctrine of *sola Scriptura*. He answered the charge that Reformed Protestantism was novel by declaring that the 'Sacred Word does not deserve to be accused of novelty.'[71] Thus, according to Calvin, to disparage Reformed theology for its newness is to disparage Scripture itself.

Calvin then claimed that the Church Fathers were on his side. If the authority of the Fathers were to decide the debate between Catholics and Protestants, Calvin said that the Fathers 'would incline towards us.'[72] In fact, Calvin believed that the Fathers would approve of the majority of his teaching. Calvin did not view the Fathers uncritically, however.[73] He said that the Fathers were 'ignorant of many things, . . . often disagreed with each other, and sometimes even contradicted themselves.'[74] Consequently, Reformed theology was under no obligation to accept the teachings of the Fathers that departed from Scripture.

Calvin used the Fathers offensively against his opponents, as well. He claimed that his opponents 'only worship the faults and errors' of the Fathers, while rejecting their good teaching.[75] The only concern of these Catholic theologians was to 'collect dung amid gold.' Calvin used the Fathers to attack the Roman Catholic position on transubstantiation, Lent, images of Jesus, and clerical celibacy, among others.[76] Calvin also criticised the Roman Catholic theologians for not representing the Fathers accurately. They either 'do not observe, or misrepresent, or pervert' the Fathers.[77] By contrast, said Calvin, 'we are so well versed in their writings that we

---

[71] Calvin, *Opera Selecta* (Munich, 1928), 3:15: 'sacrum verbum novitatis insimulari non merebatur.'
[72] OS 3:17: 'ad nos inclinaret.'
[73] OS 3:17: 'in auro legere stercora.'
[74] OS 3:18: 'multa ignorarunt . . . saepe inter se conflictantur, interdum etiam secum ipsi pugnant.'
[75] OS 3:17: 'tantum lapsus et errores adorant'.
[76] OS 3:18–22.
[77] OS 3:17: 'non observant, vel dissimulant, vel corrumpunt'.

always remember that all things are ours'.[78] For Calvin, the contributions of the Fathers that illuminate the meaning of Scripture are a benefit to the entire church.

Calvin's approach to the Fathers differed from du Moulin's in that Calvin provided lengthy quotations of the Fathers in his works and interacted with their arguments for positions contrary to his own. Calvin engaged the arguments of the Fathers primarily in his biblical commentaries, which contain one quarter of all his citations of the Fathers.[79] For example, in his Romans commentary Calvin gave a lengthy explanation of his rejection of Augustine's interpretation of the righteousness of God in Romans 2:21.[80] In contrast, du Moulin typically provided either no quotation or a very brief one for his citations of the Fathers. Du Moulin never engaged in serious analysis of a particular Father's exegesis of Scripture because he never produced a traditional biblical commentary. Rather, du Moulin preferred to wield the Fathers like a weapon against his theological opponents instead of using them as dialogue partners in detailed examinations of Scripture.

In his *Two Discourses on the Articles* of Lausanne, Calvin also revealed his position on the authority of the Church Fathers in relation to Scripture. Pointing his opponents to *sola Scriptura*, Calvin claimed that Cyprian had a similar view and 'does not wish us to have any regard to what was said or what is done by those before us, but only that we should consider what Christ our Lord says, who is before us all.'[81] He concluded the first discourse by asking his opponents 'to charge us no longer with contradicting the ancient doctors in this matter with whom we are in fact in such

[78] OS 3:17–8: 'in eorum scriptis versamur, ut semper meminerimus, omnia nostra esse'.
[79] A. N. S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (Edinburgh, 1999), 32.
[80] *Corpus Reformatorum*, ed. G. Baum et al., vol. 49 (Brunsvigae, 1892), 58.
[81] Calvin, *Two Discourses on the Articles* in *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, ed. J. K. S. Reid (Philadelphia, 1954), 40.

accord; nor with corrupting Scripture at our pleasure'.[82] Du Moulin, of course, adopted a similar approach.

In addition to his position on the authority of the Church Fathers in relation to Scripture, Calvin also displayed in his *Two Discourses on the Articles* his use of logic and reason in determining biblical and theological truths. Addressing his opponents' affirmation of the infinitude of the human body of Jesus Christ, Calvin said that 'it does not follow that, if the divinity of Christ is infinite, hence his body must also be so.' Calvin attempted to convince his opponents by reasoning through Scripture:

> I will try to answer from Scripture the grounds which you give. For when Paul says that we await our salvation from heaven, which will transform our vile and mortal body into his glorious body, he evidently affirms that the glorious body of Christ is not other or of another nature than the bodies of the faithful will be after the Resurrection. I ask you if on your conscience you believe that the bodies of the children of God, when glorified, will be in all places without being limited or circumscribed and having none of the properties of their nature. Your judgment must convince you that this is an absurdity which you cannot concede. No more than ought it to be accorded to the body of Christ, which (according to the apostle) they will resemble.[83]

Du Moulin also used logic and reason as primary means of attacking his opponents, including Moïse Amyraut and Cardinal du Perron.[84] He adopted much of Calvin's theology and methodology, although his polemical context required him to avoid giving the impression that he elevated Calvin over *sola Scriptura*, as his Catholic opponents charged.

Education Applied

Leiden

After four years in England, du Moulin made his way to the university at Leiden, where Franciscus Junius, whom he admired, had recently taken up residence. Two

---

[82] Calvin, *Two Discourses*, 45.
[83] Calvin, *Two Discourses*, 43.
[84] See below, 50–1.

months after his arrival, du Moulin was appointed to teach Logic, Greek, and Horace in the college there. The following July he was made professor of philosophy at the university, where he taught the works of Aristotle and engaged in many public disputations. Peter du Moulin considered Leiden his father's 'Fencing-School, whereby he was enabled for the many Encounters and Conferences which he had afterwards upon the greatest stage of Europe.'[85] Du Moulin published his *Elementa logices* while in Leiden, which was issued in thirteen editions—as he pointed out in his autobiography.[86] The work soon became a standard in the field, even though Armstrong has claimed that it was 'simply a condensation of Aristotle's *Organon*.'[87] Du Moulin would put his skill in logic to use in many of his anti-Catholic polemical works.

Du Moulin took leave from the university in 1596 to visit his father in France. He stopped in Paris on his journey back to Leiden and met with the pastor and elders of the Reformed congregation, who encouraged him to remain in the city. Du Moulin refused this renewed offer because he had ensured the university trustees at Leiden that he would return. In 1598, du Moulin finally submitted to the urging of the French Reformed churches to become a minister and left his post at Leiden. For the remainder of his life, he maintained a great affection for the Dutch people and for Holland, which he called 'his second Countrey.'[88]

Rationalist or Humanist?

Du Moulin's works certainly are numerous, but they are not well understood by some scholars, most notably Brian Armstrong, even though he wrote more on du Moulin

[85] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***6.
[86] Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 336.
[87] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 83.
[88] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***.

than any other scholar of the twentieth century. Armstrong primarily categorised du Moulin as a verbose rationalist who rejected the French humanism of Calvin in favour of scholastic methodology in order to combat the Arminian crisis.

To support his view, Armstrong compared Saumur theologians John Cameron and Moïse Amyraut with du Moulin and Daniel Chamier. The Saumur theologians displayed a 'tendency toward reducing the debated points to central issues. There is nothing in either Cameron or Amyraut which compares with the incredibly multifarious *Panstratiae catholicae* of Chamier, in four thick folio volumes. Nor for that matter is there anything in either of these men which compares with du Moulin's *Nouveauté du Papisme*, which fills more than one thousand quarto pages.'[89] However, Armstrong failed to mention that du Moulin's *Nouveauté du Papisme* was a response to Cardinal du Perron's volume of more than eleven hundred pages. Du Moulin certainly was capable of using more words than necessary, but he typically used an orderly methodology that he often repeated, primarily when addressing the Eucharist and *sola Scriptura*.

Armstrong highlighted the fact that Cameron believed the Bible to be the sole arbiter of all disputes, which is 'in the best tradition of the Reformation.' What is novel in Cameron, according to Armstrong, is '(1) his argument that religion is subject to corruption and therefore must always be judged in terms of its starting point, and (2) that he applies a Renaissance theory of history to substantiate this.'[90] However, du Moulin already had exhibited both of these characteristics years prior to Cameron's earliest publications. Du Moulin displayed traits related to both Protestant scholasticism and French humanism, and incorporated a historical methodology while

[89] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 8.
[90] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 11.

arguing against the use of the Church Fathers as judges of contemporary theological controversy.

Brian Armstrong outlined his understanding of Protestant scholasticism:

> (1) Primarily it will have reference to that theological approach which asserts religious truth on the basis of deductive ratiocination from given assumptions or principles, thus producing a logically coherent and defensible system of belief. Generally, this takes the form of syllogistic reasoning. It is an orientation, it seems, invariably based upon an Aristotelian philosophical commitment and so relates to medieval scholasticism. (2) The terms will refer to the employment of reason in religious matters, so that reason assumes at least equal standing with faith in theology, thus jettisoning some of the authority of revelation. (3) It will comprehend the sentiment that the scriptural record contains a unified, rationally comprehensible account and thus may be formed into a definitive statement which may be used as a measuring stick to determine one's orthodoxy. (4) It will comprehend a pronounced interest in metaphysical matters, in abstract, speculative thought, particularly with reference to the doctrine of God. The distinctive scholastic Protestant position is made to rest on a speculative formulation of the will of God.[91]

Armstrong juxtaposed Protestant scholasticism with 'French humanism', although he admitted that the 'actual picture is of course not so neat, the distinction between these two expressions not always (if ever!) clear-cut.' Despite the complexities, he concluded that the two orientations were 'fundamentally at odds.'[92] Armstrong developed his definition of Protestant scholasticism while focusing on the Amyraut controversy and Amyraut's own understanding of John Calvin. His definition is consequently too limited by its theological context to explain Protestant scholasticism as a whole.[93]

Richard Muller countered Armstrong's definition by arguing that scholasticism 'does not refer to a particular theology or philosophy but a *method* developed in the medieval schools in order to facilitate academic argument,

---

[91] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 32.
[92] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 31 n. 84.
[93] See R. Muller, 'Calvin and the "Calvinists": Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy', Part One, *Calvin Theological Journal*, 30 (1995), 357.

specifically argument leading to the resolution of objections, the identification and use of distinctions, and the establishment of right conclusions.'[94] Muller agreed with Armstrong that Protestant scholasticism did involve 'ratiocination' in order to produce a 'logically coherent and defensible system of belief', but added that the method took inductive as well as deductive forms. Armstrong's claim that 'reason assumes at least equal standing with faith in theology, thus jettisoning some of the authority of revelation', cannot therefore stand up to the evidence in du Moulin's writings.

Contrary to Armstrong's claim that humanism and scholasticism were 'fundamentally at odds', Pierre du Moulin displayed the use of both methodologies in his writings. He was educated in scholastic methodology at Cambridge and perfected his skills while teaching at Leiden.[95] Muller noted that du Moulin 'must clearly be recognized as a scholastic thinker. His method is logical, disputative, and grounded on fine distinctions and definitions.'[96] However, du Moulin also exhibited tendencies of humanism, such as in his emphasis on proper understanding of Greek and Hebrew and his use of textual criticism to determine the authenticity of a text.[97]

Armstrong maintained that French Protestants were less inclined towards scholastic methodology than Protestants in other countries. He said that 'in spite of this tendency of French Protestantism to retain a humanistic spirit, du Moulin made a valiant effort to introduce the more scholastic orientation of the rest of the Reformed

---

[94] Muller, 'Calvin and the "Calvinists"', Part One, 367. Emphasis original.
[95] See W. T. Costello, *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958).
[96] R. Muller, 'Calvin and the "Calvinists": Assessing Continuities and Discontinuities between the Reformation and Orthodoxy', Part Two, *Calvin Theological Journal*, 31 (1996), 135.
[97] Muller, 'Calvin and the "Calvinists"', Part One, 361: 'Humanism itself was not a philosophy but rather a method or, better, an approach to texts and sources – and although its proponents frequently criticized scholasticism, they also frequently (whether wittingly or unwittingly) espoused philosophical and theological perspectives that reflected the view of the medieval scholastics. . . . The scholastics of the sixteenth century were often quite open to the insights of humanism.'

world.'[98] Armstrong claimed that the Arminian crisis 'was the immediate occasion for du Moulin's precipitous action.'[99] However, Armstrong failed to recognise that du Moulin had used the scholastic method in some of his earliest writings, long before the Arminian crisis. For example, although not a work of polemics, du Moulin's *Elementa Logica* (1598) textbook contains elements that he would incorporate in his polemical writings. In this work, du Moulin spoke of the reliability of testimonies, both divine and human. He concluded that 'all dogmas of religion fail which do not depend upon divine testimony.'[100] Du Moulin expanded this section in the 1624 English edition: 'Nothing that is necessary to salvation can be knowne without warrant from the Word of God; whosoever in things necessarie to salvation, affirmeth anything not contained in the said word of God, ought not to be beleeved, and affirmes that which he knowes not.'[101] In his later polemical writings, du Moulin continued to argue repeatedly that the Word of God alone contains what is necessary to salvation.[102]

With regard to the theological dispute between du Moulin and Moïse Amyraut, Armstrong said that the biographer Lucian Rimbault 'has well characterized du Moulin's reaction to Amyraut's thought: "It is possible to say that he found in it more transgressions of logic than breaches of the authority of Scripture. The more rationalistic of the two is perhaps not he who is assumed to be." Repeatedly du Moulin returned to this particular criticism of Amyraut, and one may well conclude that in his attack this charge of faulty logic takes second place only to the charge that

---

[98] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 132–3.
[99] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 133.
[100] Du Moulin, *Elementa Logica* (Leiden, 1598), 155: 'omnia dogmata in religione concidunt quæ non nituntur divino testimonio.'
[101] Du Moulin, *Elements of Logick* (London, 1624), 90.
[102] See Chapter 6.

Amyraut has reversed the order of the decrees.'[103] Nevertheless, Armstrong failed to mention that du Moulin, who had been a logic professor and authored a logic textbook, accused nearly all of his theological opponents of using faulty logic. Dismantling the logic of his adversaries' arguments was one of his most repeated tactics. Whether or not du Moulin was more rationalistic than Amyraut is up for debate, but the debate cannot rest on du Moulin's criticism that Amyraut's logic was faulty. It certainly does not prove that du Moulin believed that transgressions of logic were more egregious than violating the authority of Scripture.

Pierre du Moulin lived through the French Reformed churches' lowest point in history, the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre, and experienced extreme poverty as a child in France and as a young man in England. A re-evaluation of his activity and motivations during his ministry is necessary in light of the circumstances of his youth. His thoughts and actions were not motivated by an 'upper-class mentalité and lifestyle' that he allegedly possessed, but by his desire to provide his family with the emotional and financial stability that he lacked early in life. He worked (and schemed) to ensure that his children were not subject to the difficult circumstances that he had faced – a frequently absent father, persecution from Catholics, and extreme poverty. He remained under the influence of his Reformed forebears, including John Calvin, John Rainolds, and William Whitaker, in honouring the Church Fathers as forerunners of the faith but denying that they were qualified to serve as judges of contemporary theological controversies.

[103] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 185.

Chapter 3

Du Moulin's French Polemical Period (1599–1609)

Pierre du Moulin's arrival in Paris in 1599 was the most opportune moment for an emerging French Reformed pastor and polemicist. The recently issued Edict of Nantes (1598) had permitted the Huguenots to hold worship services at the home of Princess Catherine du Bourbon before they eventually built a church in Charenton, the French Reformed were experiencing relative political stability compared to the past forty years of turbulent religious wars, and the treatise war between Protestants and Catholics in France was commencing. This chapter provides a brief survey of the polemical and political activity in France in order to achieve a better understanding of du Moulin's life and context. It also introduces du Moulin's most formidable French Catholic opponent, Cardinal Jacques Davy du Perron, and his complicated relationship with fellow Reformed Protestant Isaac Casaubon.

France

After a harrowing journey, on which he was nearly captured by soldiers in the Spanish Netherlands, du Moulin spent three months at his father's home near Orleans preparing himself for the ministry. He was examined and ordained in December 1598, then filled the pulpit at Blois for two months. Finally, he arrived in Paris on the last day of February 1599.[1]

Du Moulin's life prior to his acceptance of the pastoral call to Paris can be viewed as preparation for this monumental task. He was educated in Sedan and England, gained experience as a professor and author in the Netherlands, and was

[1] Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 338.

toughened by financial and other hardships. During his time in Paris he would be elevated to the highest levels of the French Reformed churches and gain an international reputation.

Du Moulin's reputation grew to such an extent during his time in Paris that he received multiple offers to leave his church. The Reformed Academy at Saumur twice offered him a professorial position (1604, 1605), and the University of Leiden asked him to fill the Chair of Divinity, once after Arminius's death in 1609 and again after the Synod of Dort in 1619.[2] In the end, the Leiden position was filled by du Moulin's brother-in-law, Andre Rivet. On each occasion, the consistory of the Paris church refused to grant du Moulin permission to leave, and he submitted to their judgement until he was forced to flee France for Sedan in 1621. If du Moulin was 'authoritarian through and through', as Brian Armstrong claimed, he did not display it in his dealings with the consistory.

Du Moulin lived much better in Paris than he had in Leiden or England. His home was spacious enough to accommodate his five children, as well as a study on the top floor. According to his son, du Moulin faced multiple attempts against his life in this home. Lone assassins were rebuffed by his servant/bodyguard on multiple occasions, and du Moulin's wife turned away with a word a man that she perceived had ill intent. Poisoned flowers were sent to his home, and twice his house received musket fire from angry mobs. He and his family escaped unharmed from all of these attempts.[3] Once, du Moulin nearly did to himself what the assassins could not do. On a bitterly cold night in his unheated study, a charcoal brazier nearly asphyxiated him.

---

[2] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***3*r*. Du Moulin made clear in a letter on 6 May 1611 that he would not change his position for 'les profits ou avantages'. G. Cohen, *Écrivains Français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVII siècle* (Paris, 1920), 293.

[3] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***2*v*.–***3*r*. Peter du Moulin's biography of his father appears to be exaggerated at points, but it is difficult to know exactly what is embellished and what is not.

His eldest son found him passed out in his study and ran downstairs shouting 'Mon père est mort'; yet du Moulin survived and was back in the pulpit in just a few weeks.[4] His family's high quality of life in du Moulin's first decade in Paris reflects the relative stability that King Henri IV brought to France following the tumultuous period of the wars of religion.

King Henri IV

After nearly five years of fighting for universal recognition of his reign, the accession of Henri IV to the throne in Paris in 1594 helped to curtail the religious civil wars that had plagued France for half a century. Although tensions remained, Henri's reign brought some measure of peace between Protestants and Catholics (and between Catholics and Catholics) in France. The new king allowed Protestant worship on Sundays at the home of his sister, Catherine de Bourbon, and at the Louvre on Wednesdays and Fridays. After an assassination attempt in December 1594 by a former student at a Jesuit college who claimed to have been inspired by the Jesuits to kill the king, the Jesuits were expelled from France by parliamentary decree.

The Edict of Nantes, issued by Henri IV in April 1598, ultimately satisfied neither Protestants nor Catholics.[5] The edict allowed for temporary coexistence of Protestants and Catholics, but Henri's ultimate goal remained the religious reunification of France with 'one king, one faith, one law'.[6] Henri never intended for the edict to be a path for the full toleration of Protestants in France. The edict granted Huguenots freedom of worship outside of their sanctuary towns, but only in the homes of nobles or on the outskirts of a town. It required Huguenots to observe all

[4] Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 469–70.
[5] For the complete text of the edict, see R. Mousnier, *L'Assassinat d'Henri IV* (Paris, 1964), 294–334.
[6] See M. P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562–1629* (Cambridge, 2005), 166–72.

the Roman Catholic feast days and to pay the ecclesiastical tithe. When a delegation of Catholic judges from the Parlement of Paris appeared at the Louvre to express their objections to the edict, Henri warned them not to 'make any allegations against my Catholic religion. I love it more than you do; I am more Catholic than you. I am the eldest son of the church, which none of you are or can be. You deceive yourselves if you think that you are good with the pope; I am better than you.'[7] The Parlement registered the edict two weeks later.

Although the physical violence of the religious wars had cooled with the accession of Henri IV, the theological controversy between Protestants and Catholics was simmering.[8] The debate in France in the period 1600–1610 centred on theological issues, primarily Scripture and the Eucharist. Reformed Protestants argued for *sola Scriptura* and the Spiritual presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper; Roman Catholics argued for Scripture and Tradition and for transubstantiation. The Oath of Allegiance controversy in England initiated the shifting of the focus of religious debates throughout Europe to more political matters, including the temporal powers of the papacy and the rights of kings. The assassination of King Henri IV in 1610 ensured that the relationship between theology and politics would receive the bulk of the attention in religious debates during the years ahead.

---

[7] B. de Xivrey, ed., *Recueil des lettres missives de Henri IV*, V (Paris, 1850), 91: 'Ne m'allegués point la religion catholique; je l'aime plus que vous, je suis plus catholique que vous: je suis fils aisné de l'Eglise, nul de vous ne l'est ny le peut estre. Vous vous abuses si vous pensés estre bien avec le Pape; j'y suis mieulx que vous.'

[8] For a detailed list of works produced during the controversy, see L. Desgraves, *Répertoire des Ouvrages de Controverse entre Catholiques et Protestants en France*, 2 vols (Geneva, 1984).

The Cardinal

French Catholic polemicists in the early seventeenth century were led by 'the personality and work of Cardinal du Perron'.[9] Jacques Davy du Perron was born to noble parents who had recently converted to Protestantism.[10] Jacques's father, Julien Davy du Perron, was a medical doctor and possibly a Protestant minister.[11] However, Jacques's study of the Church Fathers, particularly Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, convinced him to abandon the French Reformed churches of his youth and embrace the Roman Catholic Church.[12] Ironically, Philippe du Plessis-Mornay might have assisted unwittingly in du Perron's conversion with his *Traicté de l'Église*. Mornay's fallacious reasoning and inaccurate citations in defence of Reformed ecclesiology reportedly drove du Perron to the Catholic Church.[13]

Du Perron was admitted into the Congrégation de l'Oratoire de Notre-Dame de Vincennes in 1585 and was appointed Bishop of Evreux in 1591 by King Henri IV. His labours to convert to the king proved successful two years later.[14] After Henri's conversion, du Perron travelled to Rome to secure papal absolution for the king.[15] Du Perron's skill in securing the conversion of the king and several other Protestants led

---

[9] Solé, *Le débat*, 1:24: 'la personnalité et l'oeuvre du cardinal Du Perron.'
[10] His father and mother belonged to the houses of Creteville and Languerville, respectively. P. Anselme, et al., *Histoire Généalogique et Chronologique de la Maison Royale de France*, 9 vols (3rd edn., Paris, 1733), viii. 287.
[11] M. Burigny, *Vie du Cardinal du Perron* (Paris, 1768), 6.
[12] *Discours sommaire*, 5–6. The exact date of his conversion is uncertain, but it likely came before 1578, when he wrote the foreword to a book by Pontus de Tyard. 'Avant-discours sur l'un et l'autre curieux de Monsieur de Tyard, seigneur de Bissy, par J.-D. du Perron, professeur du roi aux langues, aux mathématiques et en la philosophie.' In Tyard, *Deux discours de la Nature du Monde & de ses parties* . . . (Paris, 1578). His conversion must have occurred prior to the writing of the foreword because Henri III would not have named a Huguenot an official *professeur*. P. Féret, *Le Cardinal du Perron* (Paris, 1876), 7.
[13] *Discours sommaire*, 6; Burigny, *Vie*, 16–7; L. Ellies du Pin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques* (Amsterdam, 1711), xvii. 26.
[14] For du Perron's activity related to Henri IV's conversion, see *Diverses oeuvres,* 636; *Discours sommaire* 12–3; Burigny, *Vie*, 83–91; M. Wolfe, *The Conversion of Henri IV* (London, 1993), 125, 142; V. Pitts, *Henri IV of France* (Baltimore, 2009), 171–2.
[15] For a detailed treatment of the papal negotiations, see N. M. Sutherland, *Henri IV of France and the Politics of Religion, 1572–1596,* 2 vols (Bristol, 2002), ii. 554–62.

Huguenot author Théodore-Agrippa d'Aubigné to grant him the satirical nickname 'Monsieur mon Convertisseur'.[16] Du Perron thus became one of the most prominent leaders of the Catholic Church in France.

Showdown at Fontainebleau

Du Perron and Mornay were summoned to a showdown before King Henri IV at Fontainebleau in May 1600. Mornay, whom Voltaire described as 'the most virtuous and greatest man of the Protestant party', had been devastated by Henri's conversion.[17] He responded by engaging Roman Catholic criticisms of his *Traicté de l'Église* and by issuing an updated version of the book.[18] He then published *Pour le Concile* and a treatise on the Eucharist that attacked the Catholic Mass, just months after the issuing of the Edict of Nantes.[19] Mornay's book on the Eucharist incited such strong antipathy against him that he lamented to his wife: 'Every pulpit in Paris thundered against me'.[20] King Henri suggested to the pope that du Perron respond to Mornay, and the pope agreed. Prior to the conference, du Perron claimed that if Mornay persisted in his desire for 'hand to hand combat, I will need to acquire weapons which reach and strike from afar.'[21]

---

[16] T. A. d'Aubigné, *Confession catholique du Sieur de Sancy* in E. Réaume and D. Caussade, *Oeuvres Complétes de Théodore Agrippa d'Aubigné* (Paris, 1877), ii. 236. Du Perron won a convert away from King James in 1613. Dr. Benjamin Carrier (Carier), a former chaplain to the king, received permission from James to travel to Spa in April 1613 to improve his health. By August, he had moved to Cologne to inquire at a Jesuit college. England received news in October 1613 that 'Dr. Carrier, the King's Chaplain, is turned papist.' *CS*, *Domestic*, *1611–1618*, 203.

[17] Haag and Haag, *La France Protestante*, vii. 513: 'le plus vertueux et le plus grand homme du parti protestant'; P. Mornay, *Traicté de l'Église* (London, 1578).

[18] Mornay, *Response pour le Traité de l'Église* (Geneva, 1595); Mornay, *Traité de l'Église* (Geneva, 1599).

[19] Mornay, *De l'institution, usage et doctrine du sainct sacrament de l'eucharistie* (La Rochelle, 1598).

[20] Mornay, *Mémoires et Correspondance*, ix. 270: 'Toutes les chaires de Paris ont tonné contre moi.'

[21] C. de Ligny, ed., *Les ambassades et negotiations de . . . Cardinal du Perron . . .* (Paris, 1623), 75–6: 'main à main au combat, il me sera besoin de faire provision d'armes, qui atteignent et frappent de loin.'

All of Paris was buzzing with talk of the controversy.[22] L'Estoile reported that 'in the pulpits, in the schools, in the large houses and the small houses, we speak of nothing but this conference.'[23] Du Moulin, who attended the conference as a guest of Princess Catherine de Bourbon, attempted to convince Isaac Casaubon to abstain from participating as one of the judges of the conference because he knew that the deck would be stacked against Mornay.[24]

The focus of the dispute, which Michael Wolfe called 'a complete set-up', was the veracity of Mornay's citations in his volume on the Eucharist, not his doctrine.[25] Du Perron had alleged that Mornay's book contained over 500 faulty citations. In the hearing, they only discussed nine passages.[26] The judges and the king determined du Perron to be the winner. Henri, hoping to win back the Catholics he had displeased by issuing the Edict of Nantes in 1598, proclaimed the conference a great victory for the true faith. Du Perron was hailed as a Catholic hero and received a commendation letter from the pope.[27]

---

[22] For a full treatment of the conference, see Mornay, *Discours veritable de la Conference tenue a Fontainebleau* (Montpellier, 1600); du Perron, *Actes de la conférence . . avec la refutation de faux discourse . . .* (Evreux, 1601), in *Diverses oeuvres*, 77–306; Burigny, Vie, 169–97; D. de Liques, *Histoire de la vie de Messire Philippes de Mornay . . .* (Leiden, 1647), 263–72; P. de l'Etoile, *Journal du règne de Henri IV* (The Hague, 1741), ii. 493–511; Jacques-Auguste De Thou, *Histoire Universelle*, 16 vols (London, 1734), xiii. 445–9; Féret, *Cardinal du Perron*, 150–215. M. Wolfe, 'Exegesis as Public Performance: Controversialist Debate and Politics at the Conference at Fontainebleau', in A. Forrestal and E. Nelson, eds., *Politics and Religion in Early Bourbon France* (Basingstoke, 2009), 65–85.

[23] l'Etoile, *Journal*, ii. 496: 'dans les chaires, dans les écoles, chez les grands et chez les petits, on ne parle que de cet appel.'

[24] Pattison, *Casaubon*, 155.

[25] Wolfe, 'Exegesis as Public Performance', 70. The papal nuncio in France informed the king that a doctrinal disputation could not take place without papal sanction. See l'Etoile, *Journal*, ii. 498–9; Burigny, *Vie*, 171.

[26] Mornay requested a list of the 500 allegedly faulty citations prior to the disputation. Du Perron refused, so the two agreed to discuss 50 alleged errors. Du Perron delivered a list of 61 false citations at 11 p.m. on 3 May. With the disputation scheduled to begin nine hours later, Mornay worked through the night checking his references. He had time to examine only nineteen passages. Delays prevented the hearing from commencing until one in the afternoon. By the time the conference concluded six hours later, they had discussed nine passages.

[27] Ligny, *Ambassades*, 240–1.

Du Perron's rise to the top of French Catholicism was inevitable after his faceoff with Mornay before the king. In 1604, Henri requested that du Perron be made cardinal, the highest ecclesiastical position he could attain in France.[28] Consequently, in his speech at the Estates General of 1614, du Perron would fondly acknowledge that Henri 'brought me to the Episcopate, to the Archepiscopate, to the Cardinalate; he made me grand Almoner, and gave me the means and salaries necessary to assist me in sustaining some of these charges.'[29] Pierre du Moulin opined that du Perron 'had prostituted the dignity of the king his master' and had used the opportunity to advance himself towards the cardinalate.[30]

Mornay suffered harsh criticism from his fellow Protestants for his poor performance. During the disputation, Henri asked his Huguenot secretary of state, Maximilien de Béthune, Duc de Sully, what he thought of his pope, a common insult for Mornay from Catholics. Sully replied, 'Sir, he is more of a pope than you can imagine, because, in this moment, he is giving the red cap to the Bishop of Evreux.'[31] Sully proved to be prophetic when du Perron received his cardinal's hat in 1604. Both du Perron and Mornay continued the debate with their published accounts of the conference.[32]

---

[28] *Discours sommaire*, 20. In a letter of thanks to the king, he confessed that no words were sufficient to express the excellency of such an act. *Diverses oeuvres*, 871.
[29] *Diverses oeuvres*, 637: 'm'a porté à l'Episcopat, à l'Archiepiscopat, au Cardinalat; m'a fait grand Aumosnier, et m'a donné les moyens et appointemens necessaires pour m'aider à soustenir une partie de ces charges.'
[30] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 148: 'avoit prostitué la dignité du Roy son Maistre'.
[31] Sully, *Mémoires du Duc de Sully*, ed., P. A. N. B. Daru, 6 vols (Paris, 1822), iii. 39: 'Sire, qu'il est plus pape que vous ne pensez, puisque, dans ce moment, il donne le bonnet rouge à M. d'Evreux.'
[32] Du Perron, *Discours véritable de l'ordre et forme qui a esté gardée faicte à Fontainebleau . . .* (Anvers, 1600); du Perron, *Actes de la Conference; Mornay, Discours véritable de la Conférence*; Mornay, *Advertissement du sieur du Plessis à Messieurs de l'Église romaine sur l'escrit naguères publié par le sieur Êvesque d'Évreux* (Saumur, 1601); Mornay, *Response au livre publie par le Sieur Evesque D'Evreux sur la conference . . .* (Saumur, 1602). Michael Wolfe claimed that 'Pierre du Moulin prepared and published a short account of the conference within weeks, which likely formed the template for the more substantial compilation, the Discours véritable de la Conférence à Fontainebleau, that appeared in July.' Wolfe, 'Exegesis as Public Performance', 80. Wolfe provided no title for this volume. Brian Armstrong's *Bibliographia Molinaei* included no reference for a volume by du Moulin on the Fontainebleau conference in 1600.

Pierre du Moulin surely was impressed by the central role that the accuracy of citations of the Church Fathers played in the debate between du Perron and Mornay. A polemicist could gain a major victory for his side by stressing the inaccuracies of his opponent. Du Moulin would employ this tactic in his written response to Cardinal du Perron more than twenty-five years after the conference at Fontainebleau.[33]

The Council of Trent and Church Tradition

Following the council at Fontainebleau, Cardinal du Perron made the accuracy of citations a major focus of his anti-Protestant polemics. Du Perron's polemical methodology also marked a transition in Roman Catholic theology regarding the consensus of the Church Fathers. Session IV (8 April 1546) of the Council of Trent had addressed matters related to Scripture and Tradition. In its *Decretum de canonicis Scripturis* the council defined the books of the Old and New Testaments, including the Apocrypha, and addressed Church Tradition. Prior to Session IV, the general congregation had struggled to reach agreement regarding the communication of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Early drafts of the decree stated that the Gospel was transmitted partly (*partim*) through Scripture and partly (*partim*) through unwritten Tradition received from Christ and/or the Apostles. Some prelates objected to the language of *partim–partim*, so the final draft, not completed until the day before the

[33] See Chapter 6.

session, declared that the truth and rule of Christ was found in Scripture and unwritten Tradition (*et–et*).[34]

The council intentionally did not offer a detailed explanation of the relationship between Scripture and unwritten Tradition. It certainly did not identify two, co-equal sources of revelation. David Steinmetz went far beyond the words of the decree:

> The two sources, written and unwritten, were commended by Trent to the Catholic faithful as co-equal in authority. They were co-equal because they came ultimately from the same ancient source, either directly from the mouth of Jesus or indirectly from the apostles, who were inspired by the Holy Spirit. The importance of this claim for Catholic theology is impossible to exaggerate. Unlike their Protestant counterparts, Catholics were not unduly troubled by the silences of scripture. Tradition spoke when and where scripture was silent. Both written scripture and unwritten tradition were bearers of God's ancient self-revelation to the catholic Church. Catholics should therefore accord tradition the same affection and reverence that they accorded holy scripture.[35]

The decree of Session IV consequently allowed for a position that Tradition included only interpretations of Scripture, as well as a position that Tradition included interpretations of Scripture and additional doctrine beyond Scripture. The decree did not allow, however, for a position that separated Scripture and Tradition.[36]

---

[34] For a full discussion of the debates over the decrees of Session IV, see H. Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, trans. Ernest Graf, 2 vols (London, 1957–61), ii. 58–87; J. O'Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (London, 2013), 92–8. D. Steinmetz did not distinguish between the decree and its drafts when he wrote that the council 'used the words *partim-partim*, "partly-partly". Explicit Catholic teaching is found partly in scripture and partly in the church's tradition.' Steinmetz, 'The Council of Trent', in D. Bagchi and D. Steinmetz, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004), 238. J. Wicks pointed out the error and urged readers of Steinmetz's chapter 'to add in pencil in the margin, "No, it did not say that!"' Wicks, review of *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004), *The Thomist*, 70 (2006), 291.

[35] Steinmetz, 'The Council of Trent', 238.

[36] In his explanation of Scripture and tradition in Catholic theology before the Council of Trent, David Bagchi noted: 'There was no idea of a tradition independent of scripture or opposed to it.' D. Bagchi, 'Catholic theologians of the Reformation period before Trent' in *Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology*, 225. The same was true after the council.

Session IV of the Council of Trent also issued *Decretum de editione et usu sacrorum librorum*, which identified the Vulgate as the approved text of Sacred Scripture and prescribed a method of interpretation:

> Furthermore, in order to restrain petulant spirits, It decrees, that no one, relying on his own skill, shall,--in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, --wresting the sacred Scripture to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother Church,--whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scriptures,--hath held and doth hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; even though such interpretations were never (intended) to be at any time published. Contraveners shall be made known by their Ordinaries, and be punished with the penalties by law established.[37]

As with the relationship between Scripture and Tradition, the council did not specify in the decree what it meant by *consensum Patrum*. Neither did it offer an approved list of Church Fathers or even identify their chronological boundaries. No Catholic apologists following the Council of Trent offered a definitive list of Church Fathers. Du Perron would advance Catholic apologetics by defining *consensus Patrum* and by identifying a particular group of Fathers as the rightful judges.[38]

Pierre Coton

Although du Perron was the most prominent French Catholic polemicist of his day, other theologians participated in the treatise wars, including Jesuit Pierre Coton. Coton studied law at Paris and Bourges before entering the Society of Jesus at the age of nineteen.[39] He then studied at Milan and Rome, where he was overseen by Robert Bellarmine. Coton returned to France and earned a reputation as a polished preacher, often sermonising against Protestants over Scripture and the Eucharist. Coton

---

[37] J. Waterworth, ed., *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent* (London, 1848), 19–20.
[38] See Chapter 4.
[39] P. J. D'Orleans, *La Vie du Pere Pierre Coton* (Paris, 1688), 13.

established himself as a Catholic apologist with two volumes published in 1600. The first targeted du Moulin and his fellow Reformed Protestant ministers, and the second addressed the Eucharist.[40] After learning that Huguenot pastor Daniel Chamier was preparing a list of the misused citations in Coton's work on the Eucharist, the Jesuit proposed a conference with Chamier. As in the Fontainebleau conference, the focus was to be the veracity of Coton's citations, not his doctrine.[41] Two major accounts of the conference were published.[42]

In September 1603 Henri IV signed the Edict of Rouen in September 1603, which authorised the Jesuits to establish colleges at Dijon, Lyon, and Anjou and to remain in the towns of Toulouse and Bordeaux where they had fled after Henri's expulsion of the order in the wake of a failed 1594 assassination attempt. The edict mandated that a member of the order serve as a court preacher and spokesman for the Jesuits before the king. The first to fill this role, Coton, became such an asset to Henri that he would name the Jesuit his confessor in 1608.

Coton's next major work, a list of rejections of Protestant doctrine, was published in 1606 and received a response from du Moulin the following year.[43] Coton's reply was published in 1610 as part of a larger work organized by Henri to combat Reformed theology in a more amicable manner.[44] Jesuit theologians, led by Coton and Jean Gontéry, enthusiastically engaged in religious controversy with

---

[40] Coton, *Cinquante et quatre demandes du R. P. Coton . . . au sieurs du Moulin, Montigni, Durand, Gigord, Soulas, et autres ministres de la Religion prétendue réformée* (Paris, 1600); Coton, *Du très-sainct et très-auguste sacrement et sacrifice de la Messe* (Paris, 1600).
[41] D'Orleans, *La Vie*, 43.
[42] *Discours envoyé à Monseigneur l'Illustriss. Cardinal de Sourdis . . . contenant succinctement et au vray le narré de la conférence commencée à Nîmes . . . entre le R. Pere Coton de la Compagnie de Jésus et M. Chamier Ministre* (Avignon, 1600); *Les Actes de la conference tenue à Nismes, entre Daniel Chamier . . . et Pierre Coton* (Geneva, 1601).
[43] Coton, *Trente-deux demandes proposées par le Pere Coton* (Paris, 1606). For du Moulin's response, see Chapter 4.
[44] *Institution catholique, où est declarée et confirmée la Verité de la foy . . . Divisée en quatre livres qui servent d'antidote aux quatre de l'Institution de J. Calvin* (Paris, 1610).

Protestants. Thus, Pierre du Moulin faced a formidable array of enemies during the first period of his major polemical labours.

The assassination of King Henri IV on 14 May 1610 threatened the state of relative peace between Catholics and Protestants in France. The murderous act of François Ravaillac, a fanatical Roman Catholic with connections to the Jesuits, could have sparked another religious war. However, Protestant and Catholic preachers challenged their respective communities to pursue civility and peace. L'Estoile recorded that du Moulin preached on the death of the king and 'recommended above all peace, union, and fraternal harmony with Catholics (their fellow men and neighbours), although of a contrary religion.'[45] L'Estoile added that 'the same was preached, that day, by the Catholic priests and doctors in most of the churches and parishes of Paris.'[46] Despite no evidence of direct involvement by Jesuits in the assassination, public sentiment turned against the Society. Coton quickly produced a pamphlet defending the Jesuits entitled *Lettre déclaratoire de la doctrine des Peres Jesuites*.[47] An anonymous response, *Anticoton, ou refutation de la lettre declaratoire du Pere Coton*, that claimed that the Jesuits were 'guilty of parricide of our deceased King Henry IV, has been credited to du Moulin, primarily due to Peter du Moulin's statement in his biography of his father.[48] Coton's defence of the Jesuits and the *Anticoton* reply were the opening salvos of the second stage of religious controversy in France, which focused on the intersection between theology and politics.

---

[45] P. de L'Estoile, *Mémoires-Journaux*, X: 241–2: 'Recommanda surtout la paix, l'union et concorde fraternelle avec les Catholiques (leurs prochains et voisins) bien que de contraire religion.'
[46] L'Estoile, *Mémoires-Journaux*, X: 242: 'Le mesme fust presché, ce jour, par les curés et docteurs catholiques, en la pluspart des églises et paroisses de Paris.'
[47] P. Coton, *Lettre déclaratoire de la doctrine des Peres Jesuites* (Paris, 1610).
[48] *Anticoton, ou Refutation de la Lettre Declaratoire du Pere Coton* (n.p., 1610), 48: 'sont coulpables du Parricide de nostre Roy defunct Henry IV.' See Peter du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***4. For the arguments for and against du Moulin's authorship, see Wagstaffe, 'Forms and methods of religious controversy in Paris', 194–6.

A Trophy Princess

The first confrontation between Jacques Davy du Perron and Pierre du Moulin involved King Henri's sister, Princess Catherine de Bourbon. Like Henri, Catherine had been raised a Protestant; unlike Henri, she remained a Protestant until her death. Du Moulin's first task as a minister was to serve as chaplain to Princess Catherine, who recently had become duchesse de Bar. Ministers of the Reformed congregation at Paris served in her household on a rotating basis. At the time of du Moulin's arrival in Paris, an elderly minister was scheduled to accompany Catherine on a journey to Lorraine. Du Moulin took his place and began what would become a special relationship with Catherine.[49] On that initial journey in the town of Vitry-le-François in Champagne, du Moulin met Marie Colignon, a young widow of a pastor, who would become his wife.

King Henri received pressure from the pope to secure his sister's conversion. He sent his two best apologists, du Perron and Coton, to persuade Catherine.[50] Du Perron did meet with Catherine in 1601 in an attempt to clear up some of her difficulties regarding the Mass, and the princess asked du Perron to write out his teaching on that subject so her ministers could examine it. Du Perron soon received a response, relayed by the princess, from du Moulin, Tilenus, F. de Gordon, Guillaume de Feugueray, and Jean Liévin de Beaulieu.[51] Du Perron then proposed that the ministers engage him in a public disputation in Catherine's presence. In the reply, the ministers suggested the production of immediate written accounts of all the activity and arguments of the disputation to ensure that du Perron did not issue his own

---

[49] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', *** *v*–***2*r*.
[50] Peter du Moulin attached no date to this encounter.
[51] Du Perron, *Articles de ministres et autres appellez par Madame, pour la conference propose entre eux et M. l'Evesque d'Evreux* (Paris, 1601), in *Diverses oeuvres*, 307–58; Liévin had written against du Perron a year earlier. *L'Evangile de Rome, comme il a esté immediatement recue du pape et publié par Messire Iaques Davy Sieur du Perron* (Geneva, 1600).

favourable rewrite, as he had following the conference at Fontainebleau.[52] However, du Perron considered this request slanderous.[53] The two sides could not agree on terms, and the conference never took place. Animosity was building.

Du Moulin never mentioned the failed attempt to hold a conference with du Perron. He claimed to have confronted du Perron over the issue of indulgences at Princess Catherine's palace at Fontainebleau. On one of his trips to Rome on behalf of King Henri, du Perron had received from the pope bags full of little crucifixes and blessed beads ('croisettes et de grains benits') for rosaries to grant to the people of France. Each time the recipient kissed the blessed bead, he or she received a papal indulgence pardoning 100 years in purgatory. Du Moulin mocked du Perron, a man 'd'excellent esprit', for believing that he would receive 100 years of pardon for kissing a bead. The pastor also warned the bishop that he was jeopardising his reputation by bringing such merchandise out of Italy, implying that the French clergyman was a puppet of the Italian pope.[54] Du Moulin reported that du Perron fell silent when the pastor pressed him to cite a passage of Scripture that contained God's command to issue indulgences or an example of an apostle giving an indulgence. The bishop also could not provide a reference to the teaching of an ancient doctor of the church on indulgences.[55]

Du Perron and du Moulin again faced off beside the deathbed of the Princess Catherine in 1604. According to his son, du Moulin was ministering to the dying princess when du Perron burst into the room. The bishop announced that he had been sent by the king to replace du Moulin and threatened to remove the Reformed pastor by force, if necessary. Du Moulin gripped the bedpost and refused to leave. He

---

[52] *Diverses oeuvres*, 317.
[53] *Diverses oeuvres*, 324.
[54] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 586–7.
[55] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 587.

asked the princess to express her wishes. She declared that she would die in the Reformed religion and desired du Moulin to stay by her side. Du Perron exited the room.[56]

Du Moulin could have attempted to use Catherine's favour to advance himself, such as angling to become her full-time chaplain. His poise and conduct suited him for life at court, and he would eventually make numerous appearances before Henri IV and King James. If his 'upper-class mentalité and lifestyle' truly drove him, as Armstrong claimed, du Moulin likely would have sought to take advantage of his noble heritage and secure a permanent position at the height of French society, similar to Mornay, who was governor at Saumur. Rather, he contented himself with the humble life of a Huguenot pastor, although he certainly faced a more pleasant context than the pastors of his father's day prior to the Edict of Nantes.

Polemical Writings

Pierre du Moulin emerged as the foremost French Reformed polemicist in the first decade of the seventeenth century. During this period, his writings displayed respect for the Church Fathers as faithful interpreters of Scripture, when they agreed with the Reformed view, but he deemed them insufficient to serve as judges of theological controversies.

[56] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***3*v*.

Correspondence with M. Choart (1601)

Du Moulin exchanged letters with former Protestant M. Choart, which were published by Pierre Cayet in 1602.[57] In response to Choart's claims that the Roman Catholic Church teaches the same doctrine as that taught in the first four centuries and that salvation is found only within the Catholic Church, du Moulin delivered what would become the foundation of his anti-Catholic polemics. First, he said that the Bible gives privileges to the universal church, not to the Roman Church, which is not universal but a corrupt particular. He then mentioned the Greek Church's presence at the foundation of the faith in the first four centuries. Second, du Moulin addressed Scripture and tradition and declared that 'Holy Scripture is sufficient for salvation', with a reference to 2 Timothy 3.[58] Du Moulin, ever the logician, closed the letter by pointing out that Choart had presented none of his material in the form of an argument.

In his letters with Choart, du Moulin displayed one of his primary approaches to anti-Catholic polemics over the course of his career. He attacked the claim that the Catholic Church is the one true church and argued that the Bible alone is the judge of doctrine, not the Catholic Church.

Conference with Pierre Cayet (1602)

When du Moulin returned from accompanying Princess Catherine to Lorraine in the spring of 1602, he engaged Pierre Cayet in a public debate at the house next to Catherine's residence.[59] Cayet, a former Reformed minister and chaplain to

---

[57] P. Cayet, *La Conference des ministres accordée, et puis refuse par eux, avec les Docteurs de la Saincte Eglise Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine* (Paris, 1602).
[58] Cayet, *La Conference des ministres accordée*, quoted in Wagstaffe, 'Forms and methods of religious controversy in Paris', 148: 'l'Escriture Saincte est suffisante à salut.'
[59] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***2v.

Catherine, had converted to Roman Catholicism in 1595. The conference began on 28 May 1602 and lasted ten days. Du Moulin, thirty-three years younger than Cayet, had no assistants; Cayet was assisted by two Carmelite doctors. They addressed the Mass, the adoration of the pope, and the veneration of images. Peter du Moulin noted that 'this was a famous Conference, done with great order and fair dealing, in a very full audience, and in the greatest light of France.'[60]

Cayet startled du Moulin by committing to prove his arguments 'by the text of Holy Scripture'.[61] Du Moulin could not believe that Cayet would depart from the 'maximes ordinaires' held by the Catholic Church and use only Scripture as the judge of doctrine. According to the official Catholic view, said du Moulin, Scripture was not and could not be the 'final rule and sovereign judge of doctrine.'[62] He argued that Cayet departed from the teaching of Cardinal Robert Bellarmine in *De Verbo Dei* and from Cardinal du Perron, who maintained that 'tradition and the unwritten word are of the same authority as Holy Scripture.'[63]

If Cayet indeed was adopting something similar to *sola Scriptura*, he certainly would have been distancing himself from the teaching of the Council of Trent and from Cardinal Bellarmine's articulation of that teaching. Perhaps some of his Protestant convictions were still lingering even after his conversion to Rome. Another possibility is that Cayet made a tactical decision to attempt to fluster du Moulin with an unexpected position at the beginning of the conference. In the end, Cayet did not defend his stance on Scripture after du Moulin challenged it and did not

---

[60] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***3r.
[61] A. Adaire, *Narré de la Conference Verbale et par Escrit, tenue entre M. Pierre du Moulin & M. Cayer* (Geneva, 1625), 9: 'par le texte de l'Escriture saincte'.
[62] Adaire, *Narré*, 9: 'la derniere reigle et le souverain juge de la doctrine.'
[63] Adaire, *Narré*, 10: 'les traditions, et la parole non escrite est de mesme authorité que l'Escriture saincte.'

implement it in the remainder of the debate. The experienced clergyman thus rattled the nerves of his younger opponent with some theological gamesmanship.

Du Moulin repeatedly challenged Cayet's attempts at using Scripture to defend the Roman Catholic Church. Cayet declared that 'there is nothing in the Roman Church that does not appear in Holy Scripture by commandment or example.'[64] Du Moulin immediately challenged Cayet to show in Scripture where the pope has the power to give pardons removing thousands of years in purgatory or even release souls from purgatory altogether. Cayet appealed to Ephesians 4:8 as evidence: 'When he ascended on high he led a host of captives, and he gave gifts to men.' Cayet also affirmed that Jesus descended into the lower parts of the earth (i.e., purgatory) and released the captive souls when he ascended. Du Moulin countered that the Roman Church teaches that the multitude of captives refers to the Old Testament saints who were in limbo, not the souls in purgatory. He referenced Pope Gregory the Great in support.[65]

A common tactic of du Moulin throughout his writings was to use other Catholic theologians against the arguments of his Catholic opponents. He used prominent doctors of the Roman Church against Cayet's argument that John 6:51 ('And the bread that I will give for the life of the world is my flesh.') referred to the Mass. Du Moulin cited Gabriel Biel, Nicholas of Cusa, Thomas Cajetan, Ruard Tapper, Jean Hessels, and Cornelius Jansen, who all denied that this passage spoke of the Eucharist.[66] Du Moulin also cited Pope Innocent III, who had convened the 1215 Fourth Lateran Council which affirmed transubstantiation.[67] A citation from a

---

[64] Adaire, *Narré*, 10: 'il n'y avoit rien en l'Eglise Romaine qu'il ne monstrast ex l'Ecriture saincte par commandement ou par exemple'.
[65] Adaire, *Narré*, 11.
[66] Adaire, *Narré*, 35.
[67] Adaire, *Narré*, 83.

respected Catholic theologian against du Moulin's Catholic opponent thus carried a greater weight than du Moulin's own opinion or a citation from a Protestant. This tactic also gave du Moulin the additional benefit of highlighting the apparent inconsistencies in Catholic theology.

Du Moulin began the formalised debate with a syllogism, and used many more syllogisms throughout the conference.[68] He liked to display his own skill in logic and point out the irrationalism of his opponents, typically attempting a gradual dismantling of their arguments, rather than a single knockout blow. Although du Moulin was not a systematic theologian, he used scholastic methodology in his polemical works, as did nearly all of his Reformed Protestant contemporaries. For the most part, Cayet delivered meandering, unprepared, and confusing discourses that were filled with 'embarassemens et entortillemens', as well as irregular syllogisms.[69]

Du Moulin made arguments from tradition by comparing the Roman Catholic Church to the church of the Apostles' Creed. He addressed the invisible/visible church distinction and the universal church, two themes that would appear in most of his anti-Catholic polemical works. According to du Moulin, when a Christian confesses, 'I believe the church', the church must not be visible because faith is evidence of things unseen (Hebrews 11:1). The universal church, the assembly of the faithful, cannot be visible. Also, unlike the Roman Church, which cannot be universal, the universal church includes those who are in heaven. The Roman Church 'would not dare to say that Moses, Abraham, the Apostles, etc. were of the Roman Church.'[70]

---

[68] Adaire, *Narré*, 12.
[69] Adaire, *Narré*, 23.
[70] Adaire, *Narré*, 24: 'l'oseroit dire que Moyse, Abraham, les Apostres etc. soyent de l'Eglise Romaine.'

Du Moulin incorporated passages from Juvenal to confirm his understanding of *coenaculum* ('upper-room') in Luke 22:12 and Mark 14:15, which caused the Carmelite doctors assisting Cayet to object angrily at the use of pagan authors to support a biblical point. Du Moulin replied that the only way to demonstrate the meaning of a Latin word was 'by the testimony of ancient Latin authors.'[71] This episode also reveals du Moulin's approach to Scripture. In no way did he violate *sola Scriptura* by using extra-biblical sources, even pagan authors, to confirm his understanding of the biblical text. Human reason, informed by extra-biblical sources, remained subordinate to Scripture in terms of authority and was used merely to give insight into the meaning of the Bible, not to act as another source of revelation.

Cayet reached into du Moulin's past and brought Henry Constable to assist him for one of the days of the conference. Adaire described Constable as a 'scholarly English gentleman with a good wit.'[72] Constable challenged du Moulin's understanding of Gregory of Nyssa, but he was not a strong enough influence to convince the crowd to favour Cayet, who concluded his remarks with a syllogism 'monstrous in both its form and matter.'[73] Adaire indicated that the conference was a victory for du Moulin, with the Protestants pleased and the ignorant exposed to the truth.[74] Peter du Moulin believed that 'these passages raised his reputation very high, wherby God was glorified, his Truth confirmed, and his Church edified, and increased with many Converts.'[75]

Eaux de Siloé (1603) and *Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé* (1604)

[71] Adaire, *Narré*, 104: 'par le tesmoignage des anciens autheurs Latins.'
[72] Adaire, *Narré*, 152: 'un gentil homme Anglois sçavant et de bon esprit'.
[73] Adaire, *Narré*, 155: 'monstrueux tant en la forme qu'en la matiere'.
[74] Adaire, *Narré*, 158.
[75] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***3v.

A sermon on purgatory by Jacques Suarez de Sainte-Marie, who later became Bishop of Sées, inspired du Moulin to contact the Franciscan friar. According to du Moulin, the two met in person, and then du Moulin sent Suarez a discourse on purgatory, requesting that he reciprocate. Suarez instead challenged du Moulin to a public debate, which du Moulin refused.[76] Du Moulin then published *Eaux de Siloé* against Suarez, whom he considered to be 'most ridiculously violent', speaking with 'a barbarous impetuosity'.[77]

Suarez, Cayet, and André Duval each issued responses to du Moulin. Du Moulin replied with *Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé*, an expanded edition of *Eaux de Siloé*. Although it was a polemical work, *Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé* allowed du Moulin to give fuller explanations of his own theology and more thorough refutations of the Roman Catholic position than he had done in the earlier publications of his conferences and correspondence.

Du Moulin made Scripture his starting point, as was his custom, and used humanist tendencies to combat Suarez. Du Moulin ridiculed Suarez as an 'unlearned man, who does not know Greek or Hebrew.'[78] He dismissed the biblical passages presented by Suarez, Cayet, and Duval in support of purgatory as 'either false, misinterpreted, or taken out of context.'[79] He also attacked them for poor textual criticism since they cited passages not found in the original Greek or Hebrew.

Du Moulin took issue with the way Suarez, Cayet, and Duval misrepresented his arguments and took them out of context. He claimed that they 'either timidly concealed or maliciously corrupted my best objections.'[80] He sounded every bit the

---

[76] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé pour esteindre le feu de purgatoire* (La Rochelle, 1608), 5–6.
[77] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 5: 'plus ridiculement violent'; 'une impetuosité Barbare'.
[78] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 14: 'un homme sans lettres, qui ne sçait ny Grec ny Hebrieu'.
[79] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 10: 'ou faux, ou pris à contresens, ou hors de propos.'
[80] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 16: 'ou craintivement dissimulé, ou malicieusement corrompu mes meilleures objections'.

humanist when he said that 'whoever seeks the truth ought to produce the very words of his adversary'.[81] He sounded every bit the scholastic when he challenged the three Catholics to respond 'article for article, reason after reason, leaving nothing out and not changing my words or the order of my discourse.'[82]

Next, du Moulin presented teaching from Catholic theologians on the four locations under the earth: hell, purgatory, limbo of children, and limbo of the fathers. Although, as du Moulin said, 'we do not find in the Word of God that anyone went out from this place', multiple Catholic theologians reported individuals escaping from hell through the prayers of the saints.[83] Du Moulin mocked the abuse of papal pardons for those in purgatory, referencing pardons of fifty thousand and one-hundred thousand years. He closed the first chapter declaring that he would 'show that the word of God is a river more than sufficient to extinguish this fire so profitable for the pope.'[84]

Du Moulin then set out to 'defend the perfection of holy Scripture.'[85] He listed thirty-two passages of Scripture displaying that the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory is contrary to the word of God. Du Moulin declared that 'to join to holy Scripture an unwritten word and to equate the traditions of the Roman Church to the books of the Old and New Testament, is a great disparagement of the majesty of holy Scripture.'[86] He inquired what is the 'unwritten word but a Chimera in the air, an

---

[81] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 15: 'celui qui cerche la verité doit produire les propres paroles de son adversaire'.
[82] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 16: 'article à article, raison apres raison, sans en rien defalquer, et sans changer mes paroles, ny l'ordre de mon discours.'
[83] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 19: 'nous ne trouvons point en la parole de Dieu qu'aucun sorte de ce lieu'.
[84] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 41: 'monstrer que la parole de Dieu est un fleuve plus que suffisant pour esteindre ce feu tant profitable au Pape.'
[85] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 43: 'defendre la perfection de l'Escriture saincte.'
[86] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 44: 'adjoindre à l'Escriture saincte une parole non escrite, et égaller les traditions de l'Eglise Romaine aux livres du vieil et du nouveau Testament, c'est fort ravaller la Majesté de la Saincte Escriture.'

imperceptible idea? For where can I find this unwritten word?'[87] Thus, du Moulin characteristically stressed the superiority of Scripture as judge over against the nebulous nature of tradition.

Du Moulin devoted an entire chapter to prove that the Church Fathers of the first four centuries did not teach the doctrine of purgatory. This chapter contains his earliest robust treatments of Scripture and tradition. He certainly had addressed these issues in his earlier conferences and correspondence that were published, but the nature of this work enabled him to address topics more fully than in a debate setting. Du Moulin articulated his fundamental divide with Roman Catholics:

> Our adversaries want to judge the truth by antiquity; we want to judge antiquity by the truth. They try to demonstrate the antiquity of their doctrine by human testimony; we prove the truth of ours by divine testimony taken from the holy Scriptures. The antiquity that they claim requires infinite passages from diverse authors; the truth that we maintain can be defended by a single passage from Scripture. The path that we follow is so much shorter and more certain, because reasons in disputations are more valuable than years, and the authority of God than the testimony of men.[88]

Du Moulin outlined the Protestant doctrine of *sola Scriptura* without using the term. He argued that the ancient church used the same methodology, because 'the Word of God is stronger naked than armed.'[89] The church displayed its approach at the opening of the early synods when the delegates 'placed on the table only the books of the holy Scriptures'.[90] The Church Fathers thus stood in contrast to the Roman Catholic Church, which could not be content with this 'simplicité' of Scripture alone.

---

[87] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 46: 'parole non escrite, sino une Chimere en l'air, une idée imperceptible? Car où pourray ie trouver ceste parole non escrite?'
[88] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 319: 'Nos adversaires veulent qu'on juge de la verité par l'ancieneté; nous voulons qu'on juge de l'ancieneté par la verité. Ils taschent de monstrer l'ancieneté de leur doctrine par tesmoignages humains, nous prouvons la verité de la nostre pas tesmoignages divins, tires des sainctes Escritures. L'ancieneté qu'ils pretendent requiert infinis passages de divers autheurs; la verité que nous maintenons se peut defender par un seul passage de l'Escriture. Le chemin que nous suivons est d'autant plus court et plus asseuré, que les raisons en dispute valent mieux que les années, et l'authorité de Dieu que les tesmoignage des hommes.'
[89] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 321: 'la parole de Dieu est plus forte nue qu'ainsi armee.'
[90] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 321: 'mettoit seulement sur la table les livres des Sainctes Escritures.'

According to du Moulin, Rome 'teaches many things, of which there is no commandment nor example in Scripture.'[91]

Therefore, du Moulin attacked Roman Catholic theologians for claiming to adhere to the teaching of the Church Fathers, when in reality they rejected it. Catholics tore Scripture from the hands of the laity and 'cry out nothing but the Fathers, the Fathers, in lieu of the sovereign Father, which is God.'[92] In other words, Rome ostentatiously declared its allegiance to the Church Fathers while rejecting God's revelation in Scripture. Therefore, du Moulin charged, the Roman Catholic Church is faithful neither to the Fathers nor to God.

In this early work, du Moulin revealed his scepticism about using the Fathers to judge theological disputes. He briefly listed significant points demonstrating the insufficiency of the Fathers, which he would develop in later treatises. An appeal to the Fathers, du Moulin asserted, allowed Catholic theologians to shroud themselves in thick darkness in an attempt to obscure the truth. Rather than dealing with the clear and accessible teaching of Scripture, these theologians used the Fathers to obfuscate the issue. In that time, most Christians, especially the laity, had little or no access to the works of the Fathers. The Roman Catholic theologians, therefore, possessed a secret knowledge to wield over others. Even with access to the works of the Fathers, most people could not understand their writings. Du Moulin pointed out that the Fathers repeatedly contradicted each other and even themselves. One or more Fathers had even advocated each heresy of the church. Also, the meanings of some words had changed significantly over the centuries, including indulgences, pope, satisfaction, and sacrament. In these cases, Roman Catholic theologians retained the

---

[91] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 321: 'enseigne beaucoup de choses, desquelles il n'y a ni commandement, ni exemple en l'Escriture.'
[92] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 321: 'ils ne crient que les Peres, les Peres; au lieu du Pere souverain, qui est Dieu.'

original wording but altered the doctrine. Furthermore, the works of the Fathers had been altered over the centuries, so distinguishing between the original text and later corruptions proved impossible. Conveniently, only the Roman Catholic Church was able to bring light to the darkness of the Church Fathers and interpret them. Du Moulin ironically remarked that Catholics 'want the Fathers to be our judges, but on the condition that the Roman Church is the judge of the Fathers.'[93]

Du Moulin instead used the Fathers not to support his own position, but to attack his opponents. He explained that he did not present the Fathers to 'support the truth of my cause, but to demonstrate that our adversaries abuse them and make them say things contrary to their own opinion. I take them not as advocates of my cause, but I am an advocate of theirs.'[94] Du Moulin seemed anxious that someone might accuse him of abandoning his commitment to *sola Scriptura* by employing the Fathers to bolster his argument. Consequently, he did not want to give the impression that he was mixing 'divine authority with human' by using the Fathers.[95] He made it clear that 'the truth that these fine individuals have spoken we believe, not because they spoke it, but because it is the same truth that I find in the Word of God.'[96] Du Moulin would expand these arguments against using the Church Fathers as judges of theological controversy over the course of his anti-Catholic polemical career, always being overly cautious not to cast suspicion on his adherence to *sola Scriptura*.

Following the pattern of most Reformed Protestants, du Moulin cited Augustine first and most often. He especially pointed out that Augustine denied

---

[93] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 321: 'veulent que les peres soient nos juges, mais à condition que l'Eglise Romaine soit juge des Peres.'
[94] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 324: 'appuyer sur eux la verité de ma cause, mais pour monstrer que nos adversaires en abusent, et leur font fire choses esloignees de leur opinion. Je ne les prens pas pour advocats de ma cause, mais je suis advocat de la leur.'
[95] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 324: 'l'authorité divine avec les humaines.'
[96] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 324: 'la verité que ces bons personnages ont dite, nous la croyons, non pource qu'ils l'ont dite, mais pource que cela mesmes se trouve en la parole de Dieu.'

Pelagius's depictions of limbo and purgatory.[97] Du Moulin thus often employed the tactic of associating his opponents' teachings with that of known heretics.

To sum up, in *Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé* Pierre du Moulin gave detailed explanations of his own theology, particularly on Scripture and tradition, and displayed polemical tactics that he would use repeatedly throughout his career. His systematic denial of the qualification of the Church Fathers to serve as judges of theological controversy would form the basis for his expanded argument in *Nouveauté du Papisme*.

***Nouvelles briques pour le bastiment de Babel* (1604)**

In 1604, du Moulin released a brief pamphlet in response to Théophraste Bouju, Sieur de Beaulieu. He listed the errors of the Roman Catholic Church on the subject of the Church Fathers, which fell into two categories: Rome perverted the words or sense of the Fathers, and Rome attributed to the Fathers popish doctrines that they had never taught.[98] *Nouvelles briques* addressed the latter category of errors; in this work, du Moulin listed thirty-one errors of the Roman Catholic Church that did not appear in the works of the Fathers. These included errors related to the treasury of merit, papal pardons, the veneration of Mary, and the seven sacraments. Du Moulin concluded that 'it is not believable that a doctrine was declared by the Apostles which was not closely received four hundred years after them.'[99] He then gave twenty-four reasons why the pope is not the successor to St Peter.

Nouvelles briques is not one of du Moulin's better polemical works. It appears to have been written in haste and lacks any sense of thematic flow. In

---

[97] Du Moulin, *Eaux de Siloé*, 326.
[98] Du Moulin, *Nouvelles briques pour le bastiment de Babel* (Geneva, 1631), 27.
[99] Du Moulin, *Nouvelles briques*, 28: 'qu'il n'est pas croyable qu'une doctrine ait esté annoncée par les Apostres, laquelle n'estoit en pres recoüe quatre cens ans apres eux.'

contrast to his more sophisticated works of polemics, du Moulin argued neither from Scripture or the Church Fathers. He provided no evidence for his list of doctrines not appearing in the Church Fathers and for the pope not being the successor of Peter. He offered no proof that the Fathers taught the opposite of Roman Catholic claims and provided no refutation by the Fathers of the doctrines that Rome had adopted. This work, therefore, does not display du Moulin's scholastic tendencies or his humanist influences.

Letter of Gregory of Nissa (1605)

In 1605 French Jesuit Louis Richeome defended the practice of making pilgrimages in response to a recent French translation of Gregory of Nyssa's letter to Kensitor that was critical of pilgrimages.[100] Du Moulin responded that same year with a new Latin translation of Gregory's letter, accompanied by the Greek texts and du Moulin's own notes. However, du Moulin did not intend to produce an abstract scholarly work and certainly was not motivated by a desire to expand understanding of the Church Fathers. Instead, he was attempting to incorporate Gregory into his anti-Catholic arguments. With regard to making pilgrimages to sites connected with Christ's birth and death, du Moulin noted that Gregory 'contends there is no such command taught in holy Scripture.'[101] This example from an early phase in du Moulin's polemical career displays his willingness to use the Church Fathers primarily as a weapon against Roman Catholics.

---

[100] Richeome, *Deffence des pelerinages contre le traducteur d'une lettre pretendue de St Gregoire de Nisse sur les Pelerinages* (Paris, 1605).
[101] Du Moulin, *Gregoriou episkopou Nysses peri ton apionton eis Ierosolyma : Gregorii episcopi Nyssae de euntibus Ierosolyma, epistola* (Hanover, 2007), 20: 'contendit nihil tale praecipi in sacra scriptura'.

***Trente-deux demandes proposées par le P. Cotton* (1607)**

In 1607, du Moulin joined battle with Pierre Coton by making a brief reply to a list of 'demandes' issued Coton that attacked Reformed Protestant teaching on the sacraments and the church.[102] Coton, said du Moulin, 'is perched on so high a place he can surely spit on the passers-by without receiving the same in return.' Du Moulin had responded privately to multiple lists composed by Coton, a man 'fertile en questions', but the Jesuit always suppressed his answers.[103]

Du Moulin methodically listed all of Coton's 'demandes' and, as Jesus did when tempted by the specious questions of the Scribes and Pharisees, 'satisfied them with the holy Scripture.'[104] Du Moulin attacked Coton's poor representation of the Reformed Protestant position, for only one quarter of the 'demandes' truly represented the Reformed beliefs and the other twenty four were 'slanderous'.[105] Article 8 by Coton was one such slander: 'That we must not receive Tradition'. Du Moulin charged that this article 'disguises our belief'.[106] He explained that Huguenots 'do not reject all forms of traditions, but only those that obstruct holy Scripture, or those that men contrive for their pleasure without necessity, in order to impose a judge on consciences that God did not impose.'[107] Again for du Moulin, tradition simply offered insight into the meaning of Scripture and did not serve as a means of divine revelation.

---

[102] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes par le P. Cotton* (n.p., 1616). Du Moulin revised and reprinted this work in 1608, 1612, 1616, and 1617.
[103] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes*, 3: 'qu'estant perché en lieu haut il peut seurement cracher sur les passans sans recevoir la pareille.'
[104] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes*, 3: 'leur satisfaisoit par l'Escriture saincte.'
[105] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes*, 11: 'calomnieuses'.
[106] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes*, 18: 'déguise nostre croyance.'
[107] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes*, 18–9: 'nous ne rejettons point toutes sortes de traditions, mais seulement celles qui contrarient à l'Escriture saincte, ou que les hommes forgent a leur Plaisir sans necesité, pour imposer un joug sur les consciences que Dieu n'a pas imposé.'

In his remarks on the sign of the cross, du Moulin revealed his standard for Christian practice. An action which begins as a mark of Christian profession but morphs into superstition must be avoided, especially an action that was 'not practiced by Jesus Christ nor by the Apostles and Disciples.'[108] Like most Reformed Protestants, du Moulin simply applied *sola Scriptura* to Christian piety. Looking to tradition as a secondary authority, du Moulin pointed out that making the sign of the cross upon the consecrated host is 'without example in all of antiquity.'[109] Those places in which it does appear, in the liturgies of Saint James and Chrysostom, are 'manifestly false and recently contrived'.[110] He gave proof of these liturgies' dubious nature in the fact that they both referenced individuals within them who lived much later and were unknown in antiquity, again displaying his humanist tendencies.

Following his responses to Coton's 'demandes', du Moulin delivered sixty-four of his own. He addressed purgatory, the Mass, and papal authority, among other topics. Du Moulin also fired one of his first shots in the growing Oath of Allegiance controversy in Article 35: 'Whether the power that the pope claims to have to give and to take away kingdoms, and to exempt subjects from the Oath of Allegiance is by divine right or if it is a human order and policy only.'[111] He would expand on this subject in later works.[112]

Du Moulin also attacked the supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church, one of his favourite targets, in Article 60: 'We also demand upon what authority is the Roman Church founded and how can we be assured that there is one church in the

---

[108] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes*, 16: 'non pratiquée par Jesus Christ, ni par ses Apostres et Disciples.'
[109] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes*, 16: 'sans exemple en toute l'antiquité.'
[110] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes*, 16: 'manifestement faulses, et forgées depuis peu'.
[111] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes*, 56: 'Si la puissanc que le Pape pretend avoir de donner et oster les Royaumes, et dispenser les sujets du serment de fidelité est de droict divin, ou bien si c'est un ordre humain et une police seulement.'
[112] See Chapter 7.

world, and that the Roman Church is this true church.'[113] The former professor of logic pointed out the inconsistency of the Roman position. The Catholic doctors could not produce any testimony from Scripture identifying the Roman Church as the one true church, since Rome claimed that the Church gives authority to Scripture. Therefore, the Roman Church cannot be founded upon Scripture and Scripture cannot give any authority to the Church. Du Moulin concluded that the 'foundation and support of a house cannot be founded on the house.'[114]

This brief response to Pierre Coton's list of 'demandes' further demonstrates Pierre du Moulin's development as a polemicist. He touched on some of his favourite topics, including scriptural authority, tradition, and ecclesiastical power. He used scholastic methodology and also exhibited his humanist skills in textual criticism.

Apologie pour la saincte Cène (1607)

After Jean Gontier (Gontéry), a Jesuit polemicist, published the account of his conference with du Moulin, the pastor issued a volume that focused on a single doctrine, the Lord's Supper. He claimed in the revised edition that he had 'treated this matter thoroughly and made an anatomy of the doctrine of the Roman Church.'[115] Du Moulin did address the Reformed Protestant position on the Supper, but the work primarily served as a polemic against the Mass.

---

[113] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes*, 62: 'Item, nous demandons sur quelle authorité est fondée l'Eglise Romaine, et comment nous pouvons estre asseurez qu'il y ait une Eglise au monde, et quel l'Eglise Romaine soit ceste vraye Eglise.'
[114] Du Moulin, *Trente-deux demandes*, 62–3: 'le fondement et appui d'une maison ne peut estre fondé sur la maison.'
[115] Du Moulin, *Apologie pour la saincte Cène du Seigneur* (La Rochelle, 1607), 7: 'j'ay traitté ceste matiere à plein fonds et fait l'anatomie de la doctrine de l'Eglise Romaine.'

Sola Scriptura

Du Moulin displayed his commitment to *sola Scriptura*, while employing reason and tradition as secondary support for his position. He declared:

> The Word of God contained in the holy Scriptures is the sovereign judge of differences in religion. That is, that which can make us wise unto salvation (1 Timothy 3). For it does not happen that men should be judges in the cause of God, or that the religion that God requires of man should be placed in the discretion of man; or that the interpretations that men bring to the Word of God should be equal to the authority of the Word of God. There is no one but the Lawgiver himself who can give interpretations of the Law which are of the same authority as the Law.[116]

Du Moulin's Roman Catholic adversaries, who in other controversies cloaked themselves in 'the darkness of an unwritten word', changed tactics with regard to the Eucharist.[117] In this controversy, Catholic polemicists primarily based their arguments on Scripture and they typically attacked Protestants for denying clear biblical teaching on the matter.[118] According to Catholics, Protestants claimed *sola Scriptura* in theory but denied it in practice.

Aware of this approach, du Moulin charged that his opponents 'feign to want to hold close to the words of the gospel' because sense and reason opposed them.[119] They 'recognise that their own sense and reason is completely contrary' to their position, said du Moulin.[120] They are compelled, therefore, 'to seek a refuge in the Word of God'.[121] The Roman Catholics claimed to believe the simple words of the gospel as support for their position; rather, they 'fight their [i.e. the words] sense and

---

[116] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 28r: 'La parole de Dieu contenuë és sainctes Escritures est juge souveraine des differens en la relligion; C'est elle qui nous peut rendre sages à salut. 1 Timot. 3 Car ja n'advienne que les hommes soient juges en la cause de Dieu, ou que la relligion que Dieu requiert de l'homme soit mise en la discretion de l'homme; ou que les interpretation que les hommes apportent à la parole de Dieu. Il n'y a que le Legislateur mesmes qui puisse donner des interpretations à la Loy qui soient de pareille authorité que la Loy.'
[117] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 28r: 'les tenebres d'une parole non escrite'.
[118] See Wagstaffe, 'Forms and methods of religious controversy in Paris', 188.
[119] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 28r: 'Ils feignent de vouloir se tenir de prés aux mots de 'Evangile.'
[120] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 28v: 'recognoissent que leur propre sens et leur raison leur est totalement contraire'.
[121] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 29r: 'chercher une retraitte en la parole de Dieu'.

injure their purpose, noted du Moulin.[122] He concluded that his adversaries 'in other controversies employ their reason against Scripture, in this case they employ Scripture against reason. In the first there is rashness, in the second there is obstinacy; error in the one and in the other.'[123]

Du Moulin set out to prove that his opponents 'wrap themselves in a labyrinth of absurdities, and intersect with infinite contradictions' by listing seventeen examples.[124] He sought to counterattack the Catholic assault on Protestants' use of Scripture by highlighting the inconsistencies of his opponents' approach to Scripture and reason. He intended for each example to demonstrate the inconsistency of Catholic teaching by pointing out that they claimed to believe a specific truth while simultaneously claiming to believe the opposite. For example, the Catholics said that 'the host that the priest holds is Jesus Christ and that the priest breaks this host; nevertheless that which he breaks is not the body of Jesus Christ, which is to grant the premise and not the conclusion, so they deny what they grant.'[125] Du Moulin made a similar point in his conference with Gontéry when he said that 'bread' in John 6:51 ('And the bread that I will give for the life of the world is my flesh.') could not mean the body of Christ, as Gontéry argued, because that would 'render the words of St Paul ridiculous, making him say that *The body of Christ that we break is the communion of the body of Christ*' (1 Corinthians 10:16).[126]

---

[122] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 29r: 'ils combattent leur sens, et injurient leur raison'.
[123] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 29r: 'és autres controverses employent leur raison contre l'Escriture, en celle ci employent l'Escriture contre la raison; Au premier il a de la temerité, au second de l'obstination, de l'erreur en l'un et en l'autre.'
[124] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 29v: 's'enveloppent en un labyrinthe d'absurditez, et se coupent d'infinies contradictions.'
[125] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 30v: 'l'hostie que tient le prestre est Jesus, et que le prestre rompt cette hostie, et toutesfois qu'il ne rompt point le corps de Jesus, qui est accorder les propositions et nier la conclusion; ainsi ils nient ce qu'ils accordent.
[126] Du Moulin, *Veritable narré de la conference entre les Sieurs Du Moulin et Gontier* (Geneva, 1625), 14: 'rendoit ridicules les paroles de sainct Paul, lui saisant dire que Le corps de Christ que nous rompons est la communion au corps de Christ.'

Du Moulin claimed to have 'the Word of God, reason, sense, experience, [and] the testimony of the ancients' on his side.[127] He explained that 'before hearing the testimony of men we must produce the Word of God', and that 'the Fathers will come in their rank, not as judges but as approvers of truth.'[128] Du Moulin attacked his Roman Catholic opponents for their denial of *sola Scriptura*, for 'they err in that they either do not sufficiently respect Holy Scripture or they do not want to understand it.'[129]

Catholic Inconsistency

With regard to the Eucharist, du Moulin highlighted the inconsistencies of his adversaries, who 'in this matter seem to be afraid to be believed and they do not understand themselves.' In other doctrinal points, 'their faith is missing', but in the Eucharistic controversy they lack both 'faith and common sense.'[130] Their refusal to follow their own 'maximes' served as 'the main point of this treatise. For it appears that they contradict not only each other, but also each man himself, and altogether the Word of God.'[131] Thus, the former logician eagerly drew attention to the illogic of his opponents.

---

[127] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 1v: 'la parole de Dieu, la raison, le sens, l'experience, la deposition des Anciens'.
[128] Du Moulin, *Apologie* (1609), 31r: 'car devant que d'ouir les tesmoignage des hommes il nous faut produire la parole de Dieu'; 'les Peres viendront de leur rang, non comme Juges, mais comme approbateurs de la verité.'
[129] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 2r: 'ils errant ou pour ne respecter pas assez l'Escriture Saincte, ou pour ne la vouloir entendre.'
[130] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 2r: 'la foy leur manque'; 'la foi et le sens commun.'
[131] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 2r: 'c'est le but principal de ce traitté; Car s'il apparoist qu'ils se contredisent, non seulement entr'eux, mais aussi chacun à foy mesmes, et tous ensemble à la parole de Dieu'.

Church Fathers

Apologie pour la saincte Cène contains the fullest expression of du Moulin's use of the Church Fathers of any of his writings up to that point. His repeated declaration of commitment to *sola Scriptura* perhaps reveals a concern that his fellow Reformed Protestants would view him suspiciously for his expanded employment of church tradition. After all, the French Reformed churches were so concerned about the encroachment of tradition that they prohibited the quotation of the Fathers in the pulpit.[132] Du Moulin made it clear that 'he who has for himself the Word of God does not plead for human testimony. . . . For the gospel is as strong alone as it is accompanied; and in fact being defended by human authority, it loses some of its own authority.'[133] Turning away from Scripture to another authority is 'an old ruse of Satan to weaken the authority of Scripture.'[134]

In an attempt to avoid the potential pitfalls in using the Church Fathers, du Moulin clarified that he was referencing the Fathers not to aid him in his battle against Rome but to be 'witnesses of victory. And that we produce passages from them is not to defend us, but to justify them.'[135] Du Moulin claimed that he used the Fathers not to prove his own arguments but to vindicate the Fathers by demonstrating their misuse by Catholics. He vowed that he would not allow the Fathers to be made 'advocates of a malicious cause against their own will.'[136] A proper understanding of the role of church tradition does not undermine *sola Scriptura* but strengthens it, according to du Moulin.

---

[132] See Chapter 6.
[133] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 127r: 'qui a pour soy la parole de Dieu ne mendie point les tesmoignages humains.'
[134] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 127r: 'une vieille ruze de Satan pour affoiblir l'authorité de l'Escriture saincte.'
[135] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 126r: 'tesmoins de la victoire. Et ce que nous en produisons des passages n'est pas pour nous defender, mais pour les justifier.'
[136] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 126r: 'advocats d'une meschante cause contre leur volonté.'

Reasons Against Using the Church Fathers

Du Moulin noted several reasons for not using the Church Fathers as judges of theological controversy, which he would expand and develop in later polemical works. Positioning the Fathers as judges of theological controversy inevitably leads to destruction, said du Moulin, for 'if our faith should be settled by these Doctors, who could be saved? Who can discern between the good and the bad? And when they disagree, as is the norm with them, who intervenes as judge in this disputation?'[137] He pointed out the foolishness of the Catholic Church appointing as 'judges those that she herself will judge.'[138]

Unlike Scripture, which cannot err, the Fathers were prone to err. Du Moulin noted multiple theological errors of the Fathers, including those made by Augustine, Jerome, and Cyprian, in order 'to show that only the writings of the Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists are exempt from failing.'[139] Not only did the Fathers err, but they disagreed with each other. 'What if two Fathers are of one opinion, but four are of a contrary opinion, must we judge according to the plurality?'[140]

A more foundational issue than the disagreements and errors of the Fathers was the enormous difficulty of determining exactly what the Fathers taught. Du Moulin questioned how an 'ordinary busy man could read such large volumes? How can he untangle such contradictions? How can he observe the different styles introduced by the centuries? How can he discern the supposed books, discover the

---

[137] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 129r: 'Que si nosrtre foy doit estre reiglée par les testmoignage de ces Docteurs, qui est-ce qui pourra estre sauvé?'
[138] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 129r: 'juges ceux desquels elle veut estre juge? Qui pourra discerner le bon d'avec le mauvais? Et quand ils se discordant, (comme c'est leur ordinaire) qui s'interposera pour juge en ce discord?'
[139] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 129r: 'monstrer qu'il n'y a que les escrits des Prophetes, Apostres et Evangelistes qui soient exempts de faillir.'
[140] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 129v: 'Qui si deux Peres sont d'un advis, mais quatre sont d'avis contraire, faudra-il juger selon la pluralité du nombre?'

falsified passages?'[141] Nearly all the available volumes of the Fathers came from manuscripts that had been copied in monasteries by monks, who 'had adapted them to their own pleasure.'[142] Du Moulin declared that he addressed the issue of the Fathers for those who were 'ignorant. Not that these authors are favourable to the Roman Church, but because we know that the hearer will never see the places, and that few have the books, and of those who have few have the leisure to read them, even less the will, still less the capacity.'[143] The result is that 'hidden from them are the Holy Scriptures, which are the judge of doctors both old and new, and to which these same doctors return us.'[144]

Most clergy in the seventeenth century, remarked du Moulin, were incapable of such an undertaking, not to mention the laity. He then argued along humanist lines: for those who did not understand Greek or Latin, 'must they rely on those who produce them in French?'[145] Even if someone could read Greek or Latin, 'the ancient words have changed their meaning today. . . . In the writings of the Fathers we find these words: sacrifice, oblation, altar, purging fire, bishopric, merit, station, pope, spiritual goods, indulgences, etc., but in another sense than today.'[146]

Du Moulin summed up the differences between the Roman Church and the Church Fathers: 'In short, I find antiquity so removed from Papism, that I dare to promise these gentlemen to change my coat into a monastic cloak, if they can find in

---

[141] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 129r: 'homme simple et occupé pourra lire tant de gros volumes? Comment se demesler de tant de contradictions? Comment observer la difference introduite par les siecles? Comment discerner les livres supposez, découvrir les passages falsifiés'.
[142] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 129v: 'les ont accommodés à leur plaisir.'
[143] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 130v: 'ignorans, non que ces autheurs soient favorables à l'Eglise Romaine, mais pource qu'on sçait bien que l'auditeur n'ira jamais voir les lieux, et que peu ont les livres, et que de ceux qui les ont peu ont le loisir de les lire, moins encores la volonté, moins encores la capacité.'
[144] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 130v: 'on leur cache l'Escriture Saincte, laquelle est juge des Docteurs tant anciens que nouveaux, et à laquelle ces mesmes Docteurs nous renvoyent.'
[145] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 129v: 'faudra-il s'en rapporter à ceux qui les produisent en François'
[146] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 129v: 'les mots anciens ont change aujourd'huy de signification'. The English translation of 1612 does not contain 'bishopric'.

the first four centuries, I say not one Church, but one man who was of a religion in any way close to that of the Roman Church of our times.'[147]

Although du Moulin referenced various Fathers throughout the work, he primarily used them against his Catholic adversaries in a lengthy chapter arguing that the early church did not believe in transubstantiation. He cited Augustine first and most often because he had the most 'authority and sufficiency.'[148] Du Moulin first presented passages of the Fathers demonstrating the beliefs of the early church; then, he offered passages against transubstantiation and the real presence; finally, he addressed passages of the Fathers cited by Roman Catholic theologians that were 'false, feeble, or truncated.'[149]

Du Moulin then used the Church Fathers to undermine his opponents' position. According to him, Catholic theologians had replaced St Paul's term 'supper' (1 Corinthians 11:20) with 'Mass' in order to denote the Eucharist because 'they like all sorts of terms more than the terms used in the Word of God.'[150] They cited Tertullian in support. Du Moulin countered that 'the Fathers very often called this sacrament the Supper of the Lord.'[151] The 1607 edition did not contain any references at this point, but the 1609 edition cited Augustine, Jerome, Cyprian, and even Thomas Aquinas.[152] This shows that du Moulin was expanding his use of the Fathers as his polemical career progressed.

---

[147] Du Moulin, *Apologie* (1609), 212r: 'Bref je trouve l'antiquité si esloignée du Papisme, que j'ose promettre à ces Messieurs de changer mon manteaux en capuchon monachal, s'il se trouve és quatre premiers siecles, je ne di pas une Eglise, mais un seul homme qui ait eu une relligion en rien approchante de celle de l'Eglise Romaine de nostre temps.'
[148] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 142r: 'd'authorité et de suffisance.'
[149] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 159r: 'faux, ou foibles, ou tronquez.'
[150] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 2v: 'aiment mieux toutes sortes de noms, que les noms usitez en la parole de Dieu'.
[151] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 3r: 'les Anciens appellant ce Sacrement, fort souvent la Cene du Seigneur'.
[152] Du Moulin, *Apologie* (1609), :

Addressing the Reformed Protestant doctrine of the Lord's Supper, du Moulin referenced multiple biblical passages, but did not use the Church Fathers to bolster the Reformed position in the 1607 edition. He expanded that chapter for the 1609 edition and said that 'all the Fathers and the very Canons of the Roman Church' upheld the view that Jesus was referring to the bread as his body in the Last Supper.[153]

Historical Argument

Du Moulin displayed his development as a polemical theologian in his historical account of the development of the doctrine of transubstantiation. Unknown to the early church, this 'body of errors so monstrous and composed of so many pieces was not thrown into a mould all at once; it took several centuries to lick it into shape.'[154] The doctrine had its origins in the seventh and eight centuries but only became fully realised under the medieval scholastics. Du Moulin explained that it was 'in the schools of the Scholastic Doctors that this monster of Transubstantiation was formed. It is from their writings that we draw the terms and distinctions that we use today. . . . The foundation and body of the doctrine is their invention.'[155] In his work on the Eucharist, Cardinal Bellarmine himself had admitted that Duns Scotus 'held that there is no passage in Scripture certain enough to believe Transubstantiation without the declaration of the church.'[156] Bellarmine even had confessed that 'the opinion of Scotus is not improbable.'[157]

---

[153] Du Moulin, *Apologie pour la saincte Cène du Seigneur* (La Rochelle, 1609), 18r: 'tous les peres et mesmes les Canons de l'Eglise Romaine'.
[154] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 16r-v: 'corps d'erreurs tant monstrueux et compose de tant de pieces n'a esté jetté en moule tout d'un coup, et a fallu plusieurs siecles à lecher cet ours.'
[155] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 21r-v: 'c'est és escholes de ces Docteurs Scholastiques que s'est formé ce monstre de Transsubstantiation, c'est de leurs escrits qu'on puise les terms et les distinctions don't on se sert aujourd'huy. . . . le fonds et le corps de la doctrine est de leur invention.'
[156] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 20v: 'tient qu'il n'y a point de passage en l'Escriture assez exprés pour croire la Transsubstantiation sans la declaration de l'Eglise.'
[157] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 20v: 'l'opinion de Scotus n'est point improbable'.

After the establishment of transubstantiation by medieval councils, the Church of Rome 'increased in wealth and decreased in knowledge, all good letters extinguished; the best minds of these centuries having no Hebrew or Greek'.[158] The primary doctors of the Roman Church 'recognised that only the authority of the pope and the Roman Church, to which they submitted themselves, constrained them to consent to Transubstantiation. But apart from that they found nothing in Scripture nor in reason which constrained them to believe.'[159] After making this humanist insight, du Moulin concluded that a misunderstanding of Aristotelian categories led the Church of Rome to place custom over reason and philosophy.[160]

Following Nicolas Coeffeteau's response to the 1607 edition, du Moulin said in the 1609 edition that Coeffeteau 'takes what I say the wrong way and against my intention. . . . Falsehoods swarm in his book; slanders are found throughout.'[161] Rather than addressing each of du Moulin's points, the Dominican 'turns his back and skips entire pages with a disposition of a Doctor.'[162] Coeffeteau's work, said du Moulin, was so problematic that 'I am afraid that one might think that we have hired him to write poorly and to defame his own cause by prevarication.'[163]

In the *Apologie pour la saincte Cène*, Du Moulin challenged his Roman Catholic critics for their poor methodology and scholarship. He criticised their commitment to Scripture and their use of the Church Fathers, while attacking their

---

[158] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 20v: 'en richesses, et decreuë en sçavoit, toutes bonnes lettres esteintes; les meilleurs esprits de ces siecles là n'ayans ni Hebrieu, ni Grec.'
[159] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 19v: 'recognoissent que la seule authorité du Pape et de l'Eglise Romaine, à laquelle ils se submettent, les contraint de consenter à la Transsubstantiation, mais que hors cela ils ne trouvent rien en l'Escriture ni en la raison qui les contraigne de la croire.'
[160] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 13r.
[161] Du Moulin, *Apologie* (1609), 7v: 'prend à contrepoil ce que je dis, et contre mon intention. . . . Les faussetez fourmillent en son livre: les calomnies s'y trouvent par tout.'
[162] Du Moulin, *Apologie* (1609), 7v: 'tourne le dos, saute des feuillets entiers avec une disposition de Docteur'.
[163] Du Moulin, *Apologie* (1609), 7v: 'j'ay peur qu'on ne pense que nous l'avons gage pour mal escrire, et diffamer sa proper cause par prevarication.'

logical inconsistency and lack of reason. Du Moulin also gave a historical account of the development of the doctrine of transubstantiation. Although Brian Armstrong praised John Cameron for his novelty in applying 'a Renaissance theory of history' to substantiate the corruption of religion, du Moulin had used this methodology years before Cameron.[164]

***Oppositions de la parole de Dieu avec la doctrine de l'Eglise Romaine* (1609)**

In 1609, du Moulin published a list of thirty-eight articles, similar to his response to Coton's 'demandes', that targeted specific Roman Catholic doctrines as contrary to Scripture. His opening statement set the tone for this brief pamphlet and also summed up the foundational reason for his anti-Catholic polemics: 'I cannot align myself with the Roman Church because she teaches things conflicting with the Word of God contained in the Holy Scriptures.'[165] The first and second articles in support of the opening statement encapsulated du Moulin's methodology for attacking his Catholic opponents. In Article I he stated that 'God forbids to add anything to his Word. The Roman Church, on the contrary, adds several things.'[166] He then provided a list of these things, including purgatory, the Mass, and the veneration of saints. Du Moulin presented the inverse in Article II: 'God forbids to diminish or take away anything from his Word.'[167] The Roman Church, said du Moulin, eliminated the Second Commandment (prohibition of images) and the *protoevangelium* (Genesis

[164] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 11.
[165] Du Moulin, *Oppositions de la parole de Dieu* (Geneva, 1631), 3: 'Je ne puis me ranger à l'Eglise Romaine, pource qu'elle enseigne choses discordantes avec la Parole de Dieu, contenue es Sainctes Escritures.'
[166] Du Moulin, *Oppositions*, 3: 'Dieu defend d'adjouster rien à sa Parole. L'Eglise Romaine au contraire y adjouste plusieurs choses.'
[167] Du Moulin, *Oppositions*, 4: 'Dieu defend de rien diminues ou oster en sa Parole'.

3:15). The remainder of the work displayed du Moulin's commitment to *sola Scriptura*, with biblical passages cited in the margins of nearly every article.

Near the end of the pamphlet du Moulin targeted the Roman doctrine of Tradition. He provided a list of practices that were 'contrary to holy Scripture' and contained elements which are 'outside holy Scripture and invented by men under the name of tradition.'[168]

Du Moulin's polemical activities and works between 1599-1609 reveal his commitment to *sola Scriptura* and his use of the Church Fathers as forerunners of the Reformed Protestant interpretation of Scripture. His forthrightness in criticising the Fathers during this period shifted after 1610, when he began his relationship with King James, to a more veiled approach. Du Moulin maintained the substance but softened the presentation; this new approach would alienate some in the Reformed community, even in his own congregation.

Isaac Casaubon

One of du Moulin's most renowned parishioners, Isaac Casaubon, had mixed feelings about his pastor. The classical scholar regarded the pastor as erudite and capable of delivering a sophisticated sermon. At the same time, though, Casaubon could not stomach what he regarded as du Moulin's lack of respect for the Church Fathers and church history. Casaubon considered du Moulin's approach to *sola Scriptura* to be a rejection of tradition. Most Protestants objected to receiving church tradition as an authority on par with Scripture, but Casaubon perceived du Moulin to be going even further and rejecting tradition as a respected aid to biblical interpretation. In contrast,

[168] Du Moulin, *Oppositions*, 16: 'contraires à l'Escriture saincte'; 'hors l'Escriture saincte, et inventees par les hommes sous le nom de traditions.'

Casaubon demonstrated an alternative approach to history and the Church Fathers in his own anti-Catholic polemical writings. He viewed the Fathers not as vindicators par excellence of the Reformed confessional stance but as esteemed advisers in the development of Reformed theology and as allies in anti-Catholic polemics. Du Moulin's conflict with Casaubon nearly cost him his reputation, and his use of the Church Fathers nearly drove Casaubon into Catholicism. Du Moulin's theological and ecclesiastical commitments required him to be extremely careful in his writings, but the pastor often was not careful enough.

Surviving Paris

The son of a Huguenot pastor, Isaac Casaubon grew up to become one of the foremost classical scholars in Europe. He attracted the attention of King Henri IV, who invited Casaubon to Paris 'pour la profession des bonnes Lettres' in January 1599, so he could not only acquire a distinguished scholar but to win a prized convert to Catholicism.[169] Casaubon delayed his relocation to Paris for nearly twelve months because he realised, according to Mark Pattison, that he was set to acquire his professorship in the same manner that Henri acquired and secured his crown—through abjuration.[170]

Almost immediately after his arrival in Paris in March 1600, Casaubon was pursued by the 'convertisseurs', including Bishop Jacques Davy du Perron. Mere weeks after Casaubon settled in Paris, Henri sent him to Fontainebleau to serve as one of the Protestant commissioners in the debate between du Perron and Mornay. Immediately following the conference, du Perron continued his efforts to persuade

[169] For Casaubon's biography, see M. Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon, 1559–1614* (London, 1875).
[170] Pattison, *Casaubon*, 136–8.

Casaubon of the truth of Catholicism immediately following the conference, and the rumours of Casaubon's conversion grew more feverish.[171] Desperate to save his reputation, Casaubon wrote to the synod of the French Reformed churches in 1601 to express his allegiance to the Reformed faith.[172] In the end, Casaubon recognised that he had been used as a pawn by Henri and came to regret his involvement in the affair.[173]

Du Perron put his conversion skills to the test after Casaubon was appointed to the office of librarian in the royal library in November 1601 and became the 'Garde de la librarie du roi' in 1605.[174] As Henri's Grand Almoner, du Perron had jurisdiction over the library, and he used his frequent meetings with Casaubon as opportunities to sway the Huguenot towards conversion. Du Perron attempted to persuade Casaubon to convert by using the Church Fathers in favour of Catholicism and against Protestantism, thus revealing the importance of the Fathers in early seventeenth century polemics. This context sheds light on why Pierre du Moulin was pressured to adapt his use of the Fathers to appeal to individuals such as Casaubon who valued antiquity.

Du Perron continually tried to convert Casaubon until classicist finally departed from France in 1610.[175] Casaubon might have wavered in his Protestant faith at points, but he never publicly converted despite increased strain and pressure as time

---

[171] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, i. 260–1,
[172] Aymon, *Synodes*, i. 249; Quick, *Synodicon*, i. 220; l'Etoile, *Journal du regne de Henri IV*, ii. 558–9. The letter, written in Latin, was translated into French and published with the synod's response. Casaubon, *Coppie d'une lettre de M. Isaac Casaubon au Synode à Gergeau, aved la response dudict synode* (Geneva, 1601).
[173] Casaubon, *Ephemerides* (Oxford, 1850), i. 250–7.
[174] Pattison, *Casaubon*, 194–200.
[175] I. Casaubon, *Epistolae* (Rotterdam, 1709), 225; Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 666, 699, 700, 708–9, 713:; Pattison, *Casaubon*, 213 n.88.

passed by.[176] For example, Casaubon had a particularly strenuous encounter with du Perron on 6 February 1610: 'Today, I spent many hours with the Cardinal, having been summoned by him. We discussed many things about religion. He attacked the antiquity of the doctrine of the opposition: I was exhausted by the long days which he conducted. You, eternal God, I pray, direct my mind, my speech, and my steps to the glory of your name, the edification of the church, and my salvation.'[177] Du Perron increasingly emphasised the adherence of the Catholic Church to ancient doctrine and contrasted it with the novel teaching of Protestants, exhausting Casaubon in the process. Consequently, Casaubon often cried out to God for assistance after his meetings with du Perron.[178] As much as Casaubon was attracted to the ancient doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, he was repelled by displays of what he considered to be idolatry.[179]

The more du Perron stressed the ancient faith, the more he appeared to be making headway with his librarian. Casaubon wrote on 12 April 1610: 'Summoned to Cardinal du Perron yesterday I went today, and discussed important matters. I marvelled at the doctrine and acumen of the man. He made it clear to me many things which were conveyed by our men against the truth from the ancients, either because they do not grasp the ancients, or because it pleases them to ignore the intellect of the ancients: I approve of neither one.'[180] Casaubon did not mention du Moulin by name

---

[176] Catholic apologists had more success with Isaac's son John, whose conversion in August 1610 caused his father much grief and anguish. Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 756; Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 361; Rosweyde, *Lex Talionis*, **2*v*; Pattison, *Casaubon*, 241–2.

[177] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 714: 'Hodie apud Cardinalem multas horas accitus ab ipso egi. Multa de religione egimus. Ille vetustatem doctrinæ τῶν ἐξ ἐναντίας urget: ego abusus, quos longa dies introduxit. Te, Deus aeterne, oro, dirigas mentem, linguam et gressus meos ad nominis tui gloriam, ædificationem Ecclesiae, salutem meam.'

[178] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 699, 700, 702, 708–9, 713, 724, 735, 742.

[179] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 733.

[180] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 734: 'Pridie accitus ad Cardinalem Perronium hodie veni, et de rebus magnis egi. Miratus sum doctrinam et acumen viri. Multa ostendit ille mihi, quae a nostris contra veritatem afferuntur ab antiquis, vel quia antiquos non capiunt, vel quia lubet antiquorum mentem dissimulare: neutrum probo.'

but, as the events in the next section of this chapter imply, he likely was thinking of his pastor as one who misunderstood the teaching of the Fathers and did not make much use of them. In response, du Moulin could have claimed that he merely was following the teaching of the French Reformed churches that prescribed, in the 1603 Synod of Gap, censure for preachers who quoted from the Fathers in their sermons and brought their books into the pulpit.[181]

Casaubon seemed to be weakening to du Perron's arguments when he wrote on 17 April 1610: 'Summoned by Cardinal du Perron, I was with him today. I saw many errors of ours which I had been unwilling to see. But also he compelled me to prepare a comparison of those things which are written by them with the writings of the ancients.'[182] The next day he prayed: 'You, the greatest and best God, I ask for power and assistance, grant me to discern true light and to defend it vigorously through our Lord Jesus Christ your Son, to whom with you and the Holy Spirit be praise, honour, and glory.'[183] Was Casaubon on the verge of converting to the Roman Catholic Church in April and early May of 1610? His diary appeared to indicate a crisis of faith. The level of intensity of the crisis is unknown, however. It is certain that Casaubon longed for a Church that maintained the doctrine of the Church Fathers, which he deeply loved, yet shunned idolatrous ceremonies, which he abhorred. For Casaubon, the French Reformed churches in general and du Moulin in particular had not satisfied his desire to continue in the faith of the ancient church, and the Roman Catholic Church had made too many additions to that ancient faith.

---

[181] Aymon, *Synodes*, i. 260; Quick, *Synodicon*, i. 228.
[182] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 734–5: 'Accitus a Cardinali Perronio apud illum hodie fui. Vidi multa nostrorum peccata quae nolebam videre. Sed me ille adigebat collationem instituere eorum, quae ab iis scribuntur, cum scriptis veterum.'
[183] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 735: 'Te, Deus Opt. Max., opem auxiliumque rogo: da ingenium, da veram lucem agnoscere, et strenue illam propugnare per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Filium tuum, cui una tecum et Spiritu Sancto sit laus, honos et gloria.'

On 14 May 1610, François Ravaillac, a fanatical Roman Catholic with connections to the Jesuits, assassinated King Henri IV, radically changing the dynamics of the ecclesiastical struggles in France. Mere days after the assassination, du Perron presented Casaubon with his strongest argument for the veracity of the Catholic Church. Casaubon wrote on 17 May: 'Summoned today by Cardinal du Perron; as the occasion offered we had diverse discussions about things pertaining to religion. I learned many things from him which might be worth remembering and pondering. I will note here a few particulars of many.'[184] Casaubon then listed multiple misunderstandings and misappropriations of the Church Fathers by the Reformed regarding the Eucharist and baptism. He concluded the entry: 'These and many other things Cardinal du Perron explained.'[185] Casaubon displayed his internal conflict on the pages of his diary for the next five days. The apparent incompatibility of the Church Fathers with Reformed theology caused his greatest anguish: 'Doubts grow, while I compare our writings with the writings of the ancients.'[186]

Rumours of Casaubon's conversion reached Britain in the summer of 1610. After hearing from a friend in Paris, Peter Hay wrote to Salisbury from Edinburgh in June 1610 regarding Casaubon and expressed his concern: 'I fear he is become papist by indusement of Card. Perone'.[187] The assassination of Henri IV likely accelerated Casaubon's interest in finding long-term stability outside of France. Despite Henri's use of du Perron to pressure Casaubon to convert, the king had provided the scholar relative financial security in his role as librarian. Henri also had refrained from

---

[184] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 740: 'Hodie accitus a Cardinali Perronio sermones varios de rebus ad religionem pertinentibus ex occasione habuimus. Multa ab eo intellexi, quae pretium operae sit meminisse et expendisse. Quaedam hic adnotabo, pauca e multis.'
[185] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 742: 'Haec et alia multa disserebat Cardinalis Perronius.'
[186] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 742: 'Crescunt dubitationes, dum scripta nostrorum cum scriptis veterum contendo.'
[187] Peter Hay to Salisbury, 21 June 1610. TNA SP 14/55 f. 85.

instituting systematic persecution of the Huguenots. Casaubon could not similarly trust the regency government with his livelihood or safety, so he looked beyond France for suitable conditions. Casaubon was consequently caught in the middle between the French Reformed churches, which devalued church tradition and the wisdom of the Church Fathers, and the Roman Catholic Church, which elevated Tradition over Scripture.

A Short Memory

At the same time Cardinal du Perron was attempting to convince Isaac Casaubon to convert to Roman Catholicism, Pierre du Moulin, Casaubon's pastor at the French Reformed congregation at Charenton, was driving him away. Although he considered du Moulin an 'eruditum . . . virum' capable of delivering an 'eruditam concionem', Casaubon held no esteem for the pastor's understanding of Christian tradition or textual interpretation.[188]

On 26 May 1610 Casaubon wrote to Johannes Uitenbogaert, a Dutch Remonstrant, about the Eucharist. Casaubon must have been desperate if he felt the need to confide in a Remonstrant. The Huguenot noted that Luther had departed from the ancient doctrine; Zwingli had departed from Luther; and Calvin had departed from Luther and Zwingli. Casaubon then reported that du Moulin held a different doctrine of the Eucharist than Calvin and also the Church Fathers.[189] He wondered where it would end.[190]

Casaubon knew too much about the ancient church to believe that the French Reformed churches had the same practice as the Church Fathers regarding the

[188] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 753, 760.
[189] Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 350.
[190] Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 350.

Eucharist. He wished that the Reformed faith and practices had not departed so far from those of the Church Fathers. Instead, the Reformed were establishing all the old and new superstitions that had accumulated over the centuries. Casaubon recognised that as a private individual he could not dictate that the Church change and accept the ancient traditions, particularly because the traditions were not expressed explicitly in Scripture. Casaubon longed for a more ancient faith but refrained from publicly airing his discontent with the French Reformed churches. He revealed his lack of respect for du Moulin's understanding of the Church Fathers: 'Now, because the same du Moulin rejects all the books of the ancients that are contrary to his doctrine, will he make the faith like stealthy claims for which he is weakly learned?'[191] Du Moulin's position, said Casaubon, judged Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, and all the Fathers to be deluded in their thinking.[192] He concluded: 'To me it is clear, he is deluded, and those writings are the truest, which he declares to be false'[193] Therefore, Casaubon clearly held no regard for du Moulin as a scholar of the Church Fathers.

Casaubon struggled to respect du Moulin not only for his poor comprehension of the Church Fathers and faulty methods of textual interpretation, but also for his insecure and petty attitude. Casaubon unleashed his frustration with du Moulin in his diary. For example, on 25 July 1610 Casaubon received the Lord's Supper from du Moulin but expressed alarm that the pastor was introducing new theology. Casaubon recounted du Moulin's assertion that 'Holy Scripture has no need of an interpreter, even though in some way he appeared to want to interpret, nevertheless it seemed to

---

[191] Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 350: 'Jam quod idem Molineus, omnes Veterum libros suae doctrinae contrarios respuit, ut ὑποβολιμαῖῶς, cui mediocriter docto fidem faciet?'
[192] Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 350.
[193] Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 350: 'Mihi liquet, falli ipsum, et illa scripta esse verissima, quae ipse pronuntiat yeudepigrafa.'

me and others that this was both false and absurd.'[194] Casaubon, who had spent his life interpreting ancient texts, recognised that all words, whether written or preached, required an interpreter. To claim otherwise was ludicrous. The inconsistencies in du Moulin's approach obviously did not slip by a trained classicist like Casaubon. More problematic for du Moulin, though, was that others ('aliis') noticed the same absurdities as Casaubon. Apparently, Casaubon was discussing du Moulin's untenable position with other members of the congregation.

On 30 September 1610 du Moulin came to Casaubon complaining about the critiques that the scholar had written in the margins of one of his books. Casaubon noted 'peccata magna' in du Moulin's work, which he listed as 'Apologiae pro Rege Angliae'. He likely referred to du Moulin's *Defense de la foy Catholique*, which was published that same year.[195] The volume had been seen by some of their mutual friends, which could have damaged du Moulin's reputation in the French Reformed community. Casaubon handed over the book to du Moulin and asked if he would recognise Casaubon's good intentions.[196]

Unfortunately, du Moulin rejected this opportunity to receive Casaubon's assistance with the volume and improve his book, and also refused to reaffirm the scholar's confidence in Reformed Protestantism through his pastoral care. Although he repeatedly noted intense dialogues with Cardinal du Perron, nowhere did Casaubon record a serious conversation with du Moulin about his struggles with Reformed theology and the attraction of Catholicism. Du Moulin certainly knew of the extreme pressure on Casaubon to convert to Catholicism. If Casaubon did indeed have a crisis of faith, the fact that he did not seek guidance from his pastor reveals the true nature

---

[194] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 753: 'S. Scripturam nullo opus habere interprete, quod etsi aliquo modo visus est interpretari velle, tamen vel sic mihi atque aliis visum est tam falsum quam absurdum.'
[195] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique* (Paris, 1610).
[196] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 764–5.

of their relationship. Sadly, Casaubon felt that he could not confide his deepest spiritual struggles to his pastor.

This event involving the copy of *Defense de la Foy Catholique* was Isaac Casaubon's last recorded encounter with Pierre du Moulin. Casaubon partook of the Eucharist on the following Sunday, 3 October 1610, and left for England five days later on 8 October 1610.[197] Nevertheless, Casaubon continued to vent his frustration with du Moulin to his diary.[198] In October 1611, Casaubon informed Dutch scholar Daniel Heinsius that du Moulin had dared 'to call St Cyprian an Anabaptist', thus defiling the martyr's memory.[199]

Prior to Casaubon's departure from France, du Moulin feared that the scholar was on the verge of converting to Catholicism. He wrote to James Montague, Bishop of Bath and Wells, regarding Casaubon soon after the scholar had left for England.[200] Du Moulin claimed that it had been three years since Casaubon 'began to think poorly about the [true] religion and to incline toward popery.'[201] The pastor recognised that Casaubon might have converted to Catholicism were it not for its contemptible doctrines, such as papal supremacy and the Latin liturgy. Du Moulin was aware, though, that Casaubon had related his dissatisfaction with Reformed theology, some aspects of which he considered a new invention of Calvin, to Catholics. Du Moulin had tried to correct Casaubon, but he would not listen, despite their years of friendship.[202] Du Moulin then claimed that Casaubon's discontent with Reformed theology began after an unfortunate legal matter involving his wife's inheritance.

---

[197] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 765–6.
[198] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 824–5.
[199] Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 433: 'Beatum Cyprianum appellare Anabaptistam'.
[200] Montague eventually baptised Casaubon's son in 1612.
[201] P. Colomiès and J. A. Fabricius, *Pauli Colomesii . . . Opera* (Hamburg, 1709), 531: 'coepit de Religione male sentire et inclinare in Papismum.'
[202] Colomiès, *Opera*, 531.

Seeing that Casaubon was vulnerable, Cardinal du Perron had attacked, primarily with the Church Fathers. Du Moulin expressed respect for Casaubon due to his skill in classics, but did not trust his discernment. The pastor claimed that he did all that he could to help Casaubon and that the scholar's wavering in the faith affected him personally. In the end, however, Casaubon's resentment towards Geneva proved to be too powerful for the pastor to draw him back into the French Reformed fold. Du Moulin expressed to Montague his optimism that escape to England would benefit Casaubon and asked the bishop to assist towards that end.[203]

Isaac Casaubon clearly was displeased with the teaching of the French Reformed congregation at Charenton, particularly with regard to the Church Fathers. Although he respected du Moulin as a learned man, Casaubon's deep classical knowledge prevented him from overlooking the pastor's mishandling of ancient texts. One only can speculate as to how near this situation drove him into converting to Catholicism during his final days in Paris. In France, Casaubon was caught between du Moulin's version of Reformed Protestantism, which held to a facile understanding of *sola Scriptura* and the role of the Church Fathers, and the Roman Catholic Church, which denied *sola Scriptura* and sometimes elevated Tradition over Scripture. As he searched for a Church committed to the authority of Scripture yet appreciative of church tradition, Casaubon finally found relief for his anguish in the Church of England, where du Moulin would also later seek refuge.

Pierre du Moulin had arrived in Paris in 1599 as an unheralded French Reformed theologian to take his first pastoral position. Ten years later, he was internationally known as a Reformed polemicist, had been chaplain to the king's sister, and was one of the leading voices in the French Reformed churches. The

---

[203] Colomiès, *Opera*, 532.

relative stability provided by King Henri IV and the Edict of Nantes enabled this rise to prominence for du Moulin. During this period, he first engaged his most formidable Catholic opponent, Jacques Davy du Perron. Although du Perron first achieved prominence in the French Catholic Church in 1590s with his conversion of Henri, his reputation as a polemicist expanded during the first decade of the seventeenth century, most notably with his victory at Fontainebleau over Mornay. The scholar Isaac Casaubon bristled under du Moulin's ministry in Paris during this period primarily due to the pastor's lack of sufficient esteem for the Church Fathers, and had to leave for England in hopes of finding a safer ecclesiastical home. Hoever, following the start of his cooperation with King James, du Moulin would soften his approach to the Fathers over the next decade, continuing an extensive dialogue about patristics with both his Protestant contemporaries and his Catholic opponents.

Chapter 4

An International Crisis: The Oath of Allegiance Controversy (1609–1615)

The conflict between King James VI and I of Scotland and England and Pope Paul V over the legitimacy of Protestant monarchs and the temporal power of the papacy, the Oath of Allegiance controversy, affected all of Europe, not merely Great Britain and the Vatican. Pierre du Moulin gained access to the highest levels of power in Protestantism during this controversy, as did his former parishioner, Isaac Casaubon. Meanwhile, Cardinal Jacques du Perron used this controversy to unite the two factions of the French Catholic Church, the Gallicans and the Ultramontanes, against a common enemy in King James. This chapter explores the activity of these three figures in the Oath of Allegiance controversy in order to illuminate du Moulin's shift in polemical strategy. Du Moulin used the Oath of Allegiance controversy to expand his international influence, not only as a polemicist but as one of the leading Protestant voices in all of Europe, and to gain a powerful ally for the Huguenots and a patron for himself in King James. Over the course of his involvement in the controversy, du Moulin would alter his approach to the Church Fathers in order to please his newfound benefactor.

Oath of Allegiance Controversy

In 1606, England's parliament responded to the 1605 Gunpowder Plot by reinstituting Elizabethan legal action against English Catholics.[1] The 'Act for the better

[1] Okines writes, 'Gunpowder was used to justify James's recusancy fines, his enforcement of conformity and his failure to convert to Catholicism.' Okines, 'Government Reaction', 277.

discovering and repressing of Popish Recusants' enforced religious conformity to the Church of England, including attendance of worship services and reception of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, under the penalty of fines and confiscation of property.[2] Additionally, Parliament allowed a bishop or any two justices of the peace to administer an Oath of Allegiance to anyone indicted or convicted of recusancy, anyone lapsed in attendance of worship services or the reception of the Lord's Supper, or any stranger passing through the region.[3]

The primary motivation for the English government to institute the Oath of Allegiance was to respond to threats resulting from the prevailing Roman Catholic theory on the extent of papal power. Following the Council of Trent, the Jesuit assertion of the pope's indirect authority in temporal matters, as articulated by Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, became the dominant position.[4] The Jesuit position maintained that a monarch declared to be heretical could not be allowed to reign and that the pope must depose him. If the heretical monarch forced his Catholic subjects to swear an oath of loyalty, the pope absolved them and expected them to aid foreign Catholic powers in removing the heretic. The application of the Jesuit position, legitimate or not, came in the pope's excommunication of Queen Elizabeth, the Spanish Armada, numerous plots against Elizabeth and King James, and the assassinations of Henri III and Henri IV of France by those influenced by Jesuit

---

[2] Alongside this act, Parliament issued 'An Act to prevent and avoid dangers which may grow by Popish Recusants', *Statutes of the Realm,* iv. 1071–82. The combined acts contain over 70 articles.
[3] For the question of the oath's authorship, see J. P. Sommerville, 'Jacobean Political Thought and the Controversy over the Oath of Allegiance' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University, 1981), 7–16. For a survey of the reasons for the Oath of Allegiance advanced by contemporary scholarship, see Sommerville, 'Jacobean Political Thought', 17–18.
[4] John Courtney Murray wrote of Bellarmine: 'He was, of course, in no sense the inventor of the so-called 'indirect power'; but his theological systematization of it was an historical achievement of the first order, immensely influential in his own time, and regarded as classic ever since.' Murray, 'St Robert Bellarmine on the Indirect Power', *TS*, 9 (1948), 492. Sommerville concludes, 'But there can be little doubt that the theory of the indirect deposing power was orthodox amongst English Catholics in the reign of James I.' Sommerville, 'The Jacobean Oath', 327–8.

thought.[5] According to Archpriest George Blackwell, himself notoriously tolerant of Jesuit influence in the English Catholic community, the Jesuit position was the majority opinion amongst English Catholics, though the reality is likely to have been very different.[6]

The oath linked papal deposing power to excommunication and tyrannicide. It essentially declared those who held to the doctrine of papal supremacy to be heretics. The oath did fit with King James's long-term goal of religious toleration through the reunification of Christendom, but he apparently did not foresee, apparently, the extreme backlash to the oath from both the pope and Catholic theologians, which eventually derailed his dreams of reunion.

Treatise Wars

The intensity of the theological controversy sparked by the Oath of Allegiance, according to Charles McIlwain, gave rise 'to a paper warfare in Europe the like of which has never been seen since and is hardly likely ever to be seen again.'[7] The debate began with a focus on the authority of the pope to depose rulers but expanded to address questions related to the source of political power and the catholicity of the church. Pope Paul V issued his first breve condemning the oath in September 1606 and the second in August 1607.[8] McIlwain explained the division between the king and the pope: 'Behind the temporary phases of the quarrel lay an irreconcilable difference. Did the king inherit Christ's powers as priest, or were these the sole right

[5] McIlwain, 'Introduction', xlix–l.
[6] George Blakwell, *A Large Examination taken at Lambeth* . . . (London, 1607), 13–14.
[7] McIlwain, 'Introduction,' lvii.
[8] TNA SP 85/3 ff. 89–92; TNA SP 85/3 ff. 132–133*v*. Ambassador Molin recorded James's feelings about the pope, *CSPVen*, x. 517.

of the bishop?'[9] Cardinal Bellarmine assessed the oath: 'It tends to this end, that the Authoritie of the head of the Church in England, may bee transferred from the successour of S. Peter, to the successour of King Henry the eight'.[10]

King and Theologian

Consumed with theological discourse, King James had become, as Fra Paolo Sarpi suggested, 'more of a doctor than a king.'[11] In late 1607, he personally entered the polemical fray, albeit anonymously.[12] With his *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus, or an Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance*, James endeavoured to take up the mantle of defender of God's chosen people against the armies of the Antichrist. Despite its Latin title, the book's contents were in English. French and Latin translations soon followed. Regarding future punishment of recusants who refused to take the oath, per the order of the pope, James wrote: 'Let the blood light upon the Popes head, who is the only cause thereof'.[13]

Writing at the behest of the pope, Bellarmine answered the *Triplici* the following year under the name of his chaplain, Matteo Torti.[14] Those within the controversy knew soon enough that the *Responsio* came from Bellarmine's hand. The Jesuit polemicist defended the temporal authority of the pope in matters affecting the eternal salvation of the faithful. He also targeted James's contention that the Oath of Allegiance addressed only civil matters.

---

[9] McIlwain, 'Introduction', xxix. He continued: 'The position of the English government was in fact indefensible to anyone who held the current Jesuit view of Church and State.'
[10] Sommerville, *Political Writings,* 99. King James published the letter in his *Triplici Nodo.*
[11] Fra Paolo Sarpi, *Lettere* (Florence, 1863), ii. 280: 'quale è più dottore che re.'
[12] For a treatment of James's anonymity, see M. North, 'Anonymity's Subject: James I and the Debate over the Oath of Allegiance', *New Literary History*, 33 (2002), 215–32.
[13] McIlwain, *Political Works*, 77.
[14] Robert Bellarmine, *Matthaei Torti Presbyteri* . . . (St. Omer, 1608). Bellarmine previously had replied to one of James's works in his unpublished *Hieratikon Doron* in X. M. Le Bachelet, ed., *Auctarium Bellarminianum* (Paris, 1913), 209–56.

King James quickly produced a new edition of the *Apologie* under his own name. He added a *Premonition* to the work, in which he argued that his campaign against the temporal jurisdiction of the pope ought to be waged by every sovereign ruler in Europe.[15] The king, perhaps realising that he was engaged in matters beyond his theological understanding, then enlisted the aid of Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Chichester, his favourite court preacher.[16] Andrewes played on Bellarmine's pseudonym and issued *Tortura Torti* in 1609.[17] Bellarmine, under his own name, then produced a second edition of his *Responsio* in 1610. That year, he issued an *Apologia* to James's *Premonition* and included it with a third edition of the *Responsio*.[18] James again called on Andrewes, who published his *Responsio ad Apologiam* against Bellarmine in 1610.[19] At that point, Andrewes and Bellarmine had reached a ceasefire, but numerous works defending one side and attacking the other volleyed back and forth across the English Channel for the next few years.[20]

King James and du Moulin

King James and Pierre du Moulin began their official cooperation in 1609 when James published the second edition of his *Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance,* which included an address known as the *Premonition* to fellow heads of state.[21] James sent a

---

[15] *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance . . . Together with a Premonition*. James presented copies of the work to his fellow princes. France and Venice accepted their editions; Spain, Florence, and others did not. See Sommerville, 'The Jacobean Oath', 58–9. Du Moulin also received a volume. D. Dalrymple, ed., *Memorials and Letters relating to the History of Britain in the Reign of James the First* (2nd edn. Glasgow, 1766), 72.
[16] TNA, *Salisbury*, xx. 260.
[17] For the relationship of James and his theological aides, see D. Harris Willson, 'James I and His Literary Assistants', *HLQ* 8 (1944), 35–57.
[18] Robert Bellarmine, *Responsio ad Librum inscriptum, Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus* . . . (Cologne, 1610); Bellarmine, *Apologia . . . pro Responsione sua ad Librum . . . Triplici nodo triplex cuneus* . . . (Cologne, 1610).
[19] Andrewes, *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini* . . . (London, 1610).
[20] For a relatively full list of the works in the treatise war following the Gunpowder Plot, see P. Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age* (London, 1978), 86–131; Sommerville, 'The Jacobean Oath', 59–72, 75–98.
[21] James, *Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance . . . with a Premonition* . . . (1609).

personal copy of the *Apologie* to du Moulin.[22] In December 1609, William Becker, an agent for James in France, reported to the Earl of Salisbury that du Moulin had expressed a desire to respond to Bishop Nicolas Coeffeteau's critique of James.[23] Based on du Moulin's solid reputation and the benefits to James of a reply from a Frenchman, Becker encouraged the pastor to take up the task.[24]

James and du Moulin had first made contact in the days leading up to James's coronation in England. James sent expressions of royal favour to the consistory of Paris, which then chose du Moulin to compose letters of gratitude to the king.[25] Du Moulin likely was selected because of his personal familiarity with England and the English Church.

King James might also have been aware that Pierre's father Joachim du Moulin had been resident in the first of his two kingdoms as a refugee from the Catholic League.[26] It appears that Joachim had been one of the first to take advantage of James's 1586 licence for French ministers to escape to Scotland.[27] On behalf of the May 1586 General Assembly, the scholar Andrew Melville composed a letter of welcome to the French ministers that was delivered to 'Monsieur Muleine', who already was in Scotland.[28] The Town Council of Edinburgh voted on 11 May 1586 to provide the ministers with lodging and a space for worship.[29] On 18 October 1589,

---

[22] W. B. Patterson, 'James I and the Huguenot Synod of Tonneins of 1614', 242.
[23] N. Coeffeteau, *Response à l'auertissement, addressé par . . . Iaques I* (Paris, 1609).
[24] TNA SP 78/55 f. 13*v*.
[25] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***4.
[26] Rumours that Pierre was the son of an apostate friar consistently spread in Roman Catholic pulpits and pamphlets to such an extent that he felt the need to devote an entire chapter of his reply to Cardinal du Perron to address them. Du Moulin, *Nouveauté du Papisme*, 823–9.
[27] Many scholars and ministers travelled between Scotland and France in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. See J. Durkan, 'The French Connection in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', in T. C. Smout, ed., *Scotland and Europe, 1200–1850* (Edinburgh, 1986), 19–44.
[28] *BUK*, ii. 655, 657, 706. Du Moulin met Melville in Sedan in 1611, after the Scottish scholar's exile from Britain. Although he had heard that Melville took the opposing side in the current theological controversy, du Moulin kept quiet because Melville had the reputation of being irritable ('un peu cholère'). R. Wodrow, *Collections upon the Lives of the Reformers* (Glasgow, 1848), ii. 102.
[29] J. D. Marwick, *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 1573–1589*, vol 4 (Edinburgh, 1882), 458–9.

the presbytery of Haddington offered support for 'Mr Mwling banest out of France.'[30] Although no evidence exists of a meeting between James and Joachim du Moulin, it is conceivable that they met one another. James might have been intrigued by the arrival in Edinburgh of a high-profile French Reformed refugee; it was a moment when his regime's negotiations with Queen Elizabeth for a lasting peace with England, leading that summer to the Treaty of Berwick, would have made him particularly well-disposed to French dissidents.

The relationship between James and Pierre du Moulin appeared to form out of mutual respect. Prior to sending a copy of his work to du Moulin, James had only enlisted theologians within the Church of England to assist him in the Oath of Allegiance controversy. In the midst of an assault from a seemingly endless number of Roman Catholic theologians, James needed to turn to Reformed churches beyond Britain for aid. Du Moulin could advance James's standing amongst Reformed Protestants and also provide reports of the activities of the French court. In addition, James was convinced that the first step in uniting all Protestants in Europe was to join the Church of England with the French Reformed churches, to which he promised never to 'fayle to doe them all good'.[31] Du Moulin, the lead pastor in the largest congregation of the French Reformed churches, made the ideal partner.

Prior to defending King James, du Moulin had never assisted a foreign head of state. The pastor aligned himself with James because he knew that in addition to providing support for the Huguenots in their ongoing troubles with the French crown, the English king could spearhead the movement for greater cooperation amongst all

---

[30] Register of the Presbytery of Haddington, Scottish Record Office, CH2/185/1, 18 October 1589; H. Wagner, *Pedigrees of the Du Moulin and De l'Angle Families* (London, 1883), 4; D. Agnew, *Protestant Exiles from France*, 3 vols (London, 1871–4), iii. 118.

[31] TNA SP 78/56 f. 106. For a full treatment of James's policy towards French Protestants, see Patterson, *James VI and I*, 155–8.

Protestants. In addition, du Moulin likely envisioned for himself a larger international presence within Protestantism.

Brian Armstrong suggested that du Moulin ingratiated himself with James only after he was isolated from the French court following the assassination of Henri IV on 14 May 1610.[32] However, Becker's communication, the dedication of du Moulin's response to Coeffeteau to James dated 20 January 1610, and the abrupt end of the book on the day of King Henri's assassination reveal that du Moulin saw the advantage of a partnership with James months before Henri's death.

Defense de la Foy Catholique (1610) and *Accomplissement des Propheties* (1611)

Du Moulin's reply to Coeffeteau, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, is divided into three books, with the initial two coming in 1610 and the third in 1611.[33] Each book roughly corresponded to the topics addressed by King James in his own *Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance*.[34] Du Moulin began with an account of the history of the relationship between the pope and the English monarchs ('Des usurpations des Papes sure les Rois'), then addressed James's theological convictions ('Defense de la confession de Jacques I. Roy de la Grand'Bretagne'), and concluded with a section in which he argued from Scripture that the pope is the Antichrist ('De l'accomplissement des Propheties'). Du Moulin followed James's general outline but expounded upon each topic in a much fuller manner than did his patron.

---

[32] Armstrong, 'The Changing Face of French Protestantism,' 138.
[33] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique . . . Contre la Response de F. N. Coeffeteau . . .* (Paris, 1610). Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 342. An English translation following that same year: Du Moulin, *A Defence of the Catholicke Faith . . .* (London, 1610). A third portion of the work was published separately under the title, *Accomplissement des Propheties*. John Heath translated this section into English as *The Accomplishment of the Prophecies* (Oxford, 1613).
[34] James I, *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance . . . Together with a Premonition (London, 1609).*

In his dedication to King James, du Moulin declared that he 'felt it necessary to show the world that the religion that you defend is also ours'.[35] He supported James's declaration that 'I am a Catholic Christian, who willingly subscribes the three Creeds of the Faith, namely the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, and the Athanasius. . . . And interpret them in the same sense that they were given by the Fathers and Councils who composed and wrote them.'[36] Concerning the Fathers, James had added that he held profound respect for the Fathers, even more than the Jesuits have for them. James then stated, 'For whatever they unanimously held to be necessary for salvation in the first four-hundred years after Jesus Christ I hold it with them'.[37] This statement would be debated for the remainder of the Oath of Allegiance controversy. Du Moulin clarified that the points on which James 'refrained from condemning the Fathers, although he is not obligated to follow them, are either on points not necessary to salvation or on opinions that both our church and the Roman condemn.'[38] James abstained from condemning the errors of the Fathers, but du Moulin did not. This would lead to friction between the two men, and in subsequent works du Moulin would alter his use of the Fathers so he could continue to stay in James's good graces.

Du Moulin let loose his criticisms of the Fathers when he explained the third article of James's confession. James referenced the fact that the Fathers disagreed with each other at times and said that he wanted to bring to their writings 'the

---

[35] *Du Moulin, Defense de la Foy Catholique* (Geneva, 1610), a2*r*-*v*: 'nous avons estime estre necessaire de monstrer au monde que la religion que vous defendez est aussi la nostre'.
[36] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 164: 'Je suis Catholique Chrestien, qui souscris volontiers aux trois Symboles de la foy, asçavoir au Symbole des Apostres, à celuy de Nice et à celuy d'Athanse . . . . Et les interprete au mesme sens que leur ont donné les Peres et les Conciles qui les ont composez et escrits.'
[37] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 165: 'Car tout ce qu'ils ont unanimement tenu estre necessaire a salut és premiers quatre cens ans apres Jesus-Christ, ou je le tiens avec eux,'
[38] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 165: 's'abstient de condemner les Peres, encores que sa croyance ne soit oblige à les fuivre, sont ou points non necessaires a salut, ou opinions esquelles tant nostre Eglise que la Romaine les condamnent.'

circumspection that S. Augustine brought.'[39] He would praise them for what agreed with the Scriptures in their works and reject what did not. Du Moulin generally agreed with James but went much further than the king did in listing numerous embarrassing errors of the Fathers, all of which were on points not necessary to salvation and which both Protestants and Catholics condemned. He referenced Augustine's teaching that small children must take the Eucharist in order to be saved, Ignatius's declaration that someone who fasts on Saturday or Sunday is a murderer of Jesus Christ, and Chrysostom's denunciation of St Paul for speaking against 'la verité et raison' in his approval of second marriages, amongst other errors.[40] Du Moulin concluded that 'all these good servants of God were subject to failure and had vices likes warts on a beautiful face, so that in reading them we always have in hand the compass of the Holy Scripture and the rule of the Word of God.'[41] James certainly agreed with this but, unlike du Moulin, he was unwilling to hold a magnifying glass to each wart on the faces of the Fathers.

Du Moulin took the opportunity provided by James's statement that the Fathers disagreed with each other at times to highlight some of these disagreements. St Jerome disagreed with St Augustine, and Chrysostom and Epiphanius were at odds, as were Cyril and Theodoret, amongst others. Yet again, du Moulin used one of James's brief expressions as a starting point to launch into specific criticisms of the Fathers and go much further than James would condone.

Du Moulin then made an interesting alteration to James's confession that he believed everything unanimously held to be necessary for salvation in the first four

---

[39] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 166: 'la circonspection que S. Augustin apporte.'
[40] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 168.
[41] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 170: 'Car tous ces bons serviteurs de Dieu estoyent sujetc à fallir, et ont des vices comme des verruës en un beau visage, afin qu'en les lisant on ait toujours en main le compass de l'Escriture Saincte et la reigle de la parole de Dieu.'

centuries by turning it into an offensive weapon against his Catholic adversaries. He declared that in the first four centuries 'there will not be found a single man who has had a religion even approaching that of the Roman Church today.'[42] If one could be found, he said that he would exchange his minister's coat for a monastic cloak. Du Moulin had made a nearly identical statement three years prior in *Apologie pour la saincte Cène*.

Du Moulin outlined the two types of controversies between Protestants and Catholics:

> There are some on which our adversaries produce some passages. But passages either false, or shortened, or unnecessary, or taken contrary to the author's intention. Being customary of these gentlemen to give hell to the Ancients to make them speak in favour of a lie. Such is the question of Transubstantiation, prayer for the dead, Purgatory, and the sacrifice of the Mass. But there are others no less important and in greater numbers in which they are deposing the ancient church of all authority, and on which being questioned they respond to another matter, trying to prove that which is not asked of them.[43]

Du Moulin then listed seventeen points of Catholic doctrine or practice that could not be found in the ancient church. This list closely resembled the list in du Moulin's 1609 *Response aux lettres du Sieur Gontier*.[44] On these points, Catholics did not receive the Fathers as judges, said du Moulin. In other controversies, they did receive the Fathers as judges, 'but on the condition that they themselves might be judges of the Fathers. They want the Ancients to interpret Scripture, but they themselves want to be interpreters of the Ancients, in order to make them say things contrary to

---

[42] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 171: 'il ne se trouvera un seul homme qui ait eu une religion seulement approchante de celle de l'Eglise'.
[43] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 172: 'Il y en a sur lesquelles nos adversaires produisent quelques passages. Mais passages ou faux, ou tronques, ou inutiles, ou pris a contresens. Estant l'ordinaire de ces Messieurs de donner Ia gehenne aux Anciens pour les faire parler en faveur du mensonge. Telle est la question de la Transsubstantiation, de la priere pour les morts, du Purgatoire, et du Sacrifice de Ia Messe. Mais il y en a d'autres non moins importants et en plus grand nombre sur lesquelles ils sont destituez de toute authorite de l'ancienne Eglise, et sur lesquelles estans interroguez ils respondent a autre chose, et changeans Ia question, taschent de prouver ce qu'on ne leur demande pas.'
[44] Du Moulin, *Response aux lettres du Sieur Gontier* (Geneva, 1625).

Scripture.' In the end, according to du Moulin, Catholic theologians positioned themselves as the judge of Scripture and the Fathers.

Du Moulin used King James's affirmation that he grounded his faith and belief upon the Scriptures to attack Coeffeteau and other Roman Catholic theologians for their position on Scripture and Tradition. He referenced Cardinal Bellarmine's statement in *De Verbo non Scripto* that 'Scripture is only a piece of a rule [of faith] and not the entire rule. And that it was not properly made to be the rule of our faith.'[45] Du Moulin declared that James 'pays a thousand times more respect to the holy Scriptures than the Roman Church and the Council of Trent, which ordained in Session IV that the traditions be received with the same affection of piety and reverence as the holy Scriptures, equaling human traditions with divine ordinances.'[46] As always, du Moulin took every opportunity available to criticise Roman Catholics for not holding to *sola Scriptura*.

However, du Moulin had to tread lightly when addressing James's position on ecclesiastical government. His brief and ambiguous treatment upheld the role of bishops, yet did not address the issue of clerical hierarchy.[47] He noted that the king had declared in his book that he did not intend to condemn Churches that had another form of polity. The French Reformed churches and the Church of England agreed in all points of doctrine, said du Moulin, although they were clothed in different

[45] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 176–7: 'Il n'est qu'une piece de reigle et non une reigle entiere. Et qu'elle n'est pas proprement faite pour estre reigle de nostre foy.'
[46] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 177: 'rend mille fois plus de respect aux Sainctes Escritures que l'Eglise Romaine, et que le Concile de Trente, qui ordonne en la Session IV que les traditions foyent reçues avec pareille affection de pieté et reverence que l'Escriture Saincte, égalant les traditions humaines aux ordannces divine.'
[47] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 474. In its review of du Moulin's work, *Le Mercure françois* highlighted du Moulin's confusing statements on church government. *Le Mercure François, ou la suitte de l'histoire de la paix*, (Paris, 1611), 378*r–v*.

colours.[48] Du Moulin did not show the same carefulness in his later work *De la Vocation des Pasteurs*, which earned a rebuke from the king.

As he did in most of his polemical works, du Moulin used personal insults to make his point. After demonstrating that a work cited by Coeffeteau claiming to be the testimony of an ancient Roman Church council was actually a forgery, he said that 'these falsehoods are easily discerned, and any common spirit can recognise them.'[49] For Coeffeteau, who 'does not have a drop of good learning, all evidence [supporting his position] is good.'[50] Du Moulin lamented that James's monumental work had no 'sçavant adversaire.' He sarcastically questioned if there was in France a 'man more sufficient to deceive with more grace and to combat the truth with some tinting? This certainly contributes to the disgrace of the nation.'[51] Du Moulin thus expanded his personal attacks on King Henri's confessor, first focusing on his lack of intelligence and then labelling him a national disgrace.

Overlooking the evasive position on ecclesiology, James considered *Defense de la Foy Catholique* 'most welcome' and rewarded the French pastor with two thousand livres.[52] The king, in a letter from Thomas Lake to Salisbury dated 16 December 1611, did convey to du Moulin his 'desire that his book in the next edition may be free from exceptions and advantages of the adversaries.'[53] On 19 December 1611 James communicated in a letter to Ambassador Thomas Edmondes to inform du

---

[48] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 527.
[49] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 32–3: 'Ces faussetez se discernment seulement à taster, un esprit vulgaire le pouvoit recognoistre.'
[50] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 33: 'n'a nul goust es bonnes lettres outes preuves sont bonnes.'
[51] Du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 33: 'homme plus suffisant pour tromper avec plus de grace, et combattre la verité avec quelque couleur?'
[52] TNA SP 78/56 f. 303; SP 78/56 f. 179*r*; du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***4; du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 342.
[53] TNA SP 14/67 f. 128. Thomas Lake to Salisbury. A third portion of the work was published separately as *Accomplissement des Prophéties* (Geneva, 1611).

Moulin that 'we do also request him to reform some parts of his aforesaid book.'[54] This letter was accompanied by a separate document labelled 'notes concerning Mons Du Moulin's booke.'[55] James provided a list of subjects and page numbers that he wanted du Moulin to revise, including some matters related to the Church Fathers. James listed material on Cyprian, Gregory the Great, and three separate pages on 'd'autorite peres.'[56] This was a remarkable testimony to the extraordinary amount of energy and time that the King was personally allotting to the controversy: a contrast to the charges of laziness that have often been levelled against him.

Defense de la Foy Catholique and *Accomplissement des Propheties* marked a turning point for du Moulin. After King James instructed him to revise his approach, he abandoned his relatively carefree critique of the Church Fathers in his broader argument that the Fathers were unqualified to serve as judges in contemporary theological controversies, and replaced it with a more measured portrayal of the Fathers. He still maintained his convictions, but he expressed them more subtly, especially when writing on behalf of James.

Plan for Christian Union

The most significant feature of the partnership of James and du Moulin was their plan for Christian union. In his March 1604 speech to Parliament, his first as King of England, James expressed to his new kingdom for the first time publicly his desire for an ecclesiastical reunion of Roman Catholics and Protestants.[57] Six days later, Philippe du Plessis-Mornay wrote to Robert Le Maçon, pastor of the congregation of

---

[54] TNA SP 78/58 f. 272*r*.
[55] TNA SP 78/58 f. 274*v*.
[56] TNA SP 78/58 f. 274*r*.
[57] James declared that he longed to be 'one of the members of such a generall Christian union in Religion, as laying wilfulnesse aside on both hands, wee might meete in the middest, which is the Center and perfection of all things.' Sommerville, *Political Writings*, 140.

French refugees in London, and related the activity of the recent Synod at Gap. Mornay reported that many of the delegates to the synod were delighted to see James ascend the throne of England and that they hoped his rule would produce a great advancement in the church of Christ, particularly the union of all the Reformed Churches of Europe.[58] Ironically, in the same letter, Mornay attempted to answer a request that James had issued through Le Maçon. The king desired an explanation of the synod's ruling on a matter of church government. Mornay alleviated the king's suspicions that the synod had disparaged episcopal government.[59] For the next ten years, the French diplomat attempted to reinforce King James in his efforts to lead a movement to unite Protestantism.[60]

The French Reformed churches had been pursuing unity amongst Protestants since their 1578 national Synod at Sainte-Foy.[61] Nearly every subsequent national synod until 1612 approved activity related to Protestant ecumenism, including the adoption of other churches' confessions, the proposal of a general synod of Reformed Churches, and the call for collaboration on a joint confession.[62] Mornay oversaw the political aspects of Protestant union for the French Reformed.[63] He wrote to the French ambassador to Denmark in 1580 and expressed his hope for a general synod of

---

[58] Mornay, *Mémoires et Correspondence* (Paris, 1824), ix. 544.
[59] Mornay, *Mémoires et Correspondence* (Paris, 1824), ix. 544.
[60] See Patterson, *James VI and I*, 162–5.
[61] Aymon, *Tous Les Synodes*, i. 131–3, 157, 170, 201, 227, 246, 274; Quick, *Synodicon*, i. 120–2, 143–4, 153, 180, 200, 218, 239; Rawlinson D 538, 141, 159. For a full treatment of the French Reformed churches' ecumenical activity, see Patterson, 'Huguenot Synod of Tonneins', 264–5. For an explanation of the reliability of the published acts of the national synods, see G. Sunshine, *Reforming French Protestantism* (Kirksville, MO, 2003), 8.
[62] Aymon, *Synodes*, i. 131–3, 157, 170; Quick, *Synodicon*, i. 120–1, 143, 153. The call for a joint confession came after Lutherans produced the Formula of Concord (1577), a document deemed by many Reformed to be harmful to Protestant unity, and before the Reformed developed the Harmony of Confessions (1581). See L. Spitz and W. Lohff, eds., *Discord, Dialogue, and Concord* (Philadelphia, 1977), 150–90.
[63] For a full treatment of Mornay's ecumenical activity, see R. Linder, 'The French Calvinist Response to the Formula of Concord', *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 19 (1982), 25–7; Patterson, 'Huguenot Synod of Tonneins', 243–7.

Reformed and Lutheran Churches.[64] Mornay continued to trumpet the cause of Protestant unity through his correspondence with political and theological leaders such as Henri of Navarre (later Henri IV of France), William, Prince of Orange, Theodore Beza, and Francis Walsingham, Queen Elizabeth's secretary of state.[65] In another effort to advance towards union with Lutherans, the 1603 national Synod at Gap sent letters to universities in Germany, England, Scotland, Geneva, Basel, and Leiden asking for their cooperation in this pursuit of Protestant union.[66]

Pierre du Moulin continued Mornay's pursuit of Protestant union. In a March 1613 letter to James, he included twenty articles outlining the means for uniting Protestantism.[67] He proposed an initial gathering of two theologians from each state.[68] At this meeting, the theologians would place all the Reformed confessions on a table and then compose a new one. The unified confession would not address matters beyond those necessary to salvation: for example, Piscator's view of the natures of Christ or Arminius's teaching on predestination and the perseverance of the saints. Du Moulin believed that formulating a new confession would not cause much difficulty because the Churches already agreed on the essential faith. Their only differences were confined to polity and ceremony. To prevent any discord in these areas, each delegate would declare that his Church would not condemn the other Churches over these differences. King James was to oversee the meeting from afar

---

[64] Mornay, *Mémoires et Correspondence*, ii. 86.
[65] Mornay, *Mémoires et Correspondence*, ii. 272–94, 225–6, 235–41, 376–8.
[66] Aymon, *Synodes*, i. 274; Quick, *Synodicon*, i. 239, Rawlinson D 538, 159. The national Synod at La Rochelle in 1607 reported favourable responses from churches in Geneva, Berne, and in the Low Countries; the University of Heidelberg; the Ecclesiastical Senate of the Palatinate; and the Elector Palatine. Aymon, *Synodes*, i. 300; Quick, *Synodicon*, i. 264; Rawlinson D 538, 173.
[67] TNA SP 78/61 f. 66–9. Mornay wrote in October 1613 that he strongly approved the plan. *Mémoires et Correspondence*, xii. 420. Revised versions are printed in Quick, *Synodicon*, i, 434–7; Aymon, *Synodes,* ii, 57–62; Rawlinson D 538, 378–82.
[68] In this initial proposal of his plan for union, du Moulin also included representatives from German and Danish Lutheran churches at the meeting. In subsequent versions, he added a second meeting at which the unified Reformed would dialogue with Lutherans. Aymon, *Synodes,* ii. 57–62; Quick, *Synodicon*, i. 434–7; Rawlinson D 538, 378–82.

and offer advice through messengers. Following the successful conclusion of the conference, all the delegates were to travel to England in order to offer their respects to James.[69]

In the final point of his proposal du Moulin expressed the goal of the unified Protestants holding an ecumenical council in order to reconcile with Rome. Patterson describes this hope for reconciliation as 'breathtaking in its boldness and its apparent disregard of a century of bitterness and conflict that had followed Luther's Ninety-Five Theses of 1517.'[70] An alternative interpretation is that du Moulin had experienced much of the bitterness and conflict, having survived the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre and the French Wars of Religion, and sought to achieve peace between Protestants and Catholics, however unlikely. James responded somewhat favourably to du Moulin's proposal but made it clear that he needed more time to ponder the right course of action.[71]

In an advisement to du Moulin's proposal, Mornay suggested that King James declare his intention that the Churches represented at the pro-synod support fraternally the polity and discipline of one another for the sake of peace and concord. The statesman explained that this declaration would calm suspicions that James would seek to alter the polity of other Reformed Churches at the pro-synod.[72] Du Moulin's modified plan for union was submitted to the Synod at Tonneins in 1614.[73]

---

[69] TNA SP 78/61 f. 69. Following the union of the Reformed churches, the delegates would attempt to meet with representatives of Lutheran churches for the purpose of achieving broad doctrinal unity.
[70] Patterson, *James VI and I*, 179.
[71] TNA SP 78/61 f. 88.
[72] Mornay, *Mémoires et correspondence*, xii. 423. For Mornay's contributions to du Moulin's plan, see Patterson, 'James I and the Huguenots', 246–8.
[73] David Home, a native of Scotland but a pastor in France, submitted the plan along with a letter from King James. The synod did not attribute the plan to du Moulin. See Aymon, *Synodes,* ii. 5–6, 57–62, 64–5; Quick, *Synodicon*, i. 395, 434–7, 439; Rawlinson D 538, 378–82, 384–5. For a full account of the various forms of the plan for union, see Patterson, 'James I and the Huguenots', 247–9. The national Synod at Vitré in 1617 reported on the advances that the provinces had made towards implementing the plan. Aymon, *Synodes,* ii. 108–9; Quick, *Synodicon*, i. 499.

This audacious scheme of the pastor and the king was now well underway; would it succeed?

Casaubon in England 1610-1611

At the same time that Pierre du Moulin began working closely with King James, Isaac Casaubon was pusuing a similar course. He had first contacted King James in 1603 on behalf of the Academy of Geneva.[74] Some time later, an unidentified Scotsman, likely James Hepburn, sent an undated letter to King James thanking him for a licence to travel in mainland Europe and mentioned Casaubon.[75] The Scotsman reported:

> Among other your Majesty's good friends . . . there is one in Paris called Cassabon . . ., who being of my acquaintance did infinitely regret with me that digression of your Majesty's book touching Antichrist; saying that otherwise that treatise was in a way to procure your Majesty great credit, and to have made you capable of a great work in Christendom. He told me that Cardinal Peroone, an excellent man in France and no favourer of the Jesuits, hath said unto him touching that book that an it had not been for that digression, he would have gone before the Pope upon his knees to have your Majesty satisfied in al the rest. More said Cassabon, if his Majesty had forborne that point and discreetly have sought reformation, he had assuredly gotten upon his side the whole kirk of France.[76]

George Carew, James's ambassador to France, reported to the Earl of Salisbury on 20 February 1609 that, following Joseph Scaliger's recent death, the French regarded Casaubon 'Imperator in literis humanioribus.' Carew added:

> The poore man bemoned himself to me, with teares in his eyes, protesting that he wished himself dead an hundreth tymes a day. The Cardinal of Evreux [du Perron] is perpetually in hande with him, to get him to theyr syde: Pere Coton plieth his wife to the same end. At Geneva as he sayeth, they have used him with great injustice, about his Greeke Characters, and some goods with his father left him, which he had geven to his sister, those are not only adjudged from them both, but they are much impoverished also, by the charge of the suyte. . . . Sir Henry Savile wrote unto me that there was some purpose to

---

[74] TNA, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, SP 14/2 f. 217.
[75] For Hepburn's relationship to Casaubon, see A. Grafton and J. Weinberg, *"I have always loved the Holy Tongue": Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (London, 2001), 82–3.
[76] G. D. Owen, *Calendar of the manuscripts of the most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury*, vol 21 (London, 1970), 288.

> draw him with some good offer into England, but it is about six months since, and I heare no more of it. If that purpose contineu, there must be speed used in the effecting thereof, or els I doubt he will be caught to the other other syde.[77] To the king here he commeth not, for that he is ever in hande with him to change his Religion . . . . Sir Henry Savile wrote unto me that there was some purpose to draw him with some good offer into England, but it is about six months since, and I heare no more of it. If that purpose contineu, there must be speed used in the effecting thereof, or els I doubt he will be caught to the other other syde, though to entertayne him in breathe I have promised to deale for him with his Majestie at my retourne, not letting him know that I woould write in the meane tyme. Two thinges make me doubtfull herein, the first that this king might take the withdrawing of him in evill part, the other that it will be chargeable to his Majestie. For the first, this kinges interest will not be therein controverted, but the Popes. For the second, the Bishops and Clergy of England might contribute to his mayntenance till some Prebend or headship of a house in one of the universities fitt for him fell voyde.[78]

Carew added that he thought Casaubon and King James would come to admire one another, for they were the two most learned in theology of all living laymen, in his opinion.[79]

Casaubon now contacted King James on 20 April 1610 to inquire about coming to England for a short visit.[80] He left Paris, never to return, on 8 October 1610. Upon his arrival in England, Casaubon quickly ingratiated himself with James. The king even invited him to stand behind the royal chair, a place of prominence, during the evening meal on 8 November 1610. By that time, James had received an anonymous French volume attacking him, which he supposed had been written by Cardinal du Perron. Casaubon informed the king that du Perron was not the author, but that the work had been produced by Guillaume de Reboul, a man ‘impii et fanatici’. James then invited Casaubon to return the following day. When he saw

---

[77] TNA SP 78/55/ f. 46*v*.
[78] TNA SP 78/55/ f. 46*v*.
[79] TNA SP 78/55 f. 47*r*.
[80] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 735; Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 347.

Casaubon the next day, the king rose, greeted him, and related something from Reboul's book.[81] Casaubon recounted the story to du Perron in an undated letter.[82]

James soon arranged for Casaubon to become a fixture in his court. Antoine Lefèvre de la Boderie, the French ambassador to England, wrote to Nicolas de Neufville, seigneur de Villeroy and French secretary of state, on 17 November 1610 that James spoke well of Casaubon. The king asked the ambassador to secure permission for Casaubon to remain in England.[83] Villeroy replied on 29 November 1610 that the French court would grant the king's request.[84] Thus, in less than six weeks after his arrival, Casaubon had advanced towards securing a permanent home in England.

Casaubon became fond of King James and even named his English-born son after the king; James was a godfather by proxy.[85] However, James's esteem for Casaubon's erudition cost the scholar his most prized possession: time. He entered the Oath of Allegiance controversy in 1611 at the behest of James. Before Casaubon had left for England, Fronton du Duc, a Jesuit priest and friend of the scholar, had delivered to him a response by the Jesuits to a treatise written against Pierre Coton.[86] King James determined the volume to be nothing more than a reiteration of Cardinal Bellarmine's theory of the pope's temporal power. Casaubon responded to the Jesuits' apologetic with *Ad Frontonem Ducaeum*, one of the more dispassionate works of the Oath of Allegiance controversy.[87] Thus, Casaubon had entered the realm of religious controversy, for which his temperament and interests were ill-suited. He

---

[81] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 785.
[82] Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 630–1.
[83] A. de la Boderie and P. Burtin, *Ambassades de monsieur de la Boderie, en Angleterre* . . ., vol 5 (n. p., 1750), 479.
[84] Boderie and Burtin, *Ambassades*, v. 498.
[85] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 950.
[86] Anonymous, *Response apologetique à l'Anticoton . . . par un pére de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Paris, 1610). Pierre du Moulin likely authored the anonymous *Anti-Coton* (Paris, 1610).
[87] I. Casaubon, *Isaaci Casauboni ad Frontonem Ducaeum* . . . (London, 1611).

was a true academic, who was much more comfortable locked away with ancient texts than with engaging in verbal sparring with a theological opponent.

Bishop Lancelot Andrewes became a close friend to Casaubon immediately after the classicist's arrival in England. Casaubon had a long conversation with the bishop on 5 November 1610 and noted, 'I recognised his extraordinary kindness and benevolence towards me.'[88] Casaubon read drafts of Andrewes's response to Cardinal Bellarmine and made corrections, which Andrewes received graciously.[89] Casaubon and Andrewes spent many days together in the summer of 1611 in Cambridge and Ely. He wrote in his diary on 16 August: 'I am not separated from so great a man willingly.'[90] Pierre du Moulin would receive a similar welcome to Casaubon when he arrived in England in 1615.

A Universal Exception

After Casaubon informed Cardinal du Perron that he had corrected King James's suspicions that the cardinal had authored a despicable book against him, du Perron sent a reply.[91] The cardinal assured Casaubon that he had nothing but respect for James, 'for the reverence that he showed for philosophy, and for good letters, for seating them by his erudition in the royal throne, and accomplishing in his person the hope of Plato, of philosophers reigning, or of kings philosophising.'[92] Du Perron knew how to flatter a king. He continued displaying his admiration for James by noting 'the lustre and splendour of his moral and intellectual virtue'.[93] The cardinal

[88] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 783: 'miram illius erga me humanitatem et benevolentiam agnovi.'
[89] Andrewes, *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini* (London, 1610). Casaubon wrote that 'meas notulas non neglexit, imo pluris fecit quam merebantur'. *Ephemerides*, ii. 792.
[90] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 864: 'Ego libenter facio, ut a tanto viro ne divellar.'
[91] Du Perron, *Diverses oeuvres*, 882–3.
[92] Du Perron, *Diverses oeuvres*, 883: 'pour l'honneur qu'il a faict à la Philosophie, & aux bonnes Lettres, de les asseoir par son erudition dedans le Throne Royal, et accomplir en sa Personne le souhait de Platon, des Philosophes regnants, ou des Roys philosophants.'
[93] Du Perron, *Diverses oeuvres*, 883: 'l'éclat et la splendeur de ses Vertus morales et intellectuelles'.

reached the crescendo of his admiration when he proclaimed that James lacked nothing of Xenophon's Cyrus, but was 'the true living pattern of a perfect and accomplished prince.'[94] Du Perron could not have spoken more highly of a king, especially a Protestant king. Unfortunately for the cardinal, he included a limitation: 'excepté le seul tiltre de Catholique'.[95] This single exception in a letter filled with nothing but praise for James sparked a controversy that would occupy du Perron until his death in 1618 and not conclude until 1627 when du Moulin published his final reply to the cardinal.

King James had claimed in his *Premonition* that 'what ever the Fathers for the first five hundreth yeeres did with an unanime consent agree upon, to be beleeved as a necessary point of salvation, I either will beleeve it also, or at least will be humbly silent; not taking upon mee to condemne the same.'[96] He considered this his right to the title of Catholic. The king consequently zeroed in on the only unflattering phrase in Cardinal du Perron's letter and commissioned Casaubon to write to the cardinal.[97] Du Perron dated his reply to a second letter from Casaubon as 15 July 1611.[98]

Du Perron's reply was published against the cardinal's wishes in French and English editions in 1612.[99] Casaubon had informed the cardinal that King James 's'estoit estonnée' that du Perron found nothing lacking in James as the perfect and

---

[94] Du Perron, *Diverses oeuvres*, 883: 'le vray exemplaire vivant d'un Prince parfaict et accomply.'
[95] Du Perron, *Diverses oeuvres*, 883.
[96] James I, *A Premonition . . .* in McIlwain, *Works*, 123. John Chamberlain wrote to Dudley Carleton, 30 December 1609: 'I hear that his [Lancelot Andrewes] booke is aunswered, as well as the Kings, and that the Cardinall of Evreux hath written somewhat sharply against the King, but yet qualifies yt somewhat towards the later end, which the King sayes he takes in no better part then yf he shold hold a T. in his teeth and then crie sir reverence.' McClure, *Letters of John Chamberlain*, i. 292. Chamberlain might have confused du Perron with Bellarmine, who published his *Apologia Roberti S. R. E. Cardinalis Bellarmini, pro responsione sua ad librum Iacobi Magnae Britanniae Regis* in 1610.
[97] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 814.
[98] Cardinal du Perron, *Lettre de Monseigneur le Cardinal du Perron Envoyée au Sieur Casaubon en Angleterre* (Paris, 1612), 35.
[99] Du Perron, *Lettre,* 3. Du Perron, *A Letter Written from Paris, by the Lord Cardinall of Peron to Monsr Casaubon in England* (St. Omer, 1612).

complete prince except for the title of Catholic.[100] Du Perron responded with praise for the king's piety and humility in submitting himself to 'these clear lights of antiquity.'[101] The cardinal, however, listed five observations against the king's claim of catholicity and presented an encapsulated version of an expanded argument against Protestantism in general. Du Perron skilfully worked the argument more in his favour with each point and, with his fifth observation, initiated a transition with regard to *consensus Patrum* by Catholic apologists.[102] At no point did the cardinal make the case that his Church was the same institution as the Church of Augustine's day or that they held the same doctrines. He assumed these things.[103] Therefore, he argued from a position of power regarding conformity to the doctrines of the Church Fathers, which James claimed to believe. For du Perron, separation from the institution handed down by the Fathers and rejection of the doctrines descended from the Fathers negated any right to the title of Catholic.

Du Perron's first observation was that 'the name of Catholic, is not a name of simple belief, but of communion'.[104] The cardinal quoted Augustine's appropriation of a statement by Cyprian of Carthage that one 'can find salvation nowhere except in the Catholic Church.'[105] According to du Perron, James's assertion that he believed the unanimous consensus of the Fathers concerning salvation rang hollow because he had separated himself from the institution in which salvation is found.

---

[100] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 6.
[101] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 7: 'ces clairs flambeaux de l'antiquité.'
[102] See the section on the Council of Trent in Chapter 3 for more details on the thorny background of defining *consensus Patrum*.
[103] In his second reply to James and Casaubon, du Perron offered reasons why an argument for these things was unnecessary.
[104] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 7: 'le nom de Catholique, n'est pas un nom de simple creance, mais de communion.'
[105] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 8. From Cyprian's Epistle 72 to Jubaianus: 'ne peut nulle part trouver le salut, sinon en l'Eglise Catholique.'

Du Perron then shifted his argument from stressing the true catholic church to focusing on those outside. Du Perron subtly connected the king to heretics and schismatics as he noted via Augustine's *De Fide et Simbolo* that 'the heretics believing false things of God, violate the faith; and the schismatics separate themselves from the loving brotherhood by unjust divisions.'[106] The cardinal reached the climax of his opening argument against King James by referencing Augustine's *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, that those who 'dissent such from his body, which is the Church, . . . it is evident that they are not in the Catholic Church'[107] Du Perron concluded that 'it is not sufficient in order to obtain the name of Catholic to hold, or rather to assume to hold the same belief that the Fathers held, unless we commune with the same Catholic Church with which the Fathers communed and which through the succession of persons and, we contend, of doctrine, has come down to us.'[108] Du Perron must have written to Casaubon with the seventh volume of the 1576 edition of Augustine's works opened on his desk, since seven of the first thirteen citations under du Perron's first observation are found in that volume.[109]

Du Perron's second observation zeroed in on James's declaration that he believed all that the Fathers deemed necessary to salvation. The cardinal responded that 'it is necessary to conform to the integrity of the belief of the Fathers, to believe everything that they believed, according to the degree to which they believed them.'[110] Interpreters of the Fathers must determine the degree of the belief, for 'there are two

---

[106] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 9: 'les heretiques croyant de Dieu choses fausses, violent la foy; et les schismatiques par divisions injustes se separent de la charitie fraternelle.'
[107] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 9–10: 'dissentent tellement de son corps, qui est l'Eglise, . . . il est manifeste qu'ils ne sont pas en l'Eglise Catholique.'
[108] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 12: 'il ne suffit pas pour obtenir le nom de Catholique, de tenir, ou plustost penser tenir la mesme creance que tenoient les Anciens, si on ne communique à la mesme Eglise Catholique à laquelle comuniquoient les Anciens, et qui par succession de personnes, et comme nous pretendons, de doctrine, est parvenu jusques à nous.'
[109] Aurelli Augustini, *Tomus VII Operum* (Antwerp, 1576).
[110] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 13: 'est-il besoin pour se conformer à l'integrité de la creance des Anciens, de croire toutes les choses qu'ils ont creuës, selon le degré auquel ils les ont creuës.'

other degrees of things' in addition to points necessary to salvation.[111] One had to know what was profitable for salvation and what was lawful and not repugnant to salvation. Without spelling out his criticism of a king, du Perron charged James with illegitimately separating those things the Fathers considered necessary for salvation from those that were useful and lawful. In du Perron's eyes, the king had condemned the useful and lawful and had chosen to disconnect himself from the catholic church. According to the cardinal, interpreters must distinguish the three categories within the beliefs of the Fathers but never separate them and certainly not reject the true catholic church for practicing all three. However, du Perron did not quote any Fathers in his explanation of the three degrees.

Du Perron addressed 'the ambiguity of the word, *necessary to salvation*' in his third observation.[112] After a lengthy explanation of the various kinds of necessity, which contained no quotations or examples from the Church Fathers, du Perron concluded that 'it is necessary to conform to the ancient belief and Catholic practice, to hold necessary for salvation, all things that the Fathers held necessary for salvation, to the degree and according to the categories of necessity in which they held them.'[113] Du Perron thus attempted to demonstrate to James that his simple claim of believing all that the Fathers deemed necessary to salvation was much more complex than he initially imagined.

In his fourth observation, du Perron proposed that the period of the Church Fathers should be limited to those doctors of the Church who lived during the time of the first four councils, roughly from Emperor Constantine to Emperor Marcian (ca.

---

[111] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 13: 'il y a encore deux autres degrez de choses.'
[112] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 13–14: 'l'ambiguité du mot, *necessaire à salut*'. Italics original.
[113] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 19: 'il faut pour se rendre conforme à l'ancienne creance et prattique Catholique, tenir pour necessaires à salut, toutes les choses que les Peres ont tenuës pour necessaires à salut, au degré et selon les especes de necessité selon lesquelles ils les ont tenuës.'

306–457). That which those Fathers practiced universally should be regarded as truly ancient doctrine marked with the character of the Apostolic church.[114] Du Perron, unlike many Catholic polemicists, did set a defined boundary for the period of authoritative doctrine. Those Catholics who had spoken definitively about the end of the Fathers usually ended with Bernard of Clairvaux.[115] In contrast to other Catholic polemicists, du Perron considered the Fathers at the time of the first four councils to be the definitive interpreters of the first three centuries and the best communicators of the doctrine and practice dating back to the time of the Apostles. Those Fathers confirmed, said the cardinal, that their beliefs and practice were not products of their own time but came directly from the Apostles through continual succession.

Cardinal du Perron most clearly articulated his position on the Church Fathers in his fifth observation. He called 'esprits contentieux' those who claimed 'that one identical thing is found in the writings of all the Fathers'.[116] Such an illegitimate requirement was 'an unjust and impertinent pretence.'[117] The cardinal explained that a doctrine or observation truly held by the Fathers as universal and catholic did not have to appear in the writings of all the Fathers because the Fathers addressed different subjects and not all their writings are extant. Du Perron then detailed two ways to redefine *consensus Patrum*. The first was 'when the most eminent Fathers of each region agree in the affirmation of the same doctrine or practice' and none have opposed it.[118] He referenced Augustine's citation of ten Fathers in *Contra Julianum* as sufficiently expressing the consent of the church. Du Perron's second rule was to

---

[114] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 23.
[115] Quantin, 'The Fathers in Seventeenth Century Roman Catholic Theology', 954–6.
[116] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 23: 'qu'une mesme chose se trouve actuellement dans les escrits de tout les Peres'.
[117] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 23: 'une injuste et impertinente pretention.'
[118] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 24: 'lors que les Peres plus eminents de chaque region conviennent en l'affirmation d'une mesme doctrine ou prattique.'

recognise ‘when the Fathers speak, not as doctors, but as witnesses of the custom and practice of the church of their centuries.’[119] The Fathers did not always speak authoritatively on what ought to be believed but often expressed their observations of the church in their time and place. Unless explicitly contradicted by the teaching of earlier Fathers, the observations of doctrines and practices must be regarded as normative, not only for the church of that particular Father but for the church dating all the way back to the time of the Apostles.

Du Perron, therefore, in his argument shifted the focus from doctrine to history. The cardinal redefined *consensus Patrum* as agreement on the same doctrine or practice by eminent Fathers of every country without dissension and the observation that a doctrine or practice was universal and not merely a custom of a particular church. Du Perron understood these two approaches as conforming to the rule of Vincent of Lérins and to Augustine.

Cardinal du Perron closed his letter to Casaubon by going on the offensive against King James and the Church of England. He denounced ‘your ministers, to the society of which his Majesty adheres externally’, for not upholding all that the Fathers believed were necessary to salvation (with different degrees of necessity), namely the real presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist, the oblation of the sacrifice in the Eucharist, prayer and oblation for the dead, and the prayers of the saints.[120] Du Perron offered to prove to Casaubon each of the four doctrines and to do so ‘by the unanimous consent of the Fathers who flourished at the time of the first four councils’.[121] The cardinal promised that he could deliver proofs from the Fathers in

---

[119] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 24: ‘quand les Peres parlent, non comme Docteurs, mais comme tesmoins de l’usage et de la prattique de l’Eglise de leurs siecles.’
[120] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 27–8: ‘vos Ministres, à la societé desquels sa Majesté adhere exterieurement’.
[121] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 31: ‘par le consentement unanime des Peres qui ont fleury au temps des quatre premiers Conciles’.

the affirmative, whereas his opponents could not offer a single passage proving the negative, except those which they claimed to infer by consequences. If King James heard these proofs, he would desire the title of Catholic, and 'put himself in a state to obtain it, and to acquire it for those who are deprived of it'.[122]

In his letter to Isaac Casaubon, Cardinal du Perron revealed his advancements beyond the majority of Roman Catholic apologists after the Council of Trent with regard to the use of the Church Fathers. The Spanish scholastic theologian Melchior Cano had exemplified the majority approach in his statement that 'Sancti simul omnes in fidei dogmate errare non possunt.'[123] By the early seventeenth century, however, Protestant polemicists had undermined the Roman Catholic distinction between the *consensus Patrum* and the individual opinions of each Father.[124] Du Perron's rules that agreement between eminent Fathers in each region denoted consensus and that a Father's testimony of a particular church in a specific time and place must be acknowledged as corresponding to the church in every previous age dating back to the time of the Apostles, unless explicitly contradicted, alleviated the pressure on Catholic apologists to prove universal consensus without exception. Du Perron also innovated by defining which Fathers should serve as judges in controversies between Catholics and Protestants. The Council of Trent had set no such boundaries with regard to *consensus Patrum*; thus, du Perron was treading new ground. Du Perron further developed his methods in his second reply to James and Casaubon.

---

[122] Du Perron, *Lettre*, 34: 'se mettroit en estat de l'obtenir, et de la faire obtenir à ceux qui en sont privez'.
[123] M. Cano, *De locis Theologicis libri duodecim* (Salamanca, 1563), 260; J.-L. Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford, 2009), 53: 'All the saints cannot err together in a doctrine of the faith.'
[124] Quantin, 'The Fathers in Seventeenth Century Roman Catholic Theology', 960–3; Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 216.

Casaubon Defends the King

After Cardinal du Perron's letter was published, Casaubon published his response.[125] According to his diary, Casaubon began writing the letter on 9 November 1611. He prayed for divine assistance on that day and the previous day. After spending the entirety of 10 November writing, he concluded: 'We have completed the task.'[126] King James kept Casaubon occupied during all of the following day, which the scholar considered a waste of time. On 12 November Casaubon again wrote: 'We have completed the task.'[127] These two days likely were spent editing the letter, with input from James. In the *Responsio*, Casaubon asserted that he composed only 'what came from his Majesty's own mouth'.[128] In an additional letter to du Perron, Casaubon claimed that 'the king used me as a secretary, but the work is his Majesty's.'[129] More likely, Casaubon composed the work with James granting final approval. The king 'wrote' multiple books in this manner with Lancelot Andrewes, du Moulin, and others.[130] Casaubon continued to meet with the king over the

[125] Casaubon, *Ad Epistolam Illustr. et Reverendiss. Cardinalis Perronis, Responsio* (London, 1612). The dedicatory epistle in both the Latin and English editions is dated 10 April 1612. *Responsio*, b2*v*; Casaubon, *The Answere of Master Isaac Casaubon to the Epistle of . . . Cardinall Peron* (London, 1612), B*v*. However, the letter itself is dated 9 November 1612 in the Latin edition and in Casaubon's *Epistolae*. *Responsio*, 72: 'V. Eidus Novembr. MDCXII.'; *Epistolae*, ii. 505: 'V. Eid. Novemb. CIↃ IↃ CXII'. The English, Dutch, and French editions dated the letter 9 November 1611. *Answere*, 43; Casaubon, *Responce du sieur Casaubon a la lettre de l'illustrissime Cardinal du Perron* (n.p. 1612), 78; Casaubon, *Antwoort Isaaci Casauboni Op den Brief vanden . . . Cardinael Perronius* (London, 1612), n.p. Casaubon recorded in his diary that the manuscript made it to the printer on 29 March 1612. *Ephemerides*, ii. 924. In addition, Casaubon noted in the letter that he had been in James's court for more than one year, which would indicate 1611 and not 1612. *Responsio*, 3. Clearly, the dating of the letter is off by one year in the Latin edition and in the *Epistolae*.

[126] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 897: 'In penso aliquid fecimus.'

[127] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 897: 'In penso aliquid fecimus.'

[128] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 8: 'quod ex ore ipso Ser. Regis exceptum'

[129] Casaubon, *Epistolae*, 505: 'Le Roy s'est servy de moy pour Secretaire, mais la piece est de Sa Majesté.' This letter immediately follows the *Responsio* in the volume and is undated. This letter also appears undated in du Perron, *Les Ambassades*, 698.

[130] L. Andrewes, *Tortura Torti* . . . (London, 1609); James I, *Declaration . . . contre la harangue de . . . Cardinal du Perron* (London, 1615).

following days and also spent time with Andrewes, with whom he discussed the work.[131] Finally, the letter was sent to du Perron on 29 December 1611.[132]

In his *Responsio*, Isaac Casaubon displayed his high regard for the teaching of the Church Fathers but made it clear that this teaching was subordinate to the authority of Scripture. Casaubon defended King James's right to the title of Catholic in order to promote the king as a would-be Constantine who could reunite Christendom and to prevent excommunication and/or assassination. Casaubon portrayed James as a peacemaker and defender of truth but did not intend to deliver a highly detailed analysis and critique of du Perron's letter.[133] If Casaubon truly did not intend for his letter to du Perron to be published when he penned it, he clearly shaped the dedicatory epistle to Thomas Edmonds in April 1612 to present James favourably to the masses.

Casaubon introduced James as the recognised peacemaker. After quoting Hilary of Poitiers, Casaubon explained that divisions would cease if people separated human from divine, superstitious from holy, novel and recent from truly ancient, and unnecessary and less necessary from necessary. This last category surely stung du Perron, who had spent so much time clarifying the different distinctions of 'necessary'. In order to reach such unity, said Casaubon, 'only the king's way stands open'.[134] That road to peace was a General Council, which the church had used from the beginning to settle doctrinal differences and establish reconciliation. Thanks to 'nostra omnium peccata', however, there appeared to be no hope for a universal synod.[135]

---

[131] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 897–903.
[132] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 904.
[133] Casaubon, *Responsio*, a3.
[134] Casaubon, *Responsio*, a3*v*: 'regia patet via unica'.
[135] Casaubon, *Responsio*, a3*v*: 'all of our sins'

After the dedicatory epistle, Casaubon began his letter to Cardinal du Perron by informing the cardinal that King James regarded him as a capable scholar, an honourable man, and even a friend, unlike most of the others who had replied to his *Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance*.[136] Casaubon noted that James initially thought that the controversy concerning the titles of Catholic and Christian was useless. The king knew that he had a right to both titles because he believed what was meant by them. James, however, soon recognised that common men interpret the deprivation of those titles to signal the deprivation of what is included in those titles. Casaubon did not spell it out to du Perron, but clearly he referenced James's right to the English throne and possibly his very life.[137] King James thus wanted to avoid two misfortunes: excommunication from the Catholic Church (Queen Elizabeth), and assassination (King Henri IV).

Casaubon reminded du Perron of James's title, Defender of the Faith ('Defensorem fidei') and related the account of James's rapid response to a book recently produced out of 'Germania aut Belgio'.[138] This book, said Casaubon, was 'new, perverse, and repugnant in some places to the ancient faith of the Catholic Church.'[139] James had condemned it, ordered it to be burned, and sent letters to the magistrates of the territory where the author lived to inform them of his ruling and to encourage them to investigate the matter themselves. Casaubon did not name the offender or his book, but he undoubtedly referred to Conradus Vorstius, the German theologian who had occupied much of the time and efforts of King James and Pierre du Moulin during 1611 and 1612.[140]

---

[136] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 2.
[137] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 7.
[138] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 5.
[139] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 5: 'nova, perversa, et cum antiqua fide Ecclesiae Catholicae in nonnullis pugnans.'
[140] See Chapter 5.

Observations

Casaubon's responses to Cardinal du Perron's first and fifth observations are the most notable for understanding his use of the Church Fathers. He challenged du Perron's first observation that King James could not be called Catholic since the title signified not simply belief but also communion with the Catholic Church. Through his reading of Scripture according to the interpretation of all the Fathers, King James determined that the 'true and essential' form of the Church was that the sheep of Christ hear his voice and the sacraments were administered according to the teaching of the Apostles and their followers.[141] Churches that maintained this doctrine were united to Christ and to one another in charity, mutual prayer, the communion of hope, and a common faith regarding doctrinal teachings necessary to salvation. Casaubon, interestingly, never mentioned institutional union. Without using the term, he had basically articulated the doctrine of the invisible church.

Casaubon rejected du Perron's assumption that the contemporary Roman Catholic Church was the same institution as the Church of Augustine's day, and used du Perron's historicism against the cardinal. Casaubon argued that the Roman Catholic Church was, in fact, not catholic. In response to du Perron's volley of quotes from Augustine against King James, Casaubon noted how great the distance was between Augustine's time and the present. He added a striking observation: 'How different is the Church which is called Catholic today from those times; how the face and the whole exterior form of the church is changed, to say nothing of the interior.'[142] The catholic church of Augustine's day, said Casaubon, was undisputed, undivided from east to west, and clearly identifiable. The church regularly held truly

[141] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 12: 'veram et οὐσιώδη'.
[142] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 15: 'Quam diverso sensu Ecclesia Catholica hodie nominetur, atque illis temporibus: quam sit mutata Ecclesiae facies et tota exterior forma, ut de interiore iam nihil dicamus.'

ecumenical councils, which were the 'strongest bond, in which all members of the Catholic Church were bound together in the structure of one body.'[143] If Augustine's observations were to serve as testimonies of the doctrine and practice of the church of his day and the church of the Apostolic era, as du Perron had argued, the contemporary Roman Catholic Church could not be regarded as the same institution.

Casaubon believed that the Church of England had embraced the doctrine necessary for salvation that flowed from Scripture through the ancient church and did not depart from the faith of the Roman Church in so far as the Roman Church agreed with the ancient catholic church. Therefore, Casaubon challenged du Perron to call a free council to examine the claims of the Church of England with regard to the succession of both bishops and doctrine. The Church of England's departure from Rome was a sign that it was returning to the ancient faith and not revolting from the true catholic church. Moreover, 'we do not flee, affirmed his Majesty, but are driven away.'[144] According to Casaubon, du Perron's attempt to connect James and the Church of England with the Donatists could not stand because the Donatists had left willingly.

In his address of du Perron's fifth observation, Casaubon asserted that Protestants and Catholics had to come to an agreement about how they should regard the authority of the Church Fathers. He declared that if the testimony and authority of the Church Fathers was removed 'the controversies of today will never end' and no disputes would be resolved.[145] Although there were many rules for determining the authority of the Fathers, Casaubon granted that King James could concede to du Perron's two rules. For matters necessary to salvation, however, Casaubon proposed

---

[143] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 16: 'vinculum firmissimum, quo Ecclesiae Catholicae membra omnia in unius corporis compagem devinciebantur.'
[144] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 22: 'non enim fugimus, aiebat eius Majestas, sed fugamur,'
[145] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 43: 'controversias hodiernas finem numquam'.

sola Scriptura as the judge. Only this foundation would honour the Scriptures and allow the Church Fathers their rightful place.[146]

Casaubon's attempt to read Scripture according to the interpretation of the Fathers and his willingness to accept du Perron's two rules for redefining *consensus Patrum* distinguished his approach from Pierre du Moulin's. Casaubon viewed the Fathers as mentors and truly valued their interpretations and their contribution to the church's theology. Du Moulin, on the other hand, esteemed the Fathers when they agreed with him and ignored or dismissed them when they did not. Most often, he used the Fathers to attack his Roman Catholic opponents rather than to define and support his own positions. He respected some of the Fathers some of the time and used them when expedient.

Isaac Casaubon, one of the greatest classicists of early modern Europe, revealed his understanding of the right use of the Church Fathers in his defence of King James against Cardinal du Perron. Casaubon held the Fathers in high esteem and affirmed their authority in controversies between Protestants and Roman Catholics but regarded their authority as secondary to Scripture, particularly in matters necessary to salvation. He stood between Cardinal du Perron and Pierre du Moulin with regard to the authority of the Church Fathers. However, the French Reformed churches applied pressure on du Moulin from the opposite direction. The same presbyters who approved the censure of preachers who quoted from the Church Fathers in sermons and brought their books into the pulpit would have approved the censure of du Moulin for abandoning *sola Scriptura* if he had placed too much emphasis on the Fathers during this polemical debate.

---

[146] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 44.

Cardinal du Perron received a copy of Casaubon's last letter at the beginning of April 1612, soon followed by the published copy of the response to the cardinal by King James (and Casaubon). Du Perron travelled to le château de la Guette in order to formulate 'une Replique à sa Majesté', but was side-tracked by the controversy surrounding Edmund Richer, Syndic of the Theology Faculty in Paris, who had recently published a work in which he argued that French kings ruled by divine right and denied the absolute authority of the pope in the temporal domain, including the power to depose kings.[147] Du Perron related to Casaubon that Richer's book 'held me up for nearly two months, in Paris, in perpetual occupation with our bishops'.[148] A crisis in France involving the crown and multiple factions of the Catholic Church was brewing and required du Perron's full attention. Thus, while Casaubon and du Moulin were deepening their collaborative relationships with King James, Cardinal du Perron was fighting to maintain the unity of the French church.

---

[147] Du Perron, *Ambassades*, 694–6. E. Richer, *Libellus de Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate* (Paris, 1622). An English translation addressed to Roman Catholics in England was published in 1612. Richer, *A Treatise of Ecclesiasticall and Politike Power* (London, 1612). For a full treatment of the Richer controversy, see E. Préclin, 'Edmond Richer', *Revue d'Histoire moderne*, V (1930): 242–69; F.-T. Perrens, *L'Église et L'État en France sous le Règne de Henri IV et la Régence de Marie de Mêdicis*, 2 vols (Paris, 1872), ii. 1–194; Francheschi, *La Crise*, 404–17. For Richer's life and work, see E. Puyol, *Edmond Richer, Étude Historique et Critique sur la Rénovation du Gallicanisme au Commencement du XVII*e *Siècle*, 2 vols (Paris, 1876). Richer previously had garnered suspicion from non-Gallicans by reissuing the major works of Jean Gerson and other noted French conciliarists. Ioannis Gersonii, *Opera . . . cum Indice verum et verborum et aliquot Opusculis Petri de Alliaco Cardinalis; Iacobi Almaini; et Ioannis Maioris* . . ., 2 vols (Paris, 1606).

[148] Ligny, *Les ambassades*, 695: 'm'a tenu pres de deux moys, à Paris, en perpetuelle occupation avec nos Evesques'. At a February meeting of the bishops, du Perron, 'plein de colere', delivered a stream of invective against Richer. See Burigny, *Vie*, 292. Franceschi noted that for the majority of du Perron's contemporaries Richer's book 'a été lu uniquement comme un agressif recours contre la primauté romaine.' Franceschi, *La Crise*, 874. In March 1612, du Perron and the provincial council of Sens deemed Richer's work to be worthy of censure and condemnation. See *Discours sommaire*, 27–9; Burigny, *Vie*, 300–2. For a contemporary account of the Richer saga, see *Le Mercure Francois*, vols 1–4 (Paris, 1611–18), ii. 303*v*–315. Joseph Bergin suggested that it was possible 'that du Perron's initiative was designed to pre-empt a formal papal condemnation of Richer, which would probably have infuriated a much broader constituency of opinion within France than the committed gallicans.' Bergin, *The Politics of Religion in Early Modern France* (London, 2014), 77.

Gallicanism, Ultramontanism, and the Estates General of 1614

In France, the decades-long tensions between Gallican and Ultramontane factions were exacerbated by the assassination of King Henri IV in 1610.[149] Additionally, the English Oath of Allegiance controversy and the Venetian Interdict crisis contributed to the groundswell of opposition to expansive papal power in the early seventeenth century.[150] A pivotal moment in the power struggle occurred at the meeting of the Estates General in 1614. Was it possible for French Catholics to remain loyal both to the pope and the king? Through strong leadership and persuasive oratory, Cardinal du Perron would defend papal authority without estranging the French crown.

Scope of Authority

Gallicanism and Ultramontanism in France were anything but monolithic.[151] Generally speaking, they marked opposite positions on a broad spectrum denoting the

[149] For detailed discussions of Gallicanism(s) and Ultramontanism(s), see P. Dudon, 'Gallicanisme politique et théologie gallicane' *Recherches de science religieuse*, 19 (1929), 513–39; V. Martin, *Les Origines du Gallicanisme*, 2 vols (Paris, 1939); A. Tallon, *Conscience nationale et sentiment religieux en France au XVIe siècle: Essai sur la vision gallicane du monde* (Paris, 2002), 137–62; Tallon, 'National Church, State Church and Universal Church: The Gallican Dilemma in Sixteenth-century France' in L. Racaut and A. Ryrie, eds., *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation* (Aldershot, 2005), 104–121; J. H. M. Salmon, 'Catholic Resistance Theory, Ultramontanism, and the Royalist Response', in J. J. Burns and M. Goldie, eds., *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700* (Cambridge, 1991), 219–53; Salmon, 'Gallicanism and Anglicanism in the age of the Counter-Reformation', in Salmon, Renaissance and Revolt: Essays in the Intellectual and Social History of Early Modern France (Cambridge, 1987), 155–88; F. Oakley, 'Bronze-Age Conciliarism', 65–86; Oakley, 'Complexities of Context: Gerson, Bellarmine, Sarpi, Richer, and the Venetian Interdict of 1606–1607', *EHR*, 82 (1996), 369–96; Parsons, *Church in the Republic*, 3–273; W. Bouwsma, 'Gallicanism and the Nature of Christendom', in A. Molho and J. Tedeschi, eds., *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hans Baron* (DeKalb, IL, 1972); Franceschi, *La Crise Théologico-Politique*, 15–34.

[150] See J. Parsons, *The Church in the Republic* (Washington, DC, 2004). Parsons, *Church in the Republic*, 201. Francis Oakley remarks: 'One of the striking characteristics of this whole great ideological upheaval was the intimacy of the ties binding together the critics of Ultramontane views in London, Venice and Paris and the ease and speed with which tracts and ideas circulated among them.' Oakley, 'Bronze-Age Conciliarism: Edmond Richer's Encounters with Cajetan and Bellarmine', *History of Political Thought*, 20 (1999), 70. For the Venetian Interdict crisis, see Appendix 2.

[151] Both terms originated in the modern era and insufficiently capture the positions on papal and monarchical power. Alternatives such as *anti-Romanism*, *anti-papalism*, and *papalism* also lack nuance. See F. Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française, des origines à 1900*, 13 vols (Paris, 1924–72), ix. 915–6; V. H. Raab, 'Zur Geschichte und Bedeutung des Schlagwortes "ultramontan" im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert', *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, 81 (1962), 159–73.

authority of the papacy and the authority of kings. The assassination of Henri IV motivated each side to attempt to establish its position on the temporal power of the papacy as binding law.[152] Gallicanism took political and ecclesiastical forms, both of which sought to limit the power of the papacy in their respective realms.[153] Lawyer Pierre Pithou summarised ecclesiastical Gallicanism under two headings in 1594: 1. The pope cannot infringe upon the temporal authority of a Christian king. 2. The pope is sovereign in spiritual matters but is bounded by the canons and rules of the ancient councils of the church.[154] Ultramontanists, in contrast, favoured extensive papal authority within the Church and society. They differed, however, as to the exact scope and nature of the pope's ecclesiastical and temporal authority.[155] Jotham Parsons concluded that 'neither Gallicanism nor ultramontanism can be understood apart from each other, for they owed their existence mainly to their conflict.'[156] The majority of the French clergy in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries embraced the decrees of the Council of Trent and adopted some form of Ultramontanism.[157] The clergy squared off against the Parlement of Paris and many of the faculty at the Sorbonne.[158]

Gallicans in the Parlement of Paris and the Sorbonne shared the common enemy of Ultramontanism with King James. In 1614, the Parlement condemned *Defensio Fidei*, the Jesuit theologian Francisco Suárez's work refuting James's defence of the Oath of Allegiance. Whether or not either side publicly acknowledged

---

[152] R. Mousnier, *L'assassinat d'Henri IV* (Paris, 1964), 237–66; Franceschi, *La Crise*, 203–313.
[153] Some forms of ecclesiastical Gallicanism also advocated the limitation of the monarch's authority over the church. See Tallon, 'National Church, State Church and Universal Church', 173–201.
[154] P. Pithou, *Les Libertez de L'Eglise Gallicane* (Lyon, 1594), 4. See Franceschi, *La Crise*, 21.
[155] See Tutino, *Empire of Souls*, 182–210; Salmon, *Renaissance and Revolt*, 157.
[156] Parsons, *Church in the Republic*, 6.
[157] Tallon, *La France et le concile de Trente* (Rome, 1997), 801–7; Parsons, *Church in the Republic*, 227–52.
[158] Parsons, *Church in the Republic*, 225.

it, Gallicans and King James were allies.[159] However, most Gallicans believed that James went too far in his critiques of the papacy and his treatment of English Catholics.[160]

The Estates General

Cardinal du Perron had served King Henri IV loyally and proved himself a good son of the French Church while maintaining his allegiance to the pope. As one of the most prominent leaders in the French Church, he endeavoured to maintain peace between Gallicans and Ultramontanes without compromising his commitments to the crown and the papacy. The years between Henri's assassination and his own death in 1618 stretched the cardinal's peace-making abilities.

Following the loss of Henri's unifying leadership, Huguenots grew anxious, French nobility expected payouts to retain their loyalty, Spain loomed on France's borders, Gallicans clashed with Ultramontanes, and the Prince of Condé, the first prince of the blood, stood ready to challenge for the crown.[161] In order to quell the uncertainty, Marie de Médicis, Louis XIII's regent, agreed to convoke the first official meeting of the Estates General since 1588 and the last until 1789.[162]

Three weeks after the proclamation of the majority of King Louis XIII the Estates General officially opened on 26 October 1614, with Cardinal du Perron named as a deputy to the First Estate. On 7 November 1614, the First Estate voted

---

[159] Franceschi called the relationship an 'alliance indestructiblement scellée'. *La Crise*, 480.
[160] A. Tallon, *Conscience nationale*, 209–10.
[161] J. M. Hayden, *France and the Estates General of 1614* (Cambridge, 1974), 2–3.
[162] Marie de Médicis, *Double de la response de la Royne regente . . .* (Paris, 1614), 4. Hayden noted that the Queen Mother had sent letters to Cardinal de Sourdis and various governors on February 12th, 13th, and 14th informing them of her plan to call the Estates General. Hayden, *Estates General of 1614*, 62. The Estates General had been called illegally by the Catholic League in 1593. For thorough treatments of the Estates General of 1614, see *Mercure françois*, iii. 292–719; F.-T. Perrens, *L'Église et L'État . . .*, 2 vols (Paris, 1872), ii. 238–317; Hayden, *Estates General of 1614*; Bercé, *Birth of Absolutism*, 53–63; P. Blet, *Le Clergé de France et la Monarchie*, 2 vols (Rome, 1959), i. 40–82.

that the first general proposal discussed should be the reception, publication, and keeping of the decrees of the Council of Trent.[163] The king refused the request the following day.[164] Henri IV and the Regency government had avoided completely accepting the decrees of the Council of Trent because they weakened the authority of the crown against the expansion of papal authority in the Church of France.[165]

The First of the Third

The first article of the Third Estate shared many similarities with King James's Oath of Allegiance, as Cardinal du Perron would point out. Both were intended to prevent another assassination of a king by a religious zealot. They each denied the temporal power of the papacy, direct or indirect, along with papal deposing power, although the Third Estate's article never expressly referred to the papacy. Neither denied the pope's authority to excommunicate, which was a key point of Catholic dogma.[166]

The first article differed from James's oath in that it required all subjects to affirm that the doctrine contained in the article conformed to Scripture, which basically made it *de fide*.[167] James's oath, in contrast, contained no such clause.

---

[163] Lalourcé and Duval, eds., *Recueil de pièces originales et authentiques concernant la tenue des Etats – Généraux*, 9 vols (Paris, 1789), ix. 93. For a full treatment of the reception of the decrees of Trent, see Blet, *Le Clergé de France et la Monarchie*, 112–33.
[164] Lalourcé and Duval, *Recueil*, viii. 34–5.
[165] Hayden, *Estates General of 1614*, 52; Bergin, *Politics of Religion in Early Modern France* (New Haven, 2014), 56–7. Lalourcé and Duval, *Recueil*, viii. 195–7. Undeterred, an assembly of the French clergy gathered in the exact room that had held the First Estate a few months after the meeting of the Estates General closed and voted to receive the decrees of Trent. Blet, *Le Clergé de France et la Monarchie*, 129.
[166] Lalourcé and Duval, *Recueil*, viii. 115; F. Rapine, *Recueil très-exact et curieux de tout ce qui s'est fait et passé de singulier et memorable en l'Assemblée generale des Estats . . .* (Paris, 1651), 205–6. For an evaluation of most of the extant editions, see Hayden, *France and the Estates General*, 187–9. E. W. Nelson published a previously unknown early draft of the First Article. Nelson, 'Defining the Fundamental Laws of France: The Proposed First Article of the Third Estate at the French Estate General of 1614', *EHR*, 115 (2000), 1217–8, 1228–30. See also J. R. Major, *The Deputies to the Estates General in Renaissance France* (Madison, WI, 1960), 118. For the background of the formulation of the oath and its purpose, see P. Blet, 'L'article du Tiers aux États généraux de 1614', *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, 2 (Apr-June, 1955), 81–106; Nelson, *Jesuits and the Monarchy*, 220–9.
[167] Rapine, *Recueil*, 205.

Ultimately, many French Catholics could not agree to this clause because they believed that it would separate them from Catholics in other realms who confessed no such doctrine. Du Perron made a speech on behalf of the bishops of the First Estate, who remained loyal to the king but did not want to offend the pope.[168] Du Moulin, writing under the name of King James, would later produce a response to the speech.

The Harangue

Cardinal du Perron, of whom Solé noted that it is 'significant that his main intellectual activity was devoted to controversy', spoke for nearly three hours in the chamber of the Third Estate, despite a severe illness that confined him to a chair.[169] He outlined four points of contention with regard to the first article of the Third Estate. First, the article required subjects to assent to a doctrine as a doctrine of faith that was contrary to the doctrine held by all other parts of the Catholic Church, past and present. Second, permitting laymen to make pronouncements on Scripture and matters of faith would usurp both the authority of the Church and the office of the priesthood. Third, the article inevitably would lead to schism because it indirectly declared the doctrine held by all other parts of the Catholic Church to be contrary to Scripture; therefore, the Church holding such heretical doctrine could not be the Church of God but was the Synagogue of Satan. Fourth, the article would not result in the security of kings as intended, but would place rulers in greater peril because of

[168] Lalourcé and Duval, *Recueil*, vi. 261–2, 302, 307–8, vii. 166–9; *Ordre des Estats tenus à Paris, l'an 1614* . . . in Bibliothèque Nationale Ms fr. 4082, f. 36; Rapine, *Recueil*, 297–323.
[169] Solé, *Le débat*, 1:27: 'significatif que sa principale activité intellectuelle ait été consacrée à la controverse.' Lalourcé and Duval, *Recueil*, viii. 112; Cardinal du Perron, *Harangue* . . . (Paris, 1615), in *Diverses oeuvres*, 594. The preface to this edition of the speech explained that the address carried much of the same content as the cardinal's earlier address to the Second Estate.

the schism it would create.[170] The first point best revealed the cardinal's understanding of history as an authoritative judge.

Du Perron began his speech by reminding the members of the Third Estate that they had given testimony of holding the clergy as 'your Fathers, as the Pastors and guides of your souls'.[171] He informed them that God had given the clergy the light of his word; therefore, these must walk before the other orders and direct them through teaching and example how to serve faithfully those in authority. The cardinal commended the members of the Third Estate for their honourable intentions of protecting the king through the oath, but informed them that civil laws with temporal punishments did not hold the same effectiveness as ecclesiastical laws with eternal punishments.[172]

Du Perron affirmed the clergy's agreement with the Third Estate on two of the three points of the oath. Both estates condemned violence against kings and acknowledged the temporal sovereignty of the King of France. The clergy denied, however, that subjects were bound to their oath of loyalty to the king even if he became apostate and spread false religion in his realm. Members of the Third Estate had made no provision in their proposed law for subjects to be absolved from the oath. Du Perron made it clear that he wanted to avoid contentions and disputes, while he skilfully linked the Third Estate with the schismatic Reformed Protestants.[173] He noted that all parts of the Catholic Church, from the institution of the schools of theology until the arrival of John Calvin, recognised that a king who became apostate had broken his oath to God and his subjects. Thus, his subjects were released from their oath of allegiance to him. If the French Catholic Church were to adopt the oath

---

[170] *Diverses oeuvres*, 602.
[171] *Diverses oeuvres*, 596: 'vos Peres, comme les Pasteurs et les guides de vos ames'.
[172] *Diverses oeuvres*, 598.
[173] *Diverses oeuvres*, 600.

of the Third Estate as a matter of faith, it essentially would be declaring all other parts of the Catholic Church, in the present and the past, heretical and worthy of excommunication. Du Perron declared to the Third Estate that the English Oath of Allegiance 'is the model of yours' and that 'this is the oath of England, pure and simple'.[174]

In his speech, which had the tone of a work of apologetics, Cardinal du Perron revealed a view of ethics and history that united the sacred and the secular, the Christian and the pagan. He referenced the teaching of Aristotle, the history of the kings of Sparta and Persia, and then transitioned to treatments of justice found in the Bible and the Church Fathers. He concluded that both Scripture and secular writings affirm the virtue of justice.[175] For du Perron, both canonical and secular history displayed God's providential hand. God was no less active in the achievements of the Roman Empire than he was in the successes of Jerusalem under Melchizedek.

God's providence oversaw all of history, which du Perron divided between divine and human. Divine history included the events and doctrines of the Bible and the church. It provided divine and theological certainty. Human history included events and practices of kings and nations. It provided certainty, as well, albeit on the human and historical level, not from faith. Du Perron did not separate divine history between canonical and non-canonical because the same doctrine informed both; the history of the church was one and the same from Genesis to the present day.[176]

Next, the cardinal established the foundation of his speech on 'the columns of history and of the practice of the church'.[177] In particular, he proposed that the belief

---

[174] *Diverses oeuvres*, 600: 'est le patron de la vostre'; *Diverses oeuvres*, 641 'c'est le serment d'Angleterre tout pur'.
[175] *Diverses oeuvres*, 595.
[176] *Diverses oeuvres*, 599.
[177] *Diverses oeuvres*, 602: 'les colomnes de l'histoire et de la prattique de l'Eglise'.

that subjects may be absolved from an oath of allegiance made to heretical and persecuting princes had been held by all other parts of the church for the previous eleven hundred years.[178] He maintained that all parts of the Catholic Church, around the world and in France, had held the doctrine until the time of Calvin, when it was corrupted.[179] The cardinal began his survey of the universal doctrine with Anastasius, who became Byzantine Emperor in 491, and concluded it with Henri IV. He answered opponents of his view at multiple points in his speech using the ecclesiastical sources of papal decrees and bulls and the hostile sources of John of Paris and the Protestant Centuriators. He never drew a sharp distinction between the two types of sources in terms of their evidentiary reliability or effectiveness.[180]

Du Perron answered the three principal historical objections to his position by explaining the historical circumstances of each case. He cited primary sources, such as Bouchel's *Decretorum Ecclesiae Gallicanae*, and general histories, such as Haillan's *L'Histoire de France.*[181] He addressed the theological objections to his position by quoting William of Ockham, John of Paris, Jacques Almain and others in support of his position. Du Perron carefully distinguished between theology and history. He made it clear that this was not a question of right, but of fact. Whether or not the French theologians should have objected to the solubility of oaths of allegiance in cases of heresy or apostasy was immaterial. The issue was whether or not anyone actually did object.[182] Du Perron gave no indication that a case made from historical facts was weaker or inferior to one made from theological or ecclesiastical rights.

---

[178] *Diverses oeuvres*, 602.
[179] *Diverses oeuvres*, 600.
[180] *Diverses oeuvres*, 610.
[181] *Diverses oeuvres*, 608–15. L. Bouchel, *Decretorum Ecclesiae Gallicanae* . . . (Paris, 1609); B. de Girard, Seigneur du Haillan, *L'Histoire de France* (Paris, 1576).
[182] *Diverses oeuvres*, 620.

Du Perron concluded his speech with a blow to the Gallicans who sought greater independence for the Church of France. According to du Perron, the history of France showed that the country experienced great spiritual and temporal prosperity when its kings had been in close union with the pope, but suffered affliction and adversity when the relationship between pope and king was strained.[183]

In his speech to the Estates General of 1614, Cardinal du Perron displayed a view of history that did not distinguish sharply between canonical and secular, ecclesiastical and social. Neither did he distinguish sharply between Christian and non-Christian wisdom, for all virtue came from God. He did seek make a point to differentiate between history and theology, but made it clear that questions of right were not superior to questions of fact.

The controversy over the first article of the Third Estate and du Perron's speech continued after the closing of the Estates General.[184] A short description of du Perron's session with the Third Estate and a summary of his speech soon reached the public.[185] Polemicists on both sides published works attacking the other, and King James soon rang in.

Declaration of a King

Response by the English Ambassador

King James received regular updates of the activities of the Estates General, including a summary of du Perron's speech, through the hand of Thomas Edmondes, his ambassador in France.[186] Edmondes reported to Ralph Winwood, secretary of state,

---

[183] *Diverses oeuvres*, 642.
[184] For details of the pamphlet war, see Hayden, *Estates General of 1614*, 142–3; Nelson, *Jesuits and the Monarchy*, 233–9.
[185] *Advis à un des grands de ce Royaume, sur la harangue faicte au Tiers Estat le 2 Janvier 1615. Par Monseigneur le Cardinal du Perron* . . . (n.p., 1615).
[186] TNA SP 78/62 ff. 247–79; 78/63 ff. 6–44.

on 9 January 1615 about du Perron's claim that the proposed oath of the first article of the Third Estate 'was by practice out of England' and that 'the proposition for the establishing of the Oath of Allegiance had been made'.[187] Edmondes sharply criticised du Perron in a remonstrance to King Louis XIII and the Queen Mother in June 1615. King James, said the ambassador, was astonished by 'such boldness from the mouth and from the writings of a person of this quality.'[188] Edmondes charged that du Perron had attempted to reverse the proposition for the preservation of the life and authority of kings under the pretence of maintaining the interests and rights of the pope. During his speech, du Perron had unleashed several injurious statements against the person and government of the king.[189]

Edmondes delivered a preview of James's (and du Moulin's) response to du Perron's speech. He rejected the cardinal's claim that popes can depose 'heretic' kings, took offense at du Perron's attribution to James of 'nothing that belongs to a Christian', and deplored the notion that James had endeavoured to create schism and division in the assembly of states and in the kingdom by trying to make them receive the same oath that he administered to his own subjects.[190] Edmondes closed his address by informing the young king that his father, Henri IV, and James had agreed that, after one of them died, the survivor would act as 'father and protector' of the deceased's children.[191] In this role, James felt an obligation to warn King Louis that du Perron's doctrine, should it be received and authorised in France, placed him and his offspring in peril.

---

[187] TNA SP 78/63 f. 8*v*.
[188] T. Edmondes, *Remonstrance faicte par l'Ambassadeur de la Grande Bretagne au Roy et à la Reyne sa mère, en Juin 1615* (Paris, 1615), 12: 'telle audace par la bouche et par les escrits d'un personnage de ceste qualité.'
[189] Edmondes, *Remonstrance*, 12.
[190] Edmondes, *Remonstrance*, 13–4: 'rien de ce qui appartient au Chrestien'.
[191] Edmondes, *Remonstrance*, 15: 'pere et protecteur'.

Du Moulin in England

A few months after the close of the meeting of the Estates General, King James, through his personal physician Théodore de Mayerne, invited Pierre du Moulin to England in February 1615.[192] Du Moulin had been Mayerne's pastor in Paris prior to the Huguenot doctor's emigration to England.[193] Du Moulin desired to make the journey with Mayerne on the physician's return, but his consistory in Paris opposed him, fearing that he would not come home. He persuaded them to release him by swearing an oath before the church that he would return. Mornay politely made it clear to Mayerne that du Moulin was not to settle in England: 'Donnes nous caution de le ramener'.[194] Prior to leaving, du Moulin wrote to Mornay about his plans to advance the cause of Protestant union while in England.[195] Mornay considered James's invitation a 'bon augure' ('a good omen') for du Moulin's plan of union but expressed his wish that du Moulin not abandon his homeland for England.[196] Du Moulin set off for England with de Mayerne in March 1615 and arrived in early April.[197] Chamberlain reported to Carleton that Mayerne had brought du Moulin to England 'but I thincke not to remain here.'[198]

James warmly received the French pastor and allowed him to stand behind the royal chair, a place of prominence, during dinner. On several occasions, the king retired with du Moulin and Mayerne for extended conversations. Du Moulin spent much of his three months in England answering Cardinal du Perron's speech to the French Estates-General, in which the cardinal spoke disparagingly of King James.

---

[192] du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 342; McClure, *Letters of Chamberlain*, i. 591.
[193] For Mayerne's life and work, see H. Trevor-Roper, *Europe's Physician* (London, 2006).
[194] P. DuPlessis de Mornay, *Mémoires de Messire Philippes de Mornay*, 2 vols (Amsterdam, 1652), ii. 722.
[195] Du Moulin to Mornay, 5 March 1615, *BSHPF*, 33 (1884), 402–3.
[196] Mornay, *Mémoires*, ii. 723.
[197] *CSPV*, xiii. 411.
[198] McClure, *Letters of Chamberlain*, i. 591.

James brought du Moulin with him to Cambridge, where the Frenchman received the Doctor of Divinity degree, as did John Donne, 'by the kinges expresse mandat'.[199] James then granted du Moulin a prebend at Canterbury.[200] The Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, advocated episcopal polity but adopted a pragmatic stance towards church government, a perspective similar to that of James.[201] Abbot, the leader of the Calvinist party in the Church of England, surely found a theological comrade in du Moulin.[202] Upon his installation before the chapter, du Moulin took the Oath of Allegiance and the Oath of Canonical Obedience, with the exception 'as far as it doth not prejudice the allegiance due to my king.'[203] According to the French ambassador to England, du Moulin travelled to Edinburgh, where he preached before French exiles in a grand hall in the university.[204] During his time in England, du Moulin struck up friendships with other theologians, including Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, who was, according to du Moulin, 'very favourable to him'.[205] Upon his return to France, du Moulin was imprisoned for nineteen hours in Boulogne.[206] He wrote to James from Paris in August 1615 and expressed a desire to spend his retirement in England should God not allow the French Reformed churches to continue in peace.[207]

---

[199] McClure, *Letters of Chamberlain*, i. 591.
[200] Chamberlain to Carleton, 15 June 1615, TNA SP 14/80 f. 182.
[201] P. Welsby*, George Abbot* (London, 1962), 37.
[202] Abbot shared du Moulin's Calvinism and also his staunch opposition to Tridentine Catholicism. J. H. M. Salmon notes that Abbot received an English version of Paolo Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent* in 1620. Salmon, 'Gallicanism and Anglicanism in the age of the Counter-Reformation', in Salmon, *Renaissance and Revolt* (Cambridge, 1987), 155.
[203] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ****r*; du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 343; McClure, *Letters of Chamberlain*, i. 602. James later granted du Moulin a second benefice in Wales.
[204] Francisque Michel, *Les Éccossais en France, Les Français in Écosse* (Paris, 1862), ii. 118.
[205] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ****.
[206] Du Moulin to James, 7/17 August 1615, TNA SP 78/63 f. 268*v*.
[207] TNA SP 78/63 f. 269.

In the Name of the King

According to Pierre du Moulin, Cardinal du Perron had sent a copy of his address to the Third Estate to King James in order to 'sting him'.[208] Since du Moulin was in England at the time, he was able to collaborate with the king on a response. The king took credit for the composition of the work and claimed that du Moulin merely assisted with the French style. Du Moulin later revealed in his autobiography that he had written the response in the name of the king.[209]

In the declaration, Pierre du Moulin challenged the historicism that Cardinal du Perron had displayed in his harangue. Du Moulin charged that the cardinal had converted questions of history into questions of theology and ethics. He responded by arguing that particular historical circumstances did not imply that something was right. In other words, *that* something occurred did not mean that it *ought* to have occurred. Du Moulin also claimed that the cardinal had spoken of fact rather than right because he knew that he lacked the right. The French pastor then offered his correction of du Perron's faulty historical account itself. Du Moulin demonstrated that he valued the use of history in polemics but only for historical, not theological or ethical, purposes.

Du Moulin did offer compliments from King James to du Perron, calling the cardinal a man 'full of knowledge and eloquence'.[210] With these compliments, however, du Moulin delivered personal criticism from James to du Perron for the first time. Of all the clergy, said du Moulin, 'there is one who has prostituted wonderfully

---

[208] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, ***v*: 'afin qu'il se picquast en la prenant'.
[209] Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 343. Although du Moulin's autobiography contains some apparent embellishments, it seems plausible that he did write under James's name. James's history of reliance upon others in the production of his works, his own admission that du Moulin assisted on the volume, and the style of the work point to du Moulin as primary author. Peter du Moulin conveniently neglected to mention the ghost-writing in his biography of his father.
[210] Du Moulin, preface to *Declaration . . . contre la harangue de . . . Cardinal du Perron* (London, 1615), 5: 'plein de sçavoir et d'eloquence'.

his own honour and to whom France has little obligation': namely, du Perron.[211] After reading a copy of du Perron's speech, du Moulin claimed that he recognised 'what difference there is between a man who speaks wisely and one who speaks against his conscience. For, everywhere he contradicts himself and seems to be afraid of being understood.'[212] In other words, according to du Moulin, du Perron was a self-aware hypocrite trying not to get caught. The time for amicable debate had ended. Cardinal du Perron had labelled King James a sower of dissensions, a persecutor of the Catholic Church and of his Catholic subjects, and the source of the monstrous first article of the Third Estate.[213] Seeing du Perron's speech as a personal attack, the king retaliated with equal ferocity through du Moulin. The pastor continued by remarking that engaging a cardinal in debate was not an honour for a king and was beneath the royal dignity. Scripture exalted princes, even calling them gods; whereas the dignity of a cardinal was a new human invention.[214]

Du Moulin expressed the king's pleasure at the contents of the first article of the Third Estate, which was 'a sigh of liberty dying' amidst all the opposition.[215] It would have been better not to attempt such a remedy, however, because the violence of a strange faction had left the truth lying on the floor. There was no doubt, said du Moulin, that the French king ruled at the discretion of the pope, who had the power to remove the crown.[216] Du Moulin avoided explicitly labelling the pope Antichrist, but certainly alluded to it.[217] James and du Moulin were attempting to stoke the fires of

---

[211] Du Moulin, preface, 5: 'il y en a un qui a merveilleusement prostitué son honneur et auquel la France a peu d'obligation'.
[212] Du Moulin, preface, 7: 'quelle difference il y a entre'un homme qui parle a bon escient et un qui parle contre sa conscience. Car par tout il se contredit a soy mesme et semble avoir peur d'estre entendu.'
[213] Du Moulin, preface, 12.
[214] Du Moulin, preface, 12.
[215] Du Moulin, preface, 2: 'un souspir de la liberté mourante'.
[216] Du Moulin, preface, 3.
[217] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 90.

dissension between the Gallicans and the Ultramontanes, but calling the pope Antichrist would have linked the two groups closer together in their opposition to James.

Du Moulin next charged du Perron with treating Scripture and the Church Fathers with little faithfulness.[218] The cardinal's argument from history lacked the weight of the authority of Scripture or even of the ancient church.[219] Du Moulin did not share du Perron's appreciation for what might be called secular sources. He considered du Perron's citations of Pericles, Aristotle, Minos, the Druids, Hannibal, and others to be beautiful flowers growing within a field of corn – they spoiled more than they embellished. They were beneath the dignity of the Estates General, the subject of the speech, and of the speaker himself. The pastor remarked that 'he should not begin with Pericles but with the holy name of God.'[220] Du Moulin also rejected du Perron's esteem for the conquests of the Roman Empire. The cardinal had credited the success to God's grace and temporal blessing, which du Moulin determined would be a reward for their idolatrous zeal, 'as if God would reward the crimes.'[221] Du Moulin did not deny the usefulness of secular sources; he often used them offensively against his Catholic opponents. They supported the biblical sources, however, and could not prove a theological argument on their own.

Du Moulin not only criticised du Perron's references to Aristotle, but he also used the philosopher against the cardinal. In his speech, du Perron had explained that he considered the opposite view of his own not to be heretical, but 'problematique'.[222] The point of contention was not a matter of faith. Du Moulin, the former professor of

---

[218] Du Moulin, preface, 10.
[219] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 47.
[220] Du Moulin, preface, 13: 'Il ne devoit commencer par Periclés mais par le nom sacré de Dieu.'
[221] Du Moulin, preface, 13: 'comme si Dieu recompensoit les crimes.'
[222] Du Perron, *Diverses oeuvres*, 602.

logic, explained that Aristotle taught that every proposition is called a 'probleme' when it is proposed in a formal doubt, though the underlying truth might be necessary to its nature. For examples, he gave the questions: Is there one God? Is man a rational creature? It was clear, said du Moulin, that 'les propositions proposées problematiquement' did not abandon the necessity of their nature and that often the contradictory proposition obligated those who believed it to an anathema and loss of communion.[223] Du Moulin also noted that there were a number of similar matters that he had to pass over in order to address the substance of the debate.

Du Moulin challenged du Perron's primary claim that the doctrine that subjects may be absolved from an oath of allegiance made to heretical and persecuting princes had been held universally for eleven hundred years. This historicist argument held no authority because one could not make doctrinal conclusions from a historical account, even if it were true. Du Perron had admitted in that statement, said du Moulin, that the doctrine had not been believed or practiced for the first five hundred years of the church. The church desperately could have used that doctrine while suffering under heretical emperors and kings.[224]

Du Perron's historical account also lacked accuracy, argued du Moulin. Not only was the cardinal's method faulty, said du Moulin, but also his execution. He set out to correct du Perron's false history of papal deposition of various princes in the cases of heresy, apostasy, or persecution of the church. Even worse, the cardinal had kept going in his hypocrisy. In place of the charges of heresy, apostasy, or persecution against various deposed kings and emperors, du Moulin provided the actual reasons, including incompetence, the collating of benefices and prebends (King

[223] Du Moulin, preface, 14: 'the propositions proposed problematically'.
[224] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 10.

John of England, Philip IV of France), and adultery (Philip I of France), amongst others. Du Moulin even claimed that Pope Sixtus V had called for the deposition of King Henri III of France for neither heresy or apostasy. Furthermore, said du Moulin, popes had declared doctrines to be heretical which, in fact, were orthodox.[225]

Du Moulin systematically corrected the errors and cavils in each of du Perron's twelve examples of popes deposing kings for heresy over the eleven hundred years of the doctrine's supposed existence. In du Perron's first example of Emperor Anastasius the cardinal 'touched neither near nor far the question,' said du Moulin.[226] The pastor had learned from the success of du Perron's tactics at the Conference at Fontainebleau and focused on what he believed was his opponent's mishandling of the details of the argument.

Du Moulin even subtly questioned du Perron's loyalty to the French crown. Du Perron attributed the transfer of the Kingdom of Navarre from King Jean d'Albret to King Ferdinand of Aragon to d'Albret's violation of an alliance, not to the orchestration of Pope Julius II. Du Moulin charged that du Perron's unfounded explanation insinuated that King Louis XIII had no lawful right to the Kingdom of Navarre. The cardinal thus had made himself an advocate of the king of Spain against his own king.[227] Du Moulin thus again tried to deposit doubt into the minds of the Gallicans concerning the Ultramontane du Perron's loyalty to the French king.

Du Moulin then offered examples of the French crown standing up to papal tyranny. Beginning with King Philip the Fair, whose nobility 'carried another sort of courage than those who aided the cardinal in his harangue', du Moulin documented

---

[225] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 8–9.
[226] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 11: 'ne touche ni prés ni loing la question.'
[227] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 35.

the independence of the French crown and the French Church from the papacy.[228] In his explanation of the battle between King Louis XII and Pope Julius II, du Perron subtly taught that the French Church and crown had to judge whether or not papal deposition of a French king was lawful. If deposition was deemed unlawful, the kings could annul the pope's judgements and scoff at his anger.[229] Du Moulin concluded the section on French opposition to papal tyranny by referencing the papal bulls sent by Pope Gregory XIV in 1591 to King Henri IV declaring him unfit for the French crown. The Parlement of Paris had decreed the bulls to be invalid and had ordered them to be torn into pieces and burned by the public executioner. Du Moulin even credited du Perron for standing firm against Pope Gregory despite the charge of heresy against Henri.[230]

Du Moulin also discussed the French theologians. He argued that du Perron's treatment of them contained as many errors and misinterpretations as his historical account. The pastor began with Thomas Aquinas, who du Perron believed should have been counted amongst the French doctors despite being Italian.[231] Du Moulin also examined Robert Earl of Flanders (d. 1093), Hildebert of Le Mans, Bernard of Clairvaux, and John Major, like Aquinas, not in fact a Frenchman. Du Moulin offered his own citations of Major that appeared to contradict those of du Perron. He put forth similar quotations of Jacques Almain and claimed that the cardinal had intentionally misconstrued the words of Almain.[232] Du Perron produced passages that he claimed revealed Almain citing Ockham, yet they actually contained Almain speaking in his own words and giving his own opinion. Du Moulin also accused du

---

[228] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 32: 'estoyent alors d'un autre courage que ceux qui assistoyent M. le Cardinal en sa harangue'.
[229] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 34.
[230] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 37.
[231] Du Perron, *Diverses oeuvres*, 612.
[232] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 42.

Perron of slipperiness because anyone could attribute heresy to Augustine or Jerome by alleging that they approved of all the passages that they cited from other authors.[233] For this reason, said du Moulin, the cardinal had not reproduced passages in their entirety but only included fragments. Du Perron had truncated and concealed the words of Almain and even Almain's quotations of Ockham because they did not coincide with his argument.[234] Du Moulin included other quotations of Ockham by Almain and concluded that anyone could see that Ockham's opinion was far different from that of du Perron.[235] Again, du Moulin charged du Perron with a faulty method and faulty execution.

The cardinal, said du Moulin, had employed similar tactics with his quotations of Jean Gerson, ripping quotations from their contexts and claiming that Gerson offered his own opinions when he actually spoke in the character of the voice of sedition.[236] Du Moulin explained that neither of the two passages cited from Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologica* by du Perron contained what he alleged.[237] The cardinal, argued the pastor, handled theology as poorly as he handled history. Du Moulin concluded by reminding the reader of du Perron's dependence upon history, not theology or ethics. The cardinal 'says often that he speaks only of fact, as one who recognises that he does not have the right. He reports that which has occurred, but not that which ought to have occurred. This is to teach nothing.'[238]

In the declaration of King James, Pierre du Moulin displayed his convictions regarding theology and history. Scripture stood as the primary authority in questions

---

[233] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 42.
[234] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 42–3.
[235] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 43.
[236] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 44–6.
[237] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 43–4.
[238] Du Moulin, *Declaration*, 51: 'dit souvent qu'il ne parle que du fait, comme recognoissant qu'il n'a point de droit: il rapporte ce qui s'est fait, mais non pas ce qu'il falloit faire. Cela est ne rien enseigner.'

of right, and the ancient church served as a secondary authority. Only those who lacked support from Scripture and the ancient church turned to secular history to prove issues of right. Du Perron, said du Moulin, failed in his choice to argue from secular history and also failed in his execution of that argument. He criticised the cardinal for misreading and misunderstanding history and misquoting and misrepresenting the Church Fathers. Du Moulin also attempted to secure one of his and James's primary, but unstated, goals of adding to the dissension between Gallicans and Ultramontanes in the French Catholic Church by questioning du Perron's loyalty to the French crown.

A Posthumous Reply

Support from the Fathers

After King James and Pierre du Moulin published their reaction to Cardinal du Perron's speech at the Estates General of 1614, du Moulin noted that 'everyone expected to see the response very soon'.[239] However, Cardinal du Perron's reply, in French, to King James (and Isaac Casaubon) was not published until 1620, two years after his own death.[240] His brother Jean du Perron, Archbishop of Sens, dedicated to King Louis XIII 'the immortal and imperishable body of his writings, the work on which he ended his days and his life.'.[241] Du Perron's letter to Casaubon was included in the volume, and the majority of the reply itself was an expansion of the cardinal's

---

[239] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, ***v*: 'chacun s'attendoit d'en voir bien tost la response.'
[240] Du Perron, *Réplique a la Response du Serenissima Roy de la grand Bretagne* . . . (Paris, 1620). French editions of the *Réplique* were published in 1620, 1622, and 1633. An English edition was produced in 1630. I cite the 1620 edition because it was the edition used by Pierre du Moulin.
[241] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 4: 'le corps immortel et perdurable de ses escrits, l'oeuure sur lequel il a terminé ses jours et sa vie'. Jean also wrote the dedication to the king in the cardinal's *Traitté du sainct sacrement de l'Eucharistie*, published in 1622. The cardinal had left a lengthy manuscript of an additional reply to King James that has been preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale under the title *Oeuvres postumes de Messire Jacques Davy Cardinal du Perron*. Du Moulin, however, never addressed it.

observations produced in the letter. Du Perron argued against James's claim to catholicity based on his belief in all that the Church Fathers held was necessary to salvation, his affirmation that outside the church there is no salvation, and his assertion that his doctrine came from Scripture alone.

In his reply, Cardinal du Perron displayed his convictions regarding the appropriate use of the Church Fathers. Scripture and the Fathers, according to the cardinal, both held the necessary authority to serve as judges in controversies between Catholics and Protestants. Du Perron's two advancements related to the *consensus Patrum* thus enabled him to argue more strategically against his Protestant opponents.

Du Perron made it clear that his contention with King James was a question of history, not doctrine. James had to justify his claim to the title of Catholic by demonstrating that he believed everything that the church of the first four centuries believed was necessary to salvation. The point of contention was not what *ought* to be believed, but what *had been* believed. The king failed to realise, however, that 'among the things necessary to salvation, the primary and most necessary, is the knowledge and recognition of the Catholic Church.'[242] The cardinal boldly stated that his display of the unanimous consent of the Church Fathers would bring an end to his dispute with the king.[243] James would be left with no means of recovery. Therefore, du Perron's entire contention with King James depended upon the consent of the Fathers.

The cardinal also posited that James required sufficient justification for the separation of the Church of England from the Roman Catholic Church. The king (and all Protestants) held the burden of proof to demonstrate that du Perron's Church

---

[242] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 52: 'entre les choses necessaire à salut, la principale et plus necessaire, est la cognoissance et recognoissance de l'Eglise Catholique.'
[243] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 748.

espoused doctrine in opposition to salvation and destructive to the true church, which had not been held by the church of the first four councils.[244] The Roman Catholic Church did not have to prove its status as the one true church, said du Perron. James and Protestants, on the other hand, had to prove that it was not the one true church. In order to determine whether the Church in which du Perron served as cardinal was the same Church as that in the time of Augustine, one had to examine what had been believed, not what ought to be believed.[245] Du Perron charged that the king had to admit that the Roman Catholic Church better resembled the church of the first four ecumenical councils than did the Reformed Church. He predicted: 'Behold, what the most excellent king, when it pleases him to ponder it with sufficient leisure, will find what was the Catholic Church was in the time of St Augustine and of the first four councils. Let his Majesty see in these facial features if he recognises that [Church] of Calvin or of ours.'[246] The rules of disputation prevented du Perron from addressing other issues, but he claimed that it was not difficult, contrary to James's thinking, to prove that the contemporary Catholic Church held all things necessary for salvation.[247]

In support of his position du Perron cited Vincent of Lérins, who said that the correct doctrine is 'that which has been believed everywhere, always, and by all'.[248] Du Perron explained that Vincent used *toujours* to refer to possession and prescription, not demonstration. It denied preceding proof of the contrary but did not present current proof of the affirmative. When a new heretical doctrine arose, the

---

[244] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 599.
[245] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 588–9.
[246] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 87: 'Voila ce que le Serenissime Roy, quand il luy plaira d'y penser auec loisir suffisant, trouuera qu'estoit l'Eglise Catholique au temps de sainct Augustin et des quatre premier Conciles. Que sa Majesté voye si à ces traicts de visage elle recognoistra celle de Caluin ou la nostre.'
[247] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 603.
[248] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 724: 'ce qui a esté creu par tout, toujours, et par touts'. Du Perron cited the second edition of Vincent's *Pro Catholicae fidei antiquitate et veritate: adversus prophanas omnium haerese* . . . (Paris, 1586). The cardinal also cited M. de la Bigne's *Sacra Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum* (Paris, 1576): 'Et cela finalement se sera, si nous suivons l'universalité, l'antiquité et le consentement.'

church was not obligated to prove that it had been in possession of the orthodox doctrine in each preceding century. Rather, the church merely demonstrated that it had been in possession of the particular doctrine prior to the arrival of the heresy and that the heretics could not identify a point in the preceding centuries that the church had held the contrary position.[249]

Next, du Perron argued that participants in controversies between Roman Catholics and Protestants must submit to the common consent of the Fathers because God promised 'the aid of the holy Spirit in the common consent of the pastors of his church.'[250] Du Perron believed that the Protestant approach removed the testimony and weight of the ancient church. In the Protestant system, each individual stood above the Fathers to judge whether or not their interpretations of Scripture genuinely conformed to Scripture. These individuals then used their own interpretations of Scripture to advance their own purposes.[251] In contrast, the cardinal believed that the Fathers should speak for themselves.

Du Perron then charged that James had changed the rules of the dispute when he turned the discussion from his adherence to the doctrines necessary to salvation as taught by the Church Fathers to a discussion of the conformity of the doctrines of the faith to Scripture alone. The king had switched from history to theology, from fact to right. The cardinal argued from the Fathers that Scripture alone was insufficient to determine the doctrines of the faith. Du Perron offered the opinion of Epiphanius that it was necessary to use Tradition, 'for all things are not able to be drawn from Scripture.'[252] Epiphanius, whom Calvin had called an authentic witness, added that

---

[249] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 724.
[250] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 748: 'l'assistence de son sainct Esprit au commun consentement des Pasteurs de son Eglise.'
[251] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 749.
[252] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 751: 'car toutes choses ne peuuent pas estre prises de l'Escriture.'

'God the Father, the Son, and the holy Spirit have taught both without writing and with writing.'[253] Thus, du Perron's contention was that he (and Epiphanius) displayed the Tridentine position that the rule of Christ was found in Scripture and unwritten Tradition (*et–et*).

Advancing the Argument

In his reply to King James, Cardinal du Perron reiterated the two rules for understanding *consensus Patrum* that he had introduced in his letter to Casaubon.[254] The first rule stated that consensus was proven when the most eminent Fathers in each region reached agreement concerning a doctrine, with no dissent. The second rule stated that the Fathers often spoke not as doctors but as witnesses of the church in their days. The doctrines and practices of the church in their time and place to which the Fathers testified must be regarded as the result of continual succession from the Apostolic church, unless explicitly contradicted.[255]

Du Perron demonstrated his rule that *consensus Patrum* required agreement from the most eminent Fathers of each region by noting that Augustine cited eleven of the most significant fathers against the Donatists and that the Council of Ephesus produced ten fathers against Nestorius. Both Augustine and the council, therefore, believed that a consensus of prominent Fathers, though few in number, sufficiently proved the universal agreement of the church.[256]

Du Perron responded to King James's charge that the Roman Catholic Church bore the name 'catholic' differently than the Church in Augustine's day by adopting a

---

[253] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 751: 'Dieu le Pere, le Fils et le sainct Esprit a enseigné et sans écrit et par écrit.'
[254] See Chapter 6.
[255] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 747.
[256] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 747. Du Perron did not provide citations for Augustine or the Council of Ephesus.

similar approach to defining the catholic church as he did *consensus Patrum.* According to du Perron, no one understood the terms *catholic* or *consensus* to denote one-hundred percent agreement without exceptions. The Church of Augustine's time was catholic by synecdoche; the part stood for the whole. As the largest and most ancient church, it was called 'catholic' and 'the church of all nations' in comparison with the various sects and societies, even though it had not spread to every nation on earth. Du Perron concluded that 'the church did not bear the title of Catholic in another sense than it does now.'[257]

Du Perron demonstrated his second rule that the doctrines and practices of the Church in their time and place to which the Fathers testified must be regarded as Apostolic Tradition by using a quotation of Augustine against the Donatists. Augustine had said, 'If anyone requires divine authority in this matter, how much that the universal church holds, and which has not been instituted by Councils, but always has been preserved, is rightly believed not to have been handed down by tradition without Apostolic authority.'[258] The cardinal thus explained that Apostolic Tradition, which is displayed in the practices of the universal church, carried divine authority.

Du Perron again referenced Augustine to prove that universally accepted doctrines of the Church were regarded as having been handed down by the Apostles. Augustine claimed that 'the Apostles prescribed nothing on this point, but this custom, which was opposed to Cyprian, might be believed to have had its origin in their tradition, just as there are several things that the universal church observes and therefore are rightly believed to have been ordered by the Apostles, yet they are not

---

[257] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 88: 'l'Eglise ne portoit point lors le tiltre de Catholique en autre sens qu'elle fait maintenant.'

[258] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 751: 'Si quelqu'un en cela requiert authorité diuine, combien que ce que l'Eglise uniuerselle tient, et qui n'a point esté institué par les Conciles, mais a toujours esté retenu, se croid tres-droictement n'auoir esté baillé par tradition, sinon d'authoritié Apostolique.'

found in their writings.[259] In the category of doctrines derived from unwritten Tradition rather than Scripture alone the cardinal placed the necessity of baptism, free will, works of faith, the primacy of the papacy, and others. Du Perron affirmed that these doctrines were accepted universally by the Church of the first four councils and had been handed down by the Apostles.

In his reply to King James, Cardinal du Perron demonstrated his belief that Scripture and the teaching of the Church Fathers served as qualified judges in the controversies between Protestants and Catholics. He articulated his understanding that the Vincentian Canon referred to perpetual possession and prescription of doctrines but did not require a demonstration of continual adherence. The burden of proof thus fell on heretics, not the Church. Du Perron also utilised his two advancements regarding the *consensus Patrum* and provided a model for future Catholic apologists to follow. Indeed, du Perron profoundly influenced all francophone apologists, such that Jacques Solé claimed that 'apart from the Jesuits, all that matters at the beginning of the reign of Louis XIII, among the French-speaking Roman polemicists, from the Capuchins to the Dominicans via the Reformed apostates or the repentant former Leaguers, is gathered in the shadow of the cardinal.'[260] Even though du Perron's death closed this era of French Catholic polemics, he would provide his successors with plenty of ammunition to use against their opponents.

---

[259] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 756: 'les Apostres n'ont rien prescrit de cela, mais ceste coustume qui estoit opposée à Cyprian, doit estre creuë auoir pris origine de leur tradition, comme il y a plusieurs choses que l'Eglise uniuerselle obserue, et pour ceste cause se croyent à bon droict auoir esté commandees par les Apostres, encore qu'elles ne se trouuent point écrites.'

[260] Solé, *Le débat*, 1:27: 'En dehors des Jésuites, tout ce qui compte, au début du règne de Louis XIII, parmi les polémistes romains de langue française, des Capucins aux Dominicains en passant par les réformed apostats ou les anciens ligueurs repentis, se regroupe à l'ombre du cardinal.'

Thus, Pierre du Moulin would have much work and careful strategising to do in order to compose an answer that would not only refute du Perron but also satisfy his Protestant contemporaries.

Chapter 5

Intra-Protestant Polemics over the Use of the Fathers (1612–1619)

Pierre du Moulin did not limit his polemical activity to combatting Roman Catholic theology; he also took on his fellow Protestants. One of the primary battlegrounds of these debates was the nature of church government and pastoral ordination. Another pertained to the use of the Church Fathers and the role of the ancient church in contemporary theological controversies. Thus, du Moulin was shouldering a heavy polemical burden, having to fight on multiple fronts against two different groups of opponents.

Du Moulin's ecclesiastical commitments led him into a delicate situation involving Bishop Lancelot Andrewes of England. His presbytery requested that du Moulin provide an answer to the Jesuit Jean Arnoux's sermon before King Louis XIII in June 1617. In *De la Vocation des Pasteurs* du Moulin attempted to refute his Catholic adversary and satisfy his presbytery, all the while not jeopardising the patronage of King James. His remarks regarding Anglican episcopacy drew the ire of James, who commissioned Andrewes to correct du Moulin, and nearly cost him his benefices. Andrewes made it clear to du Moulin that the Church of England and its episcopate was off-limits in any anti-Catholic polemical work.

Du Moulin's commitment to James also led him into anti-Arminian polemics. The king initially commissioned him to write against Conradus Vorstius. Following the Synod of Dort, du Moulin published his answer to Arminianism. In both works, du Moulin displayed a somewhat different use of the Church Fathers than in his anti-Catholic works. Du Moulin's involvement with James in the plan for the reunion of

Christendom further complicated his position against these rogue Reformed Protestants.

De la Vocation des Pasteurs

Pierre du Moulin found himself in a predicament after Jean Arnoux preached a sermon before King Louis XIII in June 1617, in which the Jesuit attacked the confession of faith of the French Reformed churches. Du Moulin was charged by his three colleagues at the Charenton Church to produce a defence of the confession, which all four ministers signed.[1] In this short book he argued for the validity of the vocation of French Reformed ministers as articulated in Article 31 of their confession, a favourite target for Roman Catholic polemicists and a key point in Arnoux's sermon. Du Moulin continued his argument in favour of the content of this article the following year in *De la Vocation des Pasteurs*.[2] Later in 1618, he published *Bouclier de la Foy*, in which he gave a point-by-point defence of the entire confession against Arnoux's criticisms, including a lengthy section on Article 31.[3]

Du Moulin then faced a dilemma. In order to complete his task of defending the ministerial office of the French Reformed churches without facing censure from his fellow presbyters, he had to argue for parity amongst all clergy and against a divine prescription for episcopal government. At the same time, du Moulin had to avoid disparaging episcopacy itself or risk jeopardising the patronage of King James. In the end, he failed to satisfy both sides and faced rebuke from the king.

---

[1] Du Moulin, Montigny, Durand, Mestrezat, *Defense de la Confession . . . contre les accusations du sieur Arnould Iesuite* (La Rochelle, 1617).
[2] Du Moulin, *De la Vocation des Pasteurs* (Geneva, 1624).
[3] Du Moulin, *Bouclier de la Foy* (Paris, 1618), 504–21; du Moulin, *Buckler of the Faith* (London, 1620), 353–65. *Bouclier* and *Nouveauté du Papisme* became Du Moulin's most widely diffused works. In Metz, he ranked second to Calvin in popularity. P. Benedict, *Faith and Fortunes of France's Huguenots* (Aldershot, 2001), 166–9.

Du Moulin's approach to episcopacy more closely resembled that of John Calvin than the practice of the French Reformed churches. Calvin argued that Scripture interchangeably used the words for *bishop*, *presbyter*, *pastor*, and *minister*.[4] These are offices of each local congregation, not of an ecclesiastical hierarchy that oversees each congregation. Calvin clearly argued for the equality of all ministers, but he did allow for the appointment of moderators of ecclesiastical assemblies, the original role of bishops in the ancient church.[5] Appointment to this position of moderator could even be granted to one minister for life. Calvin, in fact, suggested that the king of Poland establish episcopacy within a synodical system, including the appointment of an archbishop of the entire church.[6]

The *Confession of Faith of the French Reformed Churches* was developed in 1559 through the influence of Calvin. The confession affirmed the parity of all ministers but also called for the election of superintendents, similar to Zurich's ecclesiastical government.[7] The superintendents were to consult amongst themselves 'by what means the whole Body may conveniently be ruled. . . . This doth not hinder but that in some Churches there may be those particular Constitutions, which will be more convenient for them than for others.'[8] The *Discipline Ecclésiastique*, however, shaped the practice of the French Reformed churches in a stricter manner than the confession. The Discipline made it clear that 'no minister shall claim or exercise any Primacy or Jurisdiction over another.'[9] The Discipline also prescribed that ministers 'shall preside by turns in their Consistories, that so none may claim a Superiority of

---

[4] See G. Sunshine, 'Reformed Theology and the Origins of Synodical Polity', in W. F. Graham, *Later Calvinism* (Kirksville, MO, 1994): 141–58.
[5] Calvin, *Institutes*, IV.iv–v; IV.xii.22.
[6] Sunshine, 'Reformed Theology and the Origins of Synodical Polity', 148; A. Ganoczy, *Calvin, Théologien de l'Eglise et du Ministère* (Paris, 1964), 389–90.
[7] The synods at Gap (1603) and La Rochelle (1607) affirmed the parity of ministers and the permanency of superintendents. Quick, *Synodicon*, i. xiii, 227, 266; Aymon, *Synodes*, i. 259, 303.
[8] Quick, *Synodicon*, i. xiii.
[9] Quick, *Synodicon*, i. xx.

his Fellow', a clear rejection of Calvin's allowance of a permanent moderator.[10] In provincial synods, a minister is chosen to be moderator, but that office 'shall expire together with the Synod', although the outgoing moderator could be chosen again at the next synod.[11] The French Reformed churches thus more firmly rejected episcopal government than did John Calvin, specifically with regard to the appointment of moderators of assemblies. Undoubtedly, their context within France and its Roman Catholic episcopal government influenced their position, as they sought to avoid any appearance of episcopalianism.

Nevertheless, du Moulin could have defended the ordination of the French Reformed churches while maintaining a high regard for Reformed episcopalianism, similar to the approach of William Perkins. The Church of England minister prescribed elements of presbyterian ecclesiology and indirectly criticised aspects of episcopalian ecclesiology but never mentioned the words 'presbyterian' or 'bishop'. At the time of the writing of *Vocation des Pasteurs*, Reformed Protestants in England, Scotland, Hungary and Transylvania, and Zurich all espoused some form of episcopal government. The Synod of Dort also reflected the amicable relationship between Calvinist presbyterians and Calvinist episcopalians.[12] George Carleton, Bishop of Llandaff, served as one of the British delegates to the Synod and essentially was treated as the first amongst equals. Carleton moved about with an entourage and stayed in accommodations separate from other delegates. He led the procession of delegates at the close of the synod and, according to multiple depictions of the synod, sat apart from the other delegates under a canopy. Other delegates who wrote of the

[10] Quick, *Synodicon*, i. xx.
[11] Quick, *Synodicon*, i. xxxix.
[12] Anthony Milton does note that Franciscus Gomarus expressed some resentment at the deference paid to Bishop Carleton. *British Delegation*, xxxv.

synod in diaries or letters referred to Carleton as 'the bishop', not 'Dr Carleton'.[13] This is not to say that the presbyterians and episcopalians at the synod took no issue with each other. Indeed, the British delegates gave an impassioned defence of episcopacy to the synod. However, a spirit of collegiality overcame the differences in ecclesiology. The British delegates were criticised harshly by some Anglican *iure divino* episcopalians, particularly the Laudians, for not condemning presbyterians at the synod. By the 1630s, the Laudians had such a rigid interpretation of *iure divino* episcopacy as a separate order that they alienated non-episcopal Reformed Churches in other countries.[14]

Defending French Reformed Polity

Du Moulin's conviction that polity is by ecclesiastical right, not divine right, shaped his defence of the ordinary and extraordinary callings of ministers articulated in Article 31 of the French Reformed Confession. As did most French Reformed theologians, he considered polity to be of the well-being (*bene esse*) of the church, not of the essence (*esse*). Therefore, du Moulin claimed that ordination through the hand of the bishop was not an essential point of doctrine or necessary for salvation.[15] Indeed, the succession of bishops was impossible to prove; true succession came through apostolic doctrine.[16] Nevertheless, Brian Armstrong claimed that 'on the matter of Apostolic succession, [du Moulin] departs significantly from the ordinary Reformed position. Most Reformed overtly denied the propriety of the idea of a "succession." . . . At this point he surely knew that he was at variance with the

[13] Milton, *British Delegation*, xxxv.
[14] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 483–5.
[15] Du Moulin, *Vocation des Pasteurs*, 17.
[16] Du Moulin, *Vocation des Pasteurs*, 41–50.

mainstream of his tradition.'[17] On the contrary, du Moulin's denial of the succession of chairs and affirmation of succession of doctrine securely placed him at the centre of the Reformed tradition. William Whitaker, du Moulin's teacher at Cambridge, stated that 'even if we should concede the succession of that church to have been unbroken and complete, yet it would be a matter of no consequence; because we do not consider the external succession of places or persons, but the internal of faith and doctrine.'[18]

Du Moulin argued that in moments of institutional apostasy God called men to the ordinary vocation of the ministry but added an extraordinary commission. He cited the prophets Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and John the Baptist, who fulfilled the ordinary office of prophet yet were employed by God for an extraordinary work. In a similar manner, God had called the sixteenth-century founders of the French Reformed churches to an ordinary vocation, but due to the corruption of the Church they also had an extraordinary commission. God's calling and charge of the ministers remained the same; the work seemed extraordinary only because of the inveterate corruption of the Church.[19]

The argument was similar to that made by Perkins in his *Treatise of the Duties and Dignities of the Ministerie*. Perkins argued that non-ordained men do not 'have the abilitie ordinarily by their good conference and Christian counsel' to convert a soul, pronounce the sentence of Law or Gospel, and perform other duties of ministers. Those abilities 'ordinarily belong to the publike Ministerie of the word'. However, 'in times or places where no Minister can be had, God blesseth the labours of private

---

[17] Armstrong, 'The Changing Face of French Protestantism', 144.
[18] Whitaker, *Disputatio* (Herborn, 1590), 575: 'Ut concedamus esse incorruptam et integram illius Ecclesiae successionem, nullius interim momenti ea erit; quia nos non externam illam locorum et personarum, sed internam doctrinae ac fidei successionem spectamus.' See also J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, IV.ii.2; *Selected Works of John Calvin*, iii. 243-5; vi. 108–10.
[19] Du Moulin, *Vocation des Pasteurs*, 21–2.

men that have knowledge', even for converting sinners to God and for comforting those near death. Perkins made it clear that this is 'extraordinarie, and in want of ordinarie Ministers'.[20] In those cases, though, 'a private man of knowledge and godlinesse is made a Minister for that time to himselfe, or to another; even as a private man in cases of extreme danger, when no Magistrate is present, is made a Magistrate himselfe to defend his owne life. So then as in want of a Magistrate, the sword of the Magistracie is put into the hands of private men.' Therefore, Perkins explained that 'in the want of Ministers, the keyes of the Ministerie are committed and put into the hands of private men, (as in the dayes of persecution).[21] Perkins reiterated that 'a private man is as a Minister for that time and in that case; but ordinarily (and alwayes in setled Churches) this power pertaineth to the Ministerie, and is theirs alone by ordination'.[22] Unlike Perkins, who maintained good standing with self-conscious episcopalians in the Church of England, du Moulin pressed the argument much harder and forced a reaction from defenders of episcopacy.

The national Synod at Gap in 1603 had judged that the preaching and reforming conducted by the founders of the French Reformed churches were established principally upon their extraordinary calls and were not dependent upon their prior ordinations in the corrupted Roman Catholic Church.[23] Du Moulin made it clear that the ordinary and extraordinary callings of Article 31 of the confession only applied to the French Reformed churches, not to the universal church.[24] His clarification echoed Mornay's explanation to King James of the ruling of the Synod at Gap fifteen years earlier.[25] The extraordinary callings of the Reformed ministers were

[20] W. Perkins, *The Workes of William Perkins* (London, 1631), 3:437.
[21] Perkins, *Workes*, 3:437–8.
[22] Perkins, *Workes*, 3:438.
[23] Aymon, *Synodes,* ii. 259; Quick, *Synodicon*, i. 227; Rawlinson D 538, 151.
[24] Du Moulin, *Vocation des Pasteurs*, 183–4.
[25] Mornay, *Mémoires et Correspondence*, ix. 543–4.

necessitated by the interruption of the true church in France, which was proven by historical events, not Scripture. Du Moulin explained that the Word of God provided the doctrines necessary for salvation, not a description of all future events or the possibilities of what might happen in France. Some well-intentioned individuals, he said, wished that the New Testament contained the Chronicles of the Kingdom of France.[26] He explained that a different polity applied to churches of the Reformation located in contexts where the institutional church had not been overcome by corruption. In those churches, the extraordinary call was unnecessary.[27]

In *Vocation des Pasteurs* du Moulin attempted to fulfil an almost impossible task of defending the extraordinary ordination of French Reformed ministers without denouncing Reformed churches that had episcopal government. Recounting the circumstances of the early days of the Protestant Reformation, du Moulin pointed out that in places where God transitioned Roman Catholic bishops 'to this excellent work, as in England, the name and degree of the bishop remained.'[28] His Reformed predecessor William Perkins had made a similar but more subtle case against apostolic succession and ordination by bishops alone and for extraordinary ordination in contexts of persecution and a lack of ministers. Unlike du Moulin, Perkins made his point while not overtly advocating presbyterianism and condemning episcopalianism, and thus drawing the attention of the authorities. Although du Moulin's direct connection of Roman Catholic and Anglican bishops was not egregious, the pastor could not avoid attracting the ire of King James.

---

[26] Du Moulin, *Vocation des Pasteurs*, 184.
[27] Du Moulin had made comparable statements regarding the validity of multiple forms of church polity eight years earlier in his first defence of King James. See du Moulin, *Defense de la Foy Catholique*, 475.
[28] Du Moulin, *Vocation des Pasteurs*, 23: 'à ceste oeuvre excellente, comme en Angleterre, le nom et le comme en Angleterre, le nom et le degré d'Evesque est demeuré.'

Rebuke from the King

Du Moulin eventually received word that *Vocation des Pasteurs* had 'grieved the soul' of King James. The king considered the work to be in overt opposition to episcopal government and an attack on the English episcopate. On 5 September 1618, the pastor adopted a deferential tone and attempted to defend himself in a letter to Lancelot Andrewes, whom James had commissioned to answer du Moulin's work. James's choice of Andrewes, one of his most trusted bishops, displayed the seriousness of the matter. Andrewes had assisted in James's coronation, and the king nearly had appointed Andrewes Archbishop of Canterbury in 1610.[29]

Du Moulin confessed to Andrewes that 'truly I came to the writing of this book unwillingly, but our church demanding it and pressuring for it immediately, for halting the impudence of our adversaries'.[30] He had no intention of denying the legitimacy of the office of the bishop; in fact, he had recounted its reception in the ancient church dating back to the Apostles.[31] Du Moulin then addressed the three main complaints of the king. First, he defended his statement that the names of *bishop* and *presbyter* are used interchangeably in the New Testament.[32] This did not diminish from the dignity of the bishop, said du Moulin, because he spoke 'only of the name, not of the office.'[33] He cited Jerome, Chrysostom, and Ambrose in his favour. Second, du Moulin affirmed that the order of bishop and presbyter are 'one and the same'.[34] The ancient church agreed with him, he claimed, as did the contemporary Roman Catholic Church. Du Moulin carefully distinguished between

---

[29] J. W. Legg, *The Coronation Order of King James I* (London, 1902), lxxix; P. Welsby, *Lancelot Andrewes* (London, 1958), 109–11.
[30] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 177: 'Ego vero ad scriptionem hujus Libri animum adjeci invitus, sic postulante Ecclesia nostra et jamdudum urgente, ad retundendam proterviam adversariorum'.
[31] *Lanceloti Episcopi Wintoniensis responsiones ad Petri Molinaei . . .*, in Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 175–6.
[32] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 176.
[33] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 176: 'de solo nominee, non de solo munere.'
[34] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 176: 'unum esse eundemque'.

order and degree: 'order is one thing, degree is another.'[35] Roman Catholic bishops and priests belonged to the same order, but they differed in degree. The same difference of degree applied to bishops and archbishops. Third, du Moulin reaffirmed his belief that episcopal government is by ecclesiastical right, not by divine right. Du Moulin informed the bishop that a minister of the French Reformed churches could not speak otherwise without incurring the 'censure of our synod'.[36] He reminded Andrewes that if episcopal government were by divine right, the French Reformed churches would be in error in a point of faith and thus would bear the mark of heresy.[37]

Du Moulin had not received a reply from Andrewes by 1 December of that year, so he composed a second, more terse letter to the bishop.[38] He abandoned the customary pleasantries and communicated in a manner closer to that of his polemical writings. Du Moulin reiterated to Andrewes that he did not oppose episcopal government, and that he hoped for harmony between churches with different forms of government for the sake of the gospel. 'I am not so obnoxiously arrogant as to oppose myself to all of antiquity and to scorn as impure and wicked that which has been received in the church from the era just after the Apostles.'[39] He bluntly repeated to the bishop that no pastors in French Reformed churches could believe in episcopacy by divine right because 'to assert this would be nothing else but to damn all our churches to hell and to pronounce a sentence of damnation on my own flock.'[40]

---

[35] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 176: 'aliud est ordo, aliud gradus.'
[36] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 177: 'censuram nostrarum Synodorum'.
[37] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 177.
[38] He included a copy of his new book, *Bouclier de la Foy*.
[39] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 189: 'Non sum tam fastidiose arrogans, ut velim me opponere toti antiquitati, et rem quæ jam inde a sæculo Apostolis proximo recepta fuit in Ecclesia, ut vitiosam aut improbam aspernari.'
[40] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 189: 'Hoc asserere, nihil aliud esset quam omnes nostras Ecclesias addicerere Tartaro, et in meum gregem damnationis ferre sententiam.'

Andrewes delivered his replies to both of du Moulin's letters at the same time. The bishop charged that du Moulin's defamation of episcopal government was, 'as it were, of the same condition' as that produced by Martin Bucer, the father of presbyterian government.[41] Andrewes respected du Moulin's mandate to defend his church's government against Roman Catholic criticisms, but encouraged the pastor to direct his retorts towards Rome, not the Church of England. He lamented: 'How I wish, therefore, that you had not touched on our [church].'[42] He scolded du Moulin for not seeking the king's advice before he published his work. Andrewes agreed with du Moulin's first point concerning the interchangeable use of the names of *bishop* and *presbyter;* he stressed, however, that one must not confuse the two offices that stood behind the names. He then corrected what he saw as du Moulin's errors with regard to degree and order; ecclesiastical offices differ both in degree and order.[43] Finally, Andrewes explained that episcopal government is by divine right, but it is not of the faith. It belongs to the practice of the Church, not the points of belief. A Church without episcopal government is not damned or lacking salvation. He was pleased to hear that the 'authority of the ancients will always be powerful' for du Moulin.[44] Du Moulin 'said too little', though, when he acknowledged that episcopal government had been received in the Church since the era just after the Apostles.[45] Andrewes informed him that it 'was received from the Apostles themselves.'[46] He encouraged the pastor to ingratiate himself with the king and to refrain from meddling in the affairs of the Church of England.[47]

---

[41] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 179: 'eadem quasi de re'.
[42] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 179: 'Quam vellem igitur, vel nostra ne attigisses quidem.'
[43] Archbishop William Laud followed Andrewes in his stressing of the episcopacy as a distinct order. See Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 468–70, 486–7.
[44] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 184: 'magnam apud te semper fore antiquitatis auctoritatem.'
[45] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 184: 'minus dixisti'.
[46] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 184: 'ab ipsis Apostolis receptum'.
[47] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 178–88, 190–2.

Pierre du Moulin approached his theological opponents with ferocity, whether they belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, or even his own French Reformed churches. Rather than accept Andrewes's mild rebuke and seek to return to James's good graces, he could not leave well enough alone and repeated his arguments to the bishop in a third letter. Du Moulin closed the letter by expressing his desire that 'all the Reformed churches, which are united in the same faith, be united in the same bond of ecclesiastical government.'[48] Whereas du Moulin enjoyed the theological sparring, Andrewes ended the exchange of letters by conveying his distaste for the conflict, which he compared to a cockfight. Andrewes implied that du Moulin's never-ending polemics had escalated a slight matter of James's displeasure with three points of the book into something more. He advised du Moulin to question the expediency of publishing additional works that indirectly impugned the English episcopate. Lastly, Andrewes warned du Moulin to avoid any attempts to produce arguments related to ecclesiastical government that satisfied both his own Church and the Church of England. The French Reformed churches would be displeased, and the Church of England needed no defence.[49]

Du Moulin could not comprehend Andrewes's position that episcopal government is by divine right, but it is not of the faith. Therefore, the lack of bishops in French Reformed churches did not condemn them as false churches. Andrewes's views reflected the perspective of many in the Church of England, even those advocating *iure divino* episcopalianism, regarding foreign Churches. Although they believed that episcopal government was mandated by God in Scripture, they did not regard Churches with presbyterian government as non-Christian. They recognised

[48] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 201: 'omnes Ecclesias reformatas, quas eadem fides sociat, ejusdem quoque politiæ Ecclesiasticæ vinculo sociari.'
[49] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 202–16.

that the particular circumstances of various Reformed Churches in Europe (including France) did not allow for the establishment of episcopacy. The evidence for Anglicans' acceptance of presbyterian government as defective but not heretical is their recognition of the ordinations performed by presbyteries as valid. In the few cases of men ordained under presbyterian government seeking ministerial positions in the Church of England, they were not required to be re-ordained under episcopal government.[50] Du Moulin also had no category for a doctrine being of faith but not being necessary for salvation. For him, only doctrines that were of the essence of faith were necessary for salvation and all doctrines necessary for salvation were of the essence of faith.

Du Moulin apparently took Andrewes's correction to heart. He sent Andrewes a copy of his book against the Arminians along with a note dated 1 September 1619.[51] He acknowledged the inevitable attacks the book would receive and declared, 'I shall readily think nothing of the judgments of others, if I satisfy yours. For you alone are equal to all, inasmuch as with me you are above all. . . . You will accept this volume as a token of my regard and entire devotedness to you, which is such that I had rather be corrected and taught by you than praised by others.'[52] The letter reveals du Moulin's respect for Andrewes's scholarship, even when taking into account the customary flattery of the letter writing of the day.

Pierre du Moulin attempted to satisfy his ecclesiastical commitments and avoid attracting suspicion from his colleagues in the French Reformed churches concerning his commitment to *sola Scriptura* and presbyterian government, while not jeopardising his patronage relationship with King James by dishonouring church

---

[50] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 481–2.
[51] Du Moulin, *Anatome Arminianismi* . . . (Leiden, 1619).
[52] A. Russell, *Memoirs of the Life and Works of Lancelot Andrewes* (London, 1863), 463. Unfortunately, Russell offered no source for the quotation.

tradition and disparaging episcopal government. Unfortunately for du Moulin, he failed on both counts, at least initially. His conflict with Isaac Casaubon over the use of the Church Fathers aroused doubts concerning his knowledge and discernment and possibly led to James's request for du Moulin to revise his treatment of the Fathers in *Defense de la Foy Catholique*.[53] It is conceivable that Casaubon upon his arrival in England influenced James, directly or indirectly, to deliver this criticism to du Moulin. Du Moulin's conflict with Lancelot Andrewes over the validity of bishops also aroused doubts concerning his biblical understanding, his commitment to Reformed ecumenism, and his judgement. The plan for the reunion of Christendom proposed by du Moulin and King James already was fading by the time of Andrewes's reply to *De la Vocation des Pasteurs*, but du Moulin's inadvertent slight against Anglican episcopacy certainly did not improve his standing with James. Du Moulin unfortunately did not have the skill or savvy to succeed in satisfying both his ecclesiastical overseers and his patron in this matter. Few contemporary theologians would have attempted such a feat, and even fewer, if any, would have succeeded. Fortunately, du Moulin proved more successful in satisfying both his ecclesiastical overseers and his patron in his anti-Arminian polemics.

Arminian Controversy

Du Moulin's *Anatomy of Arminianism* (*Anatome Arminianismi*), published after the close of the Synod of Dort in 1619, though it was written prior to the synod's commencement, contains his fullest evaluation of the Remonstrants' position. His initial offering in the Arminian Controversy, however, was a portion of the 1612 *Declaration . . . . in the cause of Conradus Vorstius*, written under the name of King

[53] See Chapter 5.

James.[54] In both works, du Moulin argued that the doctrines of the Remonstrants did not conform to Scripture, reason, or church tradition. He followed the mainstream Reformed approach of using *sola Scriptura* to defend the Reformed position and to attack that of his opponents, while viewing the Church Fathers not as vindication *par excellence* of the Reformed confession but as reliable secondary authorities in support of the Reformed interpretation of Scripture.

***Declaration du Serenissime Roy de la Grand Bretaigne . . . touchant . . . Conradus Vorstius* (1612)**

Conradus Vorstius, who succeeded Jacob Arminius as theology chair at Leiden, published a second edition to his *Tractatus Theologicus de Deo* in 1610 and a reprint of Faustus Socinus's *De Auctoritate Sacrae Scripturae* in 1611, to which he wrote a preface.[55] The Vorstius affair consumed James during the autumn and winter of 1611 and 1612, beginning when James received a copy of Vorstius's *Tractatus* from Archbishop of Canterbury George Abbot on 31 August 1611.[56] Isaac Casaubon recorded in his diary that most of his conversation with the king on 16 September 1611 involved the Vorstius heresy.[57] James opposed Vorstius because he believed that the German's heresies would weaken his Dutch allies and eventually spread to Great Britain. He also recognised an opportunity to bolster his reputation as a zealous

---

[54] James I, *Declaration du Serenissime Roy de la Grand Bretaigne, sur ses actions devers les Estats Generaux des Pays bas-unis, touchant le faict de Conradus Vorstius* (London, 1612); James I, *His Majesties Declaration concerna his proceedings with the States generall of the United Provinces of the Low Countreys in the cause of D. Conradus Vorstius* (London, 1612). Du Moulin produced multiple works on behalf of James. Vorstius was dismissed from Leiden in 1612 and was condemned as a heretic by the Synod of Dort and banished from the territory of the States-General.
[55] Vorstius, *Tractatus Theologicus de Deo* . . . (Steinfurt, 1610); Socinus and Vorstius, *De Auctoritate Sacrae Scripturae* . . . (Steinfurt, 1611).
[56] James, *His Majesties* Declaration, 3. For full treatments of the Vorstius affair, see A. W. Harrison, *The Beginnings of Arminianism to the Synod of Dort* (London, 1926), 165–89; F. Shriver, 'Orthodoxy and Diplomacy: James I and the Vorstius Affair', *English Historical Review*, vol. 85, No. 336 (July 1970): 449–74; E. Platt, *Britain and Bestandstwisten* (Göttingen, 2014), 38–58
[57] Casaubon, *Ephemerides*, ii. 880.

Defender of the Faith by challenging a theologian deemed heretical by both Catholics and Protestants.[58]

James lobbied the Dutch through Ralph Winwood, ambassador at the Hague. On the same evening that he received Vorstius's book, James wrote to Winwood and instructed him to inform the Dutch that Vorstius had published 'monstrous blasphemy and horrible Atheisme'. James, as Defender of the Faith, deemed the book worthy to be burned and Vorstius 'most severely punished.' Having heard that the majority of the Dutch states approved Vorstius to succeed Arminius at Leiden, the king warned 'how infinitly We shalbe displeased if such a Monster receive advancement in the Church.'[59] In Winwood's speech to the States-General, he explained that Vorstius held 'various fantastical opinions . . . against the orthodox belief of our religion.'[60] The king had read Vorstius's book and found it 'full of blasphemy, heresy, and atheism.'[61]

King James asserted his self-appointed role as leader of Reformed Protestantism in Europe in a letter to the States-General on 6 October 1611. He expressed hope that the states would extirpate the 'Atheismes and Heresies, and to the satisfaction not onely of us, but of all the reformed Churches, who have bene hitherto extremely scandalized therewith.' But if they refused to expel those who promoted ideas 'contrary to the beliefe of the true Catholike Church, We shall then bee constrained (in our great griefe) publikely to protest against these abominations; and (as God hath honoured Us with the Title of Defender of the faith) not onely to depart and separate ourselves from the union of such false and hereticall Churches, but also

---

[58] Platt, *Britain and Bestandstwisten*, 50.
[59] TNA SP 84/68 f. 117*r*.
[60] TNA SP 84/68 f. 133*r*: 'diverses opinions fantasticques . . . contra l'orthodoxe créance de notre Religion.'
[61] TNA SP 84/68 f. 133*r*: 'tout plein du blasphemie, heresie, et atheisme.'

to exhort all other reformed Churches to joyne with Us in a Common Councell, how to extinguish and remaund to help these abominable Heresies.'[62] James thus demonstrated to the States-General what Casaubon called his 'vehemence of zeal' to extend peace through doctrine beyond Great Britain to all Churches in all countries.[63]

James presented an entire volume against Vorstius to the States General in February 1612 that included excerpts from Vorstius's writings, copies of James's letters, and Winwood's speeches to the States-General.[64] James's *Declaration* was published in Latin, English, Dutch, and French. King James argued in the Vorstius affair that he had a right to the title of Catholic because he defended the orthodox faith as a would-be Constantine who could reunite Christendom. Even Catholics acknowledged his assault against heresy. Antonio Foscarini, the Venetian ambassador in England, wrote to the doge and the senate: 'Turning to the discourse he had recently published against Vorstius, he [James] said that he had defended therein the faith that is called Roman quite as much as any other creed of Christians; I replied that in truth his Majesty could not have spoken in more Catholic terms nor with greater piety; and that is actually the case. I praised his eloquence and lively style of presentation; his profound ideas. This pleased his Majesty.'[65] The importance of the Vorstius affair to King James is revealed in the full title of the English edition of the judgements of the Synod of Dort, published by Royal Printer John Bill: *The Judgement of the Synode Holden at Dort, Concerning the five Articles: As also their sentence touching Conradus Vorstius*. The Latin, French, and Dutch editions make no mention of Vorstius in the title.

---

[62] James I, *Declaration concerning Vorstius*, 22–3.
[63] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 4: 'zeli vehementia'.
[64] James I, *Declaration concerning Vorstius*.
[65] *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, xii. 306.

Although the *Declaration* concerning Vorstius was published under James's own name, Pierre du Moulin is likely responsible for the final form of the work. He wrote under James's name on other occasions and also had a personal interest in the matter, having served as Professor of Philosophy at Leiden in the 1590s. The first printing of the volume was done in Paris, an unusual occurrence for a publication by an English king. It probably was printed on the press that was once in du Moulin's home but had been moved to either the English embassy or to the home of Thomas Edmondes, English ambassador in Paris.[66] Also, the methodology of the work resembles that of du Moulin's other polemical writings. Du Moulin (and James) made no pretence that Vorstius was within the bounds of the Reformed confession or even orthodox Christianity, calling him a 'blasphemous Monster' and a man 'convinced of an infinite number of heresies.'[67]

Du Moulin's primary concern was not to refute Vorstius with careful exegesis of biblical texts but to argue from church tradition that the German theologian had abandoned the catholic faith. He took up the weapon of church tradition that Roman Catholics had used so often against him and used it to denounce the Remonstrant. He directed most of his focus to Vorstius's understanding of the Trinity, but he did address Vorstius's teaching on the 'nature and workes of God *ad extra*'. Du Moulin refrained from outlining the implications of Vorstius's views on the nature of God for his doctrine of election and providence until he was writing under his own name and not the king's.

Against the claim that Vorstius was not actually heretical but merely careless with his use of theological language, du Moulin said that it is unlawful 'to speake of

---

[66] See Armstrong, *Bibliographia Molinaei*, 151–2.
[67] James I, *Declaration*, 25, 34.

those great Mysteries of . . . God . . . unless we use the same phrases and manner of speech, which the Church of God hath alwayes used in speaking of the said Mysteries'.[68] Vorstius, however, had rejected the ancient creeds of the church and adopted the evasive character of the 'ancient Heretiques, and namely of Arrius, and Paulus Samosatenus, when they saw themselves pinched with the arguments of the Orthodox Church, and had no power to resist.'[69] Du Moulin learned from his interactions with Roman Catholics apologists, who often connected Protestants to known heretics, and linked Vorstius with the two ancient heretics, along with more recent heretics, including the notorious Anabaptist John of Leiden. Du Moulin believed that Vorstius's rejection of the ancient creeds and his resemblance to notable heretics made him worthy of condemnation.

In April 1612 the States of Holland ordered Vorstius to move to the city of Gouda for one year. He remained on study leave, receiving a professor's salary, until he resigned in May 1619. The Vorstius affair finally ended one month later when the Synod of Dort banished Vorstius from Holland.[70]

Anatome Arminianismi (1619)

In his initial proposal of his plan for the reunion of Christendom, du Moulin called for the composition of a joint confession which avoided issues that were not necessary to salvation, including the 'subtile opinions proposed by Arminius on free will, the perseverance of the saints, and predestination.'[71] This clause remained in the plan

---

[68] James I, *Declaration*, 56. 'That is is in no sort lawfull to speake of those great Mysteries of the Essence of God, of the Trinitie, of the hypostaticall union of natures in the Person of Christ, or any such high points, unless we use the same phrases and manner of speech, which the Church of God hath alwayes used in speaking of the said Mysteries.'
[69] James I, *Declaration*, 75–6.
[70] *The Judgement of the Synode Holden at Dort* . . . (London, 1619), 105–6.
[71] TNA SP 78/61 f. *68r*: 'opinions subtiles proposees par Arminius sur le franc arbiter, sur la perseverance des Saincts, et sur la Predestination.'

when it was brought before the French National Synods in 1614 and 1617 (Tonneins and Vitré).[72] This clause was omitted, however, in du Moulin's letter to Carleton in 1618, the contents of which made it to the Synod of Dort. In that final version, du Moulin called for the joint confession to avoid issues of polity and ecclesiastical discipline but did not suggest the exclusion of doctrine concerning free will, perseverance of the saints, or predestination.[73]

Nevertheless, du Moulin apparently recognized by late 1617 that the Remonstrants could not be welcomed to the table to compose this hypothetical joint confession of the Reformed churches. Despite his lofty goal of uniting all of Protestantism, du Moulin declared his opposition to any form of concession to or compromise with the Remonstrants and maintained that the confessional integrity of the Reformed churches outweighed any potential benefits of a counterfeit union with Arminians. No quarter would be given to those who 'violently carried with the itching of their own cleverness, run beyond the bounds of the word of God.'[74]

In a letter to English Secretary of State Dudley Carleton on 22 December 1618, Pierre du Moulin stated that an assembly as notable as the Synod of Dort 'ought not to be content with appeasing the troubles of the Church of the Low Countries, but also must prevent future evils and establish an order that can prevent such inconvenience from arising hereafter, not only in the Low Countries, but also everywhere else.'[75] Du Moulin proposed that the delegates to the synod compose a joint confession that contained the points of doctrine that all could affirm. This new

---

[72] Printed in Quick, *Synodicon* , I, 434–37; Aymon, *Tous les synodes*, II, 57–62.
[73] TNA SP 84/87 f. 111.
[74] Du Moulin, *Anatome Arminianismi* (London, 1619), 1: 'prurigine ingenii correpti ultra verbi divini metas excurrunt.'
[75] TNA SP 84/87 f. *111r*: 'ne se doit pas contenter l'appaises les troubles de l'eglise des pays bas, mais aussi doit prevenir le maux futurs et etablis un ordre que puisse empescher qu'un tel inconvenient ne puisse arriver cy apres, non seulement en pays bas, mais aussi par tous ailleurs.'

confession would be drawn from the confessions of all the represented Churches and would act as the 'cement of our union'.[76]

Pierre du Moulin completed *Anatome Arminianismi* by early 1618, yet publication was delayed by his fellow Parisian pastors and the French synod, who feared that the volume would prejudge the Remonstrants prior to the international synod.[77] When the book finally was published in the autumn of 1619, du Moulin commended the Synod of Dort and stated that there has been no synod 'more famous, more holy, nor more profitable to the church.'[78]

Scripture

Du Moulin used his primary weapon, *sola Scriptura*, both positively and negatively against the Arminians. Similar to his approach against Roman Catholics, he defended the Reformed position with brief quotations and expositions of Scripture but rarely, if ever, with detailed exegesis. For example, to explain the apparent paradox between God's sovereignty and man's responsibility du Moulin quoted more than ten passages of Scripture but offered little explanation.[79] He concluded the section with a lengthy passage from Augustine in support of his position.[80]

Du Moulin also used Scripture on the offensive against the Remonstrant position, giving a clear explanation of a passage and demonstrating his opponents' error. He declared, 'It is necessary that all doctrine in the matter of salvation which

---

[76] TNA SP 84/87 f. *111r*: 'le ciment de nostre union'. Printed in Dudley Carleton, *The Letters from and to Sir Dudley Carleton. . . during his Embassy in Holland, from January 1615/16 to December 1620* (London: 1780), 325–6.
[77] D. Sinnema, 'French Reformed Churches, Arminianism, and the Synod of Dort', in M. Klauber, ed., *Theology of the French Reformed Churches* (Grand Rapids, 2014), 98–136.
[78] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, iijv: 'nec celebrior, nec sanctior, nec Ecclesiae utilior.'
[79] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 301.
[80] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 302.

does not rest on the testimony of Scripture shall fall.'[81] Addressing the Remonstrant position on the free will of the unregenerate man, du Moulin declared, 'If they stand here in judgement of holy Scripture, there will be no place for doubting.'[82] Sadly, for du Moulin, the Remonstrants leave Scripture 'depraved.'[83]

Reason

Reason served as du Moulin's secondary weapon against the Arminians, for 'holy Scripture is supported by reason.'[84] Du Moulin, the former philosophy professor who had written a volume on Aristotelian logic, demonstrated the logical inconsistency of the Arminian position. 'They so implicate themselves', said du Moulin, 'that they appear either to desire not to be understood or they distrust with their own cause.'[85] For example, Arminius said that election is of those that believe. Du Moulin countered, 'But the dead ceased to believe. Therefore, Arminius ought to say, that he might be consistent to himself, that election is of those that cease to believe, and not of those that truly believe.'[86] The Arminians' unreasonable interpretation of Scripture forced them to rely solely upon human reason: 'Driven from holy Scripture, they fly to reasoning. Just as they use Scripture without reason, so they urge reasons without Scripture.'[87] This sounds remarkably similar to his statement against Catholics in *Apologie pour la saincte Cène*. In some cases, according to du Moulin, Catholics and Arminians employed their reason against Scripture. In other cases, they employed

---

[81] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 329: 'necesse est concidat omnis doctrina in salutis negotio, quæ non nititur Scripturæ testimonio.'
[82] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 267: 'Hic si statur iudicio sacræ scripturæ, nullus erit dubitandi locus.'
[83] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 314.
[84] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 145: 'Scripturæ sacræ ratio ipsa suffragatur.'
[85] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 144: 'ita ipsi se implicant, ut vel nolle intelligi, vel causæ suæ diffidere videantur.'
[86] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 145: 'at mortui desierunt credere: Debuit ergo Arminius, ut sibi ipse constaret, dicere electionem esse eorum qui desierunt credere: non vero credentium.'
[87] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 224: 'Excussi sacra scriptura confugiunt ad rationes. Quemadmodum utuntur scripture sine ratione, ita pugnant rationibus sine scriptura.'

Scripture against reason. 'In the first there is rashness, in the second there is obstinacy; error in the one and in the other', he concluded.[88]

Du Moulin's treatment of Arminian universal sufficient grace demonstrates his critique of their exegesis and reason. He said that Deuteronomy 29:4 ('The Lord has not given you a heart to understand or eyes to see or ears to hear') drove Arnoldus (Johannes Arnoldi Corvinus) to fits as he tried to explain the obvious contradiction within the Arminian system.[89] With his 'ridiculous acumen', Arnoldus claimed that God was willing to give the Israelites a heart to understand and eyes to see and ears to hear, but he was hindered by the Israelites themselves. 'Therefore', said du Moulin, 'they were able to obey God, before he had given them a heart. But to obey, that is itself to have a heart, therefore, they were able to have a heart before they had a heart. . . He should say, God has not given them a heart because they were without a heart, as if the physician would not heal a blind man because the blind man would not see the physician coming.'[90]

The Arminians, said du Moulin, served as their own worst enemy due to their lack of consistency. Although they condemned irresistible grace, which they portrayed as a 'monster whose beard they pluck and whom they prick with needles and sticks', Arminians actually upheld a form of irresistibility.[91] According to du Moulin, Arminians maintained that the Spirit can bring conversion by extraordinary means, including means that cannot be resisted. Du Moulin said 'Here we have them confessing themselves guilty. For by this saying, whatever they have built up they

---

[88] Du Moulin, *Apologie*, 29r: 'Au premier il a de la temerité, au second de l'obstination, de l'erreur en l'un et en l'autre.'
[89] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 333.
[90] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 333–4: 'Ergo poterant obsequi Deo antequam Deus eis dedisset cor: at illus ipsum obsequi est cor habere: ergo poterant cor habere antequam cor haberent: . . . Perinde ergo agit ac si diceret, Deum non dedisse eis cor quia errant sine corde: veluti si medicus nollet sanare cæcum, quia noluit medicum venientem aspicere.'
[91] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 392: 'monstrum cui barbam vellicant et quod acu et stilo compungunt.'

overthrow from the foundation. For if God converts certain men irresistibly, and gives them faith by his precise and absolute will, it is impossible that these should be elected for foreseen faith and by an election which rests on the foreseeing of faith. For he who is absolutely and irresistibly appointed to faith, must be absolutely appointed to salvation.'[92] Thus, du Moulin repeatedly used reason and a reasonable interpretation of Scripture against his Reformed Protestant opponents.

Tradition

Du Moulin's tertiary and perhaps his most intriguing weapon was church tradition. He made it clear that tradition rested on the foundation of Scripture and was subject to reason and experience. The Arminians stood 'against the doctrine of the orthodox church, which strips from man all free will in the work of salvation, supported by the word of God, and confirmed by sense itself and experience.'[93] The Arminian doctrine of universal sufficient grace 'pulls up the Christian faith by the roots, and is opposed to Scripture and experience.'[94]

Du Moulin looked to the Church Fathers for confirmation of his own scriptural interpretation. As with his anti-Catholic works, Augustine was his favourite author to cite.[95] Regarding Augustine's campaign against the Pelagians, du Moulin said, 'Therefore, we are indebted, after God, to the wit and industry of so great a man, that this deadly plague was expelled from the bowels of the church.'[96]

---

[92] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 392: 'Hoc enim dicto quicquid ædificaverunt à fundamento subuertunt. Si enim Deus conuertit quosdam irresistibiliter, eisque dat fidem voluntati præcisa absoluta, impossibile est hos esse electos ex fide præuisa, electione quæ innitatur preuisioni fidei. Nam qui absolutem destinatus est ad fidem et irresistibiliter, oportet absolutem destinatus sit ad salutem.'
[93] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 284: 'In doctrinam Orthodoxæ Ecclesiæ, quæ hominem irregenitum omni libero arbitrio in negotio salutis exuit, fultam Dei verbo et sensu ipso ac experiential comprobatam'.
[94] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 329: 'Christianem fidem à stirpe conuellit, et scripturæ ac experientiæ aduersatur.'
[95] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 24, 30, 35, 39, 60, 172, 221, 274, 298, 299, 302, 348, 349, 350, 352.
[96] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 348: 'Debemus ergo, post Deum, viri tanti ingenio et industriæ quod exitialis hæc pestis ab Ecclesiæ visceribus depulsa est.'.

Du Moulin concluded that John 12:40 ('He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart') refers to later sins being the punishment for former sins, as 'Augustine teaches throughout book 5 against Julian.'[97] In addition to Augustine, du Moulin referred to Jerome, Chrysostom, and Ambrose, and even sought support from Thomas Aquinas, whom he often paired with Augustine.[98] In his works against Roman Catholics, du Moulin used Thomas to attack his opponents but rarely to bolster his own position.[99] Since Arminians did not revere Thomas as the premier doctor of the Church, unlike post-Tridentine Roman Catholics, du Moulin could employ him for confirmation of the Calvinist interpretation of Scripture in engaging these opponents.

In addition to using church tradition and the Fathers to advance his own cause, du Moulin condemned Arminianism by associating it with known errors from church history. Arminians, 'who care nothing about whom they imitate, find someone who might provide protection for their errors.'[100] Unfortunately for them, they chose poorly. Du Moulin pointed out that Arminius adopted the teaching of John of Damascus on the antecedent and consequent wills of God. According to du Moulin, this doctrine was a 'fiction and insult to God.'[101] But Arminius made it one of his chief doctrines and 'as often as he is threatened by us, he creeps into this den like a lizard into a thicket.'[102]

Du Moulin also linked Arminianism to Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism, which were much more damaging associations than John of Damascus. Du Moulin stated 'Now it cannot be doubted, out of what pits they have drawn their ideas, and

---

[97] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 12: 'docet prolixem Augustinus lib. 5 aduersus Iulianum'.
[98] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 221, 255.
[99] He was critical at some points, though, of Thomas and the Schoolmen. Du Moulin, Anatome, 22.
[100] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 49: 'quibus nihil pensi est quos imitentur, dum aliquid inueniant quod faciat ad præsidium erroris sui.'
[101] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 113: 'figmentum, et rem in Deum contumeliosam.'
[102] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 25: quoties urgetur à nostris, in hanc latebram ut lacertus in dumeta correpit.'

which of the ancient heretics they have proposed for themselves to imitate.'[103] Du Moulin quoted Prosper of Aquitaine's letter to Augustine, which is contained within Augustine's collected works, regarding semi-Pelagianism (the universal extent of Christ's atonement and election based on foreseen faith) and concluded of that doctrine, 'This is pure Arminianism, the same opinion; we are assaulted with the same calumnies as Augustine.'[104] He went on to say that in the denunciations in the Epistle of Prosper 'you will plainly recognise the Arminian vein, and Arminianism graphically depicted.'[105] Du Moulin said that if the title and author of the work were not known, anyone would think that the letter was written against Arminians. After recounting the semi-Pelagian teaching on foreseen faith and the universal extent of the atonement, du Moulin reiterated his judgement that 'This is pure Arminianism, except Arminians clothe themselves more attractively and paint themselves with costly colours, and use the word merit more sparingly.'[106] In response to Arnoldus's accusation that Reformed doctrine makes ministers sluggish in their ministry because their diligence only affects those whom God has predestined to save, du Moulin said, 'The Pelagians objected the same things to Augustine.'[107]

Du Moulin addressed free will in a chapter entitled 'Objections which Arminians borrow from Pelagians and Papists answered.'[108] He recounted the Arminians' charge that, according to Calvinist doctrine, an unregenerate man necessarily sins and does nothing but sin. Those promoting free will argue that an act

---

[103] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 350: 'Ut iam non possit esse dubium ex quibus lacunis sua hauserint, et quos veterum hæreticorum sibi imitandos proposuerint.'
[104] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 149: 'Hic quidem merus est Arminianismus: eadem sententia: calumniis incessimur quibus Augustinus.'
[105] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 350: 'Ibi sane plane agnosces Arminianam venam, et Arminianismum graphic depictum.'
[106] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 352: 'Hic quidem merus est Arminianismus, nisi quod Arminiani sua speciosius vestiunt et conquisitis coloribus fucant, et parcius ut utor voce meriti'.
[107] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 172: 'Eadem obiiciebant Pelagiani Augustino'.
[108] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 293: 'Soluuntur obiectiones quas Arminiani à Pelagianis et Pontificiis mutuantur.'

committed necessarily cannot be classified as sin because it cannot be avoided. Du Moulin retorted 'This Pelagian cabbage, the sectarians repeat to us and sing the same song a thousand times.'[109] After quoting Augustine's opposition to Celestius, a Pelagian, over the same subject, du Moulin said 'Therefore, in Arminius we have Pelagius resurrected.'[110]

Concerning universal grace, du Moulin argued that Arminians 'distance themselves very little from Pelagians.'[111] Lest he be seen as an 'enemy of grace', Pelagius credited grace for every good work done by man. However, by grace he 'understood nature itself, because it was established by God.'[112] Arminius distinguished between nature and universal grace but made it clear that God gave nature and grace to all men. Everyone, according to Arminius, possesses sufficient grace to obtain faith and, thus, salvation. Du Moulin concluded that 'Pelagius confuses nature with grace, but Arminius unites nature and grace.'[113] By linking Arminians with Pelagians and semi-Pelagians, known heretics, du Moulin attempted to discredit his opponents while also reminding Calvinists of the severity of the Arminian error. Therefore, the Arminian Controversy was no small intra-Reformed debate.

Although King Louis XIII barred Pierre du Moulin and his French Reformed colleagues from attending the Synod of Dort, the Parisian pastor still played a significant role in the Arminian Controversy within the Reformed churches. He sought to prove that Arminianism was a damnable heresy, on par with Pelagianism

---

[109] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 294: 'Hanc Pelagianam crambin nobis reponunt sectarii, et millies eadem occinunt'.
[110] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 298: 'Ergo in Arminio habemus rediuiuum Pelagium.'
[111] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 327: 'perexiguo discrimine à Pelagianis distare.'
[112] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 327: 'intelligebat ipsam naturam, quippe quæ à Deo esset condita.'
[113] Du Moulin, *Anatome*, 327: 'Pelagius naturam confundit cum gratia, sed Arminius naturam et gratiam sociat.'

and semi-Pelagianism, and not simply an alternative approach to Reformed theology. In his works against Arminians, du Moulin used Scripture, reason, and church tradition to refute his opponents and to support his own position. He followed the mainstream Reformed approach of using *sola Scriptura*, while employing the Church Fathers as reliable secondary authorities in support of the Reformed interpretation of Scripture but not as vindication *par excellence* of the Reformed confession.

Unfortunately for du Moulin, his plan for Protestant union got lost in the Arminian controversy. He had hoped that the Synod of Dort would provide an opportunity for the presentation of his plan of union, and had submitted his proposal to them advocating the formulation of a joint confession and an invitation to Lutherans for dialogue.[114] Unfortunately for James and du Moulin, the synod quietly dropped the matter.[115] Had du Moulin been allowed to attend the synod the outcome to his plan for reunion probably would have been the same. His inability to persuade delegates of his proposal in person, though, virtually guaranteed its failure. At the same time his plan for reunion was sinking, du Moulin severely strained his relationship with James due to the controversy over *Vocation des Pasteurs*.

The relationship between King James and Pierre du Moulin was primarily a business relationship. Both men undoubtedly admired one another and appreciated each other's company and conversation, as evidenced by James allowing du Moulin to stand behind the royal chair during dinner and inviting the pastor on his royal tour of the south of England. When James grew bored with the plan for the reunion of Christendom after the Synod of Dort, the matter was dropped. He did not deliberate

---

[114] TNA SP 84/87 f. 111*r–v*; W. B. Patterson, 'Pierre du Moulin's Quest for Protestant Unity', in R. Swanson, ed., *Unity and Diversity in the Church* (Oxford, 1996), 54. King James approved of du Moulin's proposal to the synod. TNA SP 84/87 f. 174*r–v*.
[115] TNA SP 84/88 ff. 174, 186*v*; A. Milton, ed., *British Delegation and the Synod of Dort* (Woodbridge, 2005), xli.

with du Moulin about whether or not to continue with the plan; the French pastor's wishes were immaterial to the king. Du Moulin never expressed his opinion publicly and certainly never criticized James for giving up on the plan. If he had wanted to continue with the plan, he knew that his own desires meant nothing without the backing of the king.

Chapter 6

Du Moulin's Final Activity in the Oath of Allegiance Controversy (1615-1627)

Pierre du Moulin achieved maturity as a polemicist and churchman during the final years of the Oath of Allegiance controversy. Having learned from his previous experiences, he produced his most influential polemical work, *Nouveauté du Papisme*, in 1627. Other Reformed Protestant polemicists built upon this work, particularly its use of the Church Fathers, and in doing so, altered the direction of anti-Catholic Reformed polemics, although not all acknowledging du Moulin as a proponent of this strategy.

Because the political and theological circumstances in both England and the rest of Europe had changed so drastically by the time the Oath of Allegiance controversy concluded, a survey of this state of affairs is invaluable in helping us understand what was at stake for du Moulin as he composed his capstone polemical work.

Louis XIII's Wars of Religion

While du Moulin was busy engaging in his polemical battles, the political situation in his native land was changing for the worse for the Huguenots. The conflict between Catholics and Reformed Protestants was not limited to treatises and public debates. At times, it erupted into physical conflict. Most notably, the rebellion of Protestants in Bohemia and the start of the Thirty Years War refocused the attention of King Louis XIII on Reformed Protestantism in France. Initially, the French maintained a position of neutrality in the conflict between Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II, a Roman Catholic who had been chosen to be the future king of Bohemia in an election

in 1617, and the Elector Palatine Frederick V, a staunch Protestant who was selected by Bohemian Protestant insurgents in a subsequent election in 1619, even though France had been allied with the German Protestants of the Evangelical Union, of which Frederick was a member. However, on Christmas Day of 1619, Louis made a promise to Ferdinand's ambassador to send troops to support the Holy Roman Empire, thus turning his back on France's German Protestant allies and aiding the Habsburgs, France's long-term enemies, as well as the Catholic League. The French government soon rescinded Louis's promise. The Treaty of Ulm followed in July 1620, in which the Protestant Union declared neutrality in the conflict between Ferdinand II and Frederick V.

In the autumn of 1620, Louis travelled southwest and declared the annexation of Lower Navarre and Béarn, two Protestant territories, to the French crown as part of his anti-Huguenot measures. Catholic Church property was restored, and Catholic worship was reinstituted. Huguenots responded to the king's actions by organising defences of their territories throughout the country, and an uprising by Huguenots in southern France began the 'wars of religion' of Louis XIII'.[1] Louis wanted to suppress the Huguenots before the conflict expanded because, as Tapié noted, 'Protestants in conflict with their own king were bound to look for support abroad and to press foreign rulers of the same religion as themselves to intercede on their behalf.'[2]

King James's ambassador in France, Edward Herbert, reported that Charles Albret, the Duke of Luynes and a favourite of the French king, advised Louis 'to war against his subjects of the reformed religion in France; saying, he would neither be a

[1] V-L. Tapié, *France in the Age of Louis XIII and Richelieu*, 119.
[2] Tapié, *France in the Age of Louis XIII and Richelieu*, 107.

great prince as long as he suffered so puissant a party to remain within his dominions, nor could justly style himself the most Christian king, as long as he permitted such heretics to be in that great number they were, or to hold those strong places which by public edict were assigned to them; and therefore, that he should extirpate them as the Spaniards had done the Moors'.[3] Louis approved this advice, as did the Jesuits. On the other hand, others had advised the king that it was better 'to have a peace which had two religions, than a war that had none.'[4] Despite his appeals for restraint, Herbert noted that the 'war now went on with much fervour; neither could I dissuade it, though using, according to the instructions I had from the king my master, many arguments for that purpose.'[5] King James, doing what he could to protect the Huguenots, attempted to sway Louis towards peace, to no avail.

Louis's army advanced on Huguenot territories in 1621 under the leadership of Luynes, laying siege to Saint-Jean d'Angély and removing Mornay from his post as governor of Saumur. Henri, Duke of Rohan, and his Huguenot troops rebuffed the royal army at Montauban, though, and Luynes was forced to make arrangements for peace with the leader of the Huguenots. During riots against Protestants in September 1621, the church at Charenton was burned down. In August 1622, Louis's troops launched a siege on Montpellier, a Huguenot stronghold, until Rohan again agreed to a peace. The Treaty of Montpellier, signed on 18 October, affirmed the Edict of Nantes and called for the dismantling of Huguenot fortifications at Montpellier, Uzès, and Nîmes.

However, Louis did not honour all the terms of the treaty. Rohan therefore clashed again with the king's forces in 1625, resulting in the capture of Ile de Ré.

---

[3] Edward Herbert of Cherbury, *The Life of Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury* (London, 1826), 263–4.
[4] Herbert, *Life*, 264.
[5] Herbert, *Life*, 265.

Following these events, Louis determined to end the nuisance of Huguenot uprisings. The final blow to the military might of the Huguenots came with the siege of La Rochelle, the most fortified Huguenot city, in 1627–1628. After France's secret peace with Spain in 1626, England encouraged Huguenot dissent as a means of curtailing the expansion of French power, particularly its navy. King Charles I of England sent eighty ships, under command of the Duke of Buckingham, to aid the Huguenots against the French crown. Buckingham's arrival with 6,000 troops at Ile de Ré in June 1627 launched the Anglo-French War of 1627. Unfortunately, after depleting his resources in the unsuccessful siege of Saint-Martin-de-Ré, Buckingham had to return to England. The French army surrounded La Rochelle in August 1627 and prepared for a siege. The Huguenots retaliated with cannon shots on the royal troops on 10 September. By March 1628, the entire city was blockaded. The Huguenots again looked to England for support. A fleet led by the Earl of Denbigh left in April 1628, but soon returned to Portsmouth without engaging French royal troops. The Earl of Lindsey led an expedition in September 1628 that weakened French positions but failed to dismantle the sea wall. The English ships withdrew, and La Rochelle surrendered on 29 October 1628 after 14 months of resistance. The rebellion ended with the Peace of Alais, which again affirmed the Edict of Nantes but stripped the Huguenots of their political rights and ordered that they relinquish all remaining cities and fortresses. Even though the Peace did grant the Huguenots amnesty, the fact remained that after the fall of La Rochelle Huguenots could no longer look to Protestant liberators in other countries, especially England, for aid.

The increasing marginalisation and suppression of the Huguenots by the Roman Catholic majority in France elevated the importance of Pierre du Moulin's polemical activity. He argued not for abstract theological concepts but for the French

Reformed's very right to exist. His polemical works had to strengthen the resolve of the Huguenots, convince Catholics to convert to Protestantism, and persuade Protestant heads of state to come to the aid of the French Reformed. Unfortunately, as the introductory chapter of this thesis described, du Moulin's serious mistake in soliciting King James's aid for France's enemies in the Thirty Years War led to his exile from France to Sedan in 1620. The increasingly hostile climate of the early 1620s, both in France and the rest of Europe, probably made du Moulin's exile inevitable, even if he had been more careful in his dealings.

Questions of Loyalty

Pierre du Moulin's unusual activity in the early 1620s led Brian Armstrong to challenge the pastor's commitment to presbyterianism. Armstrong claimed that du Moulin had an 'uneasiness with the system of presbyterial church government' and possessed a 'predilection for a more authoritarian system'.[6] Armstrong cited du Moulin's request to be named Bishop of Gloucester in 1624.[7] As the introductory chapter showed, du Moulin had sent a letter to James requesting help for his son-in-law the King of Bohemia, but this letter had been intercepted by the French crown. Du Moulin consequently had to flee to Sedan, and then James invited him to England to produce a final response to Cardinal du Perron.[8] James, 'moved with compassion by the adversities the Doctor had suffered for his sake', promised du Moulin long-term refuge and a university position.[9] In October of that year, du Moulin wrote to both James and secretary of state Edward Conway requesting that he be made Bishop

[6] Armstrong, 'The Changing Face of French Protestantism', 140.
[7] Armstrong, 'The Changing Face of French Protestantism', 140–1.
[8] Du Moulin had permission from Secretary Conway 'to remain or not, as he pleases.' TNA SP 14/153 f. 59. Jacques Davy du Perron, *Replique a la Response* . . . (Paris, 1620). See du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', 474; Aymon, *Synodes*, ii. 273; Quick, *Synodicon*, ii. 105.
[9] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', *****2.

of Gloucester.[10] Conway replied politely and offered du Moulin financial contributions but made no mention of the Frenchman's unusual request.[11]

Despite Peter du Moulin's claims that his father never was 'a good hunter of preferments', du Moulin's desperation brought on by medical and financial hardship in England drove him to appeal to James to fulfil his promise of providing for the needs of the du Moulin family.[12] Severe illness overtook du Moulin in England, such that he wrote to James in August 1624 and requested that, upon his death, his benefices transfer to his two sons who were preparing for ministry.[13] He was so desperate that he continued to pester the king even after the king's exchequer, Richard Watson, promised him 100 *livres*.[14] Secretary Conway wrote to du Moulin on 2 September and conveyed that the king grieved for his illness and promised benefices for his two sons.[15] The vacancy in the episcopate provided the first opportunity for James to keep his word to du Moulin concerning long-term refuge.[16] Du Moulin might have feared that it would be the last opportunity, for the king was in poor health. The appointment to Gloucester was the last of James's reign, and he chose Godfrey Goodman to fill the office; with a certain poetic justice on the decision, Goodman turned out to be the only Church of England bishop to convert to Rome before the modern era. Du Moulin's desperation continued after his failed request to

---

[10] Du Moulin to James, TNA SP 78/61 f. 129; Du Moulin to Conway, TNA SP 78/73 f. 254.
[11] TNA SP 78/73 f. 277. The secretary promised a stipend of 100 livres per year and a gift of 200 livres. On 20 November 1624, du Moulin received 200 *livres* from Richard Oliver, secretary to the Duke of Buckingham. TNA SP 14/175 f. 21*r*.
[12] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', *****2.
[13] TNA SP 14/214 f. 77*r*. His son, Peter, succeeded his father as Canterbury canon in 1660. Hasted, *The History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*, 12 vols (Canterbury, 1791–1801), xii. 68.
[14] Watson to Secretary Conway, 31 August 1624. TNA SP 14/171 f. 127.
[15] TNA SP 14/214 f. 77.
[16] TNA SP 78/73 f. 254. Peter du Moulin mistakenly wrote that his father sought to become master of the Savoy Hospital about six months after his arrival in England (ca. September 1624). Despite promising du Moulin the position, James succumbed to the persuasions of his Scottish advisors and offered the post to Walter Balcanquhall. 'Authors Life', *****2. Peter du Moulin confused the timing, however. Balcanquhall was master of Savoy Hospital from 1617–1640, with a three-year interval (1618–1621) during which he served as a delegate to the Synod of Dort. See *ODNB*, *sub voce*.

be made bishop. John Packer wrote to Secretary Conway on 27 November 1624 recommending du Moulin for the deanery of Ripon, if it could be held without residence.[17] On 11 January 1625, du Moulin was presented to the rectory of Llanarmon in the diocese of St. Asaph, which had been voided by the promotion of Goodman to Gloucester; an ironic if appropriate piece of preferment.[18] Once more, this was clearly intended to be a non-resident appointment.

In addition to du Moulin's request for a bishopric, Armstrong cited three events as proof of his conclusions.[19] First, at the national Synod at Gap in 1603, du Moulin preferred to modify the language of Article 31 on ordination to affirm the uncorrupted elements of the founders' corrupted ordinary callings. He compared their callings to pure water passing through an impure channel.[20] Du Moulin's disagreement with the wording of the article was a matter of little consequence and should not cast doubt on his adherence to presbyterian polity. Second, Jean Hotman, Marquis de Villers, relayed to Isaac Casaubon that he had heard du Moulin, when in England, express his hope that the French churches adopt the Church of England's form of ecclesiastical government. Furthermore, du Moulin had also said that the English Church most closely resembled the Church of the first four centuries in its ceremonies and teaching.[21] Armstrong also noted, though, that Hotman considered du Moulin to be 'imprudent, impudent, and an ingrate, all in one.'[22] Hotman was recounting du Moulin's statements from at least twenty-two years earlier, the last time du Moulin had been in England. Even if Hotman's memory is to be believed, du

---

[17] TNA SP 14/175 f. 86.
[18] *CSP, Domestic: James I, 1623–1625*, 444.
[19] Armstrong, 'The Changing Face of French Protestantism', 140.
[20] Du Moulin, *Vocation des Pasteurs*, 21–3.
[21] BL, Burney MS. 367, f. 23*r*.
[22] Armstrong, 'The Changing Face of French Protestantism', 135. For the contentious relationship between du Moulin and Casaubon, see M. Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon* (Oxford, 1892), 401–5.

Moulin's statements do not impinge on his support of the presbyterian system under which he served. Despite his expression of hope that episcopal government would be adopted in the French Reformed churches, he did not attempt to implement it in these churches or undermine the existing system. Instead, du Moulin's pragmatic approach allowed him to adapt to his ecclesiastical environment. Hotman's testimony of du Moulin's acknowledgement that the Church of England closely resembled that of the first four centuries coincides with du Moulin's attestations to the presence of bishops in the ancient church.[23] Third, Armstrong claimed that du Moulin's behaviour on several occasions suggested that he thought of himself as a bishop, most notably at the national Synod at Alès in 1620. This is hardly novel, though. Reformed ministers dating back to Zwingli and Calvin had been accused of acting like bishops, popes, or even tyrants. For example, a pamphlet circulated after the Synod at Privas in 1612, at which du Moulin served as vice president under the president, Daniel Chamier, was entitled *Portrait du pontife Chamier et son vicaire Du Moulin*.[24] If abuse of authority by adherents of presbyterian government signalled covert episcopalianism, there would be few genuine presbyterians.

Armstrong explained that du Moulin's request to be made bishop coincided with his hope for a central role in a unified Protestantism and 'is probably best understood in this context, even though at the time of the request (late 1624) his dream of a European coalition under James must have been fading rapidly.'[25] Rather, du Moulin's request seems more comprehensible when understood in the context of the failure of his pursuit of Protestant unity. If du Moulin was lobbying for a position of power in a unified Protestantism, the bishopric of Gloucester, the poorest in the

[23] Andrewes, *Opuscula*, 175–6.
[24] See Armstrong, '*Semper Reformanda*', in F. Graham, ed., *Later Calvinism* (Kirksville, MO, 1994), 133 n. 39.
[25] Armstrong, 'Pierre Du Moulin and James I', 22.

Church of England, surely was not it.[26] By 1624, du Moulin had realised that the plan for reunion had failed and he desperately needed a consistent income and a permanent position in a stable Church, which he could not find in the French Reformed churches after his exile to Sedan. His partnership with James for the reunion of Christendom had ended, but he still hoped to maintain a close relationship with James and possibly secure a place in the Church of England.[27]

Elizabeth Labrousse attributed the 'preposterousness' of du Moulin's request to his blindness 'to the realities across the Channel', despite the fact that he 'was anything but a fool.' Although he was a 'learned theologian', he had 'not at all grasped the Anglican niceties'.[28] Nevertheless, it is difficult to believe that du Moulin failed to grasp the 'niceties' of the Church of England's polity during his four years in Cambridge and London (1588–92), his two extended stays in England (1615 and 1624–5), or through his relatively close relationships with at least three English bishops (Andrewes, James Montague, and Joseph Hall).[29]

Labrousse attributed the misunderstanding of the ecclesiology of the Church of England by du Moulin and other Huguenots to their doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. She explained that a 'clergyman in the Church of England who is ordained by a bishop (and not consecrated by his peers, as in the Calvinist system) is indeed a *priest*, who takes his place in the long chain of apostolic succession.'[30] Labrousse mistakenly identified the 'Calvinist system' with presbyterian

---

[26] In 1680, the bishopric was worth £315 per year. *A Book of the Valuations of All the Ecclesiastical Preferments in England and Wales* . . . (London, 1680), 111.
[27] After James's death in 1625, du Moulin attempted to develop a similar relationship with James's heir. He dedicated the reply to du Perron to King Charles. *Nouveauté du Papisme* (Sedan, 1627).
[28] Labrousse, 'Great Britain as Envisaged by the Huguenots', 147.
[29] For Montague, see P. Colomesius, *Opera, Theologici* (Hamburg, 1709), 531–2. At some point during his initial stay in England, du Moulin struck up a friendship with Joseph Hall, later named Bishop of Exeter and then Norwich. He informed du Moulin in 1611 that 'since your travels here with us, we have not forgotten you: but since that, your witty and learned travels in the common affairs of religion have made your memory both fresh and blessed.' J. Hall, *Works*, 10 vols (Oxford, 1843), vi. 263.
[30] Labrousse, 'Great Britain as Envisaged by the Huguenots', 147, emphasis original.

government.[31] She failed to realise, however, that at the time of du Moulin's request a large percentage of English priests and even bishops were Calvinists.[32] When James enquired of his council as to why some bishops favoured puritans, the Earl of Middlesex, Lionel Cranfield, replied that it was because James had made so many Puritans bishops.[33] In fact, when du Moulin wrote to James in 1624, 'Calvinists' or Reformed Protestants in England, Scotland, Zurich, Hungary, and Poland all espoused a form of episcopal government in their ecclesiastical systems.

Labrousse noted that Church of England parishes welcomed French laity but required ministers who 'naïvely applied to minister to a parish in England' to submit to ordination by a bishop. There were exceptions, including du Moulin, but the practice 'was made absolutely binding after the Restoration.'[34] Labrousse did not mention the Subscription Act (1571), which admitted the ordination of presbyterian churches.[35] The Archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund Grindal granted ministerial licenses to men ordained as presbyterians, including John Morison, a minister from Scotland.[36] The Church of England did not mandate episcopal ordination until the Act

---

[31] Bernard Cottret makes a similar mistake when he asserts that 'every aspect of the [King James's] bold assertions and his avowedly absolutist plan were apparently at variance with received ideas of Calvinism. The Reformed faith was equated with a form of democracy, perfectly at odds with the monarchic design.' Cottret, *Huguenots in England* (Cambridge, 2009), 95. Robert Kingdon offered a more nuanced explanation of Reformed ecclesiastical polity and concluded that 'Brenz, Cranmer, and Beza may all be regarded as Protestant substitutes for bishops.' Kingdon, 'The Episcopal Function in Protestant Churches', 220.

[32] N. Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, *passim*. Anthony Milton notes that the earliest supporters of *iure divino* episcopacy were some of the strictest Calvinists, including Matthew Sutcliffe, John Bridge, and George Carleton. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 455.

[33] Goodman, *Court of King James*, i. 313–4; Collinson, *Religion of Protestants*, 84.

[34] Labrousse, 'Great Britain as Envisaged by the Huguenots', 147.

[35] 13 Elizabeth, cap. 12. *Statutes of the Realm*, iv. 546–7. James Murray noted that there 'were hundreds of ministers in the church at this time, who had no other ordination than what they had received from presbyterian churches'. Murray, *A History of the Churches of England and Scotland*, 3 vols (Newcastle, 1771–2), ii. 235.

[36] S. Miller, *Letters concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry* (Philadelphia, 1830), 145. Archbishop John Whitgift, Grindal's successor, denied that the Subscription Act permitted presbyterian ordination. See S. L. Adams, 'The Protestant Cause: religious alliance with the West European Calvinist communities as a political issue in England, 1585–1603' (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1973), 16.

of Uniformity (1662).[37] Even if re-ordination was demanded, it surely would not have offended French Reformed ministers seeking to serve in England, since the French Reformed churches required re-ordination for English ministers seeking to serve in France.[38] Labrousse ascribed the strictness of the Church of England to its hostility towards the Scottish Church, 'whose internal organisation was so close to that of the French Reformed Churches. It was this similarity between French Calvinism and Scottish Presbyterianism which made it impossible to give special favour to French pastors'.[39] However, England typically did not subject Scottish ministers to re-ordination. In addition, the ecclesiastical polity of the Scottish Church in 1624, with its amalgamation of presbyterian and episcopal polities, scarcely resembled that of the French Reformed churches.

In all his published works, du Moulin never exhibited any doubt that he upheld the presbyterian government of the French Reformed churches. He is recorded as subscribing the *Confession of Faith of the French Reformed Churches* and was never questioned on the subject of polity in a Church court.[40] No published theological works by fellow Reformed theologians suggest that he affirmed episcopal polity over presbyterian polity. Du Moulin followed his churches' denial of ecclesiastical government by divine right and espoused its pragmatic approach to polity. Their lack of rigidity with regard to polity allowed the French Reformed churches to pursue partnerships with other Protestants because the form of government did not act as a barrier to unity.

---

[37] In contrast to James I's policy, Scottish men who had not been ordained by a bishop first had to be ordained as deacons and priests before being ordained as bishops. See G. Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, 2 vols (London, 1724–34), i. 139–40. For a full discussion of ordination requirements for foreign ministers, see N. Sykes, 'The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches', *Theology*, Occasional papers, new series, no. 11 (London, 1948); E. Denny, *The English Church and the Ministry of the Reformed Churches* (London, 1900).
[38] J. Strype, *Life and Acts of John Whitgift*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1821), iii. 183.
[39] Labrousse, 'Great Britain as Envisaged by the Huguenots', 147–8.
[40] Aymon, *Synodes*, i. 255, 395; ii. 138; Quick, i. 225, 348; ii. 1; Rawlinson D 538, 147, 246, 479.

Brian Armstrong concluded that 'it is clear, then, that du Moulin was not in accord – in theory or in practice – with the French Reformed doctrine on the matter of ministry'.[41] If du Moulin did object covertly to his churches' ecclesiastical polity, it seems to counter Armstrong's claim that 'in everything he did, [du Moulin] can be seen as a man of total commitment to what he believed God required. . . . He would sacrifice everything to see *la cause* promoted, protected, defended, and propagated.'[42] Despite his erroneous claim that du Moulin secretly rejected presbyterian polity, Armstrong was correct in identifying du Moulin's commitment to a cause. His primary cause was providing for his large family and working to ensure their well-being after his death.

Du Moulin also adopted a pragmatic approach in terms of the practice of polity. Although he preferred presbyterian polity and supported it as a minister in the French Reformed churches, he defended the legitimacy of episcopal government that had not been interrupted in Churches prior to the Reformation, such as the Church of England. Thus, du Moulin's unexpected appeal to be made bishop did not violate his theological convictions. Throughout his published works and personal actions, especially his pursuit of Protestant union, Pierre du Moulin upheld a presbyterian form of government but maintained a pragmatic position with regard to episcopacy. This pragmatic attitude would also inform his polemical use of the Church Fathers, especially in his final reply to Cardinal du Perron.

---

[41] Armstrong, 'The Changing Face of French Protestantism', 143.
[42] Armstrong, *Bibliographia Molinaei*, XI.

A Shift in Landscape

The political and ecclesiastical contexts in England changed significantly between Pierre du Moulin's 1615 defence of King James against Cardinal du Perron and his 1627 defence. The plan for Protestant reunion had failed to gain support and had dissipated; James had relentlessly pursued the Spanish Match for Prince Charles until it too failed; the Thirty Years War had commenced; and the crown had moved from James to Charles. The Church of England had become divided between anti-Calvinists, inspired by Richard Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes, and Calvinists, led by Archbishop of Canterbury George Abbot.[43] Historians have debated for decades the exact nature of the divisions within the Church of England in the years leading up to the Civil War.[44] Rather than offer yet another attempt to untangle the web of theological, ecclesiastical, and political allegiances, the important point to note with regard to du Moulin is that he must have been aware of the competing ideologies and that he attempted to navigate the treacherous ecclesiastical landscape towards a favourable outcome for himself.

---

[43] No designation accurately describes either ideology. I have chosen 'anti-Calvinists' over 'avant-garde conformists' or 'Arminians' to denote those who opposed aspects of Reformed Protestant theology and piety. The Calvinists led by Abbot certainly did not adopt all aspects of Reformed theology as defined by Geneva, most notably presbyterian polity. Kenneth Fincham identified four broad groupings in King James's church: radical puritans, moderate puritans, conformist Calvinists, and anti-Calvinists. The groupings represented clusters of attitudes rather than factional interests. Fincham, 'Introduction', in Fincham, *Early Stuart Church*, 1–22.

[44] N. Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism, and Counter Revolution', in C. Russell, ed., *The Origins of the English Civil War* (Basingstoke, 1973), 199–234; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 1–8; Collinson, *Religion of Protestants*; Russell, *Causes of the English Civil War*; P. White, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 101 (Nov. 1983), 34–54; W. Lamont, 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered: Comment', *Past and Present*, 107 (May 1985), 227–31; Tyacke and White, 'Debate: The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 115 (May 1987), 201–29; P. Lake, 'Calvinism and the English Church, 1570-1635', *Past and Present*, 114 (Feb. 1987), 32–7; Lake, 'Anti-popery: the Structure of a Prejudice', in Cust and Hughes, eds., *Conflict in Early Stuart England*, 72–106; Lake, 'Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and avant-garde conformity', 113–33; White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*; Fincham, *Early Stuart Church*; S. Lambert, 'Richard Montagu, Arminianism, and Censorship', *Past and Present*, 124 (1989), 36–68; Davies, *Caroline Captivity of the Church*; Sharpe, *Remapping Early Modern England*, 345–91.

King James appeared to warm to anti-Calvinists in the Church of England over the course of his reign and to grow colder to Calvinists led by Abbot.[45] James identified no obvious motivation, but multiple factors might have contributed. In 1613, Abbot opposed the king's desire for a quick annulment of the marriage between the Earl of Essex and Lady Frances Howard, whereas Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop Richard Neile, and the other anti-Calvinists serving on a theological commission organised to examine the case approved it.[46] The outbreak of the Thirty Years War in 1618 and the negotiations for the Spanish Match distanced James from some Calvinists. The king attempted to extinguish any opposition to his neutral foreign policy and even imprisoned some Calvinistic dissenters who offered public support for Protestants in Bohemia, where James's daughter and son-in-law reigned. James even intended to tolerate Catholicism as part of the marriage treaty with Spain.[47] Abbot became James's fiercest opponent against the match, but anti-Calvinists generally followed the king's increasingly tolerant position towards moderate Catholics. Arminian Peter Heylyn believed that James had 'grown more moderate, and (since the death of [James] Mountague the late Bishop of Winton) into a better liking of those opinions, which he had laboured to condemn at the Synod of Dort.'[48] Bishop Montague's Calvinism had been a steady influence on James until the bishop's death in 1618.

Lancelot Andrewes had assumed a prominent role in the court soon after James's accession to the throne. He became the king's favourite court preacher and

---

[45] James had utilised both Calvinists and anti-Calvinists in the Oath of Allegiance controversy and the production of the Authorised Version of the Bible. See Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy of King James', 187.
[46] Neile was named Bishop of Lincoln the following year.
[47] Patterson, 'King James and the Crisis of 1618', 319–34.
[48] P. Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus* . . . (London, 1668), 125.

produced two volumes against Cardinal Bellarmine on James's behalf.[49] He seemed to achieve a higher level of influence, however, with his assistance to James during the pursuit of the Spanish Match. The bishop was named to the Privy Council in September 1616, accompanied the king to Scotland in 1617, and was elected Bishop of Winchester in 1618.[50]

Andrewes Against du Perron

Following Cardinal du Perron's 1620 reply to King James, Andrewes agreed to respond on behalf of the king. The bishop attempted to defend the catholicity of the English Church and its royal head against the cardinal's assaults while simultaneously preserving the potential future Spanish-origin queen from charges of idolatry due to her Roman Catholic faith. Likely due to his poor health, Andrewes only produced two brief chapters in response to du Perron. The work, written in English, remained unpublished during his lifetime but was included in the 1629 publication of his *Opuscula*.[51]

Unlike Pierre du Moulin, Andrewes objected in no way to du Perron's use of the Church Fathers as judges in the current controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants. In his challenge to the cardinal's claim of continuity between the Church of Augustine's day and the Roman Catholic Church, Andrewes's primary tactic was to point out the cardinal's misunderstandings of the Church Fathers and the doctrines of the Church of England. Du Perron had cited the acknowledgement by Ulrich Zwingli, the 'principal patriarch of the Sacramentarians', that the belief in a merely

[49] For Andrewes's role as James's court preacher, see McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, 119–63.
[50] J. V. Lyle, ed., *Acts of the Privy Council of England, Volume 35: 1616–1617* (London, 1927), 29; Birch, *Court and Times*, i. 447.
[51] Andrewes, *Stricturae* . . . in *Opuscula quaedam Posthuma* (London, 1629), 1–62. Separate pagination.

carnal presence of Christ in the Eucharist was the majority position in the time of Augustine.[52] The cardinal appeared to believe that the Church of England followed Zwingli's rejection of the real presence, so he used the Swiss Reformer's own words against King James. Andrewes agreed with du Perron's critique of Zwingli and said 'if the Cardinall mislike him, so doe we. And so, he doth not well (against his own knowledge) to charge his opinion upon us.'[53] Andrewes also listed multiple errors in citation and interpretation by the cardinal.[54]

Andrewes categorised the subject of tradition as a matter of opinion, not practice, that did not touch on the 'outward face and form' of the church.[55] The bishop had outlined his position in a sermon on 1 Corinthians 11:16 ('But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.' AV) that he preached before King James on Easter Sunday 1618. Far from an overly rigid understanding of *sola Scriptura* held by some Protestants, Andrewes argued that the customs of the Church, which Scripture confirmed and grounded, were used to prevent contentions within the body. In other words, the testimony of the Apostles and the Church spoke so clearly through written and unwritten tradition that only a contentious person would oppose it. He concluded that 'there is, and shall be enough ever in this Text, to avow any Custome'.[56] In the observance of Easter, Andrewes claimed that 'we doe no more, then the Churches of God, then the Apostles have done before us.'[57]

The omissions in Andrewes's defence of James and the English Church against du Perron are more significant than the inclusions. Unlike his treatises against

---

[52] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 82: 'le principal Patriarche des Sacramentaires'.
[53] Andrewes, *Stricturae*, 2.
[54] Andrewes, *Stricturae*, 4, 23, 33, 55.
[55] Andrewes, *Stricturae*, 9.
[56] Andrewes, *XCVI Sermons* . . . (London, 1629), 518.
[57] Andrewes, *XCVI*, 520.

Bellarmine, Andrewes conspicuously excluded mention of the pope as Antichrist, although he did object briefly to papal appointment *de jure divino*.[58] He also evaded the subject of idolatry and any connection of the Spanish Infanta to idolatrous practices, most notably with regard to the Eucharist. After quoting Augustine, Andrewes noted, 'I trust no Christian man will ever refuse . . . to adore the flesh of Christ.'[59] He then clarified that Christ's flesh is only received spiritually in the Eucharist, but stopped short of charging Rome with idolatry in the adoration of the host. Andrewes thus distinguished James's view of the Eucharist from Rome's without making the necessary conclusion, as so many Protestants did, that Rome engaged in an idolatrous act. He preserved the catholicity of James and the English Church without unduly offending Rome. Consequently, King Charles and Archbishop William Laud would use the works of Andrewes to promote their version of the Church of England in the 1630s.[60] An anti-Calvinism inspired by Andrewes but lacking the bishop's tact and grace began to deepen the divide within the Church of England.

Church Tradition

The divide between theologians who held a strict view of *sola Scriptura* and those who emphasised the importance of the Church Fathers in addition to *sola Scriptura* was also tangential to the controversy between Calvinism and anti-Calvinism.[61] By the 1620s, the strict *sola Scriptura* position that argued that the Church Fathers were useful for confutation of error but not for the establishment of doctrine had come to

---

[58] Andrewes, *Stricturae*, 14.
[59] Andrewes, *Stricturae*, 5.
[60] P. McCullough, 'Making Dead Men Speak', *THJ*, 41 (1998), 401–24; Lake, 'Avant-Garde Conformity', 133. This is not at all to say that Andrewes was proto-Laudian or the first Anglican.
[61] For a thorough treatment of the various opinions on the Church Fathers by Tudor and Stuart divines, see Quantin, *Church of England and Antiquity*, 22–284.

be associated with proponents of Elizabethan Puritanism, such as William Whitaker and John Rainolds, and Reformed Protestants in mainland Europe such as John Calvin.

Lancelot Andrewes came to be associated with the view that upheld *sola Scriptura* while maintaining the importance of the Church Fathers. In a 1613 sermon preached before King James, Andrewes famously declared that 'one canon inscripturated by God, two testaments, three creeds, the first four councils, five centuries and the succession of Fathers throughout, three centuries before Constantine and two after, establish for us the standard of religion.'[62] He was not articulating a slogan for a militant Anglicanism 'to meet the militancy of both Calvinism and the Papacy', but was identifying a methodology for theology and polemics.[63] Andrewes believed that adherence to the teaching of the Church Fathers included the preservation of apostolic order, namely episcopal church government. In the same sermon he affirmed episcopal ecclesiology, which is 'not from men' ('non de hominibus'), and rejected presbyterianism for its lay deacons and absence of ordained bishops.[64]

Andrewes and his colleagues who highly regarded the Church Fathers and episcopal government had a low opinion of the French Reformed position on the Fathers. Arminian Peter Heylyn travelled to France in 1625 and reported on the state of the French Reformed churches. He relayed that their sermons contained 'little in them of the Fathers, and lesse of humane learning; it being concluded in the synod of

---

[62] Andrewes, *Concio Latine Habita . . . XIII° Aprilis, A.D. MDCXIII*, in *Opuscula*, 91: 'Nobis Canon unus in Scripta relatus a Deo, Duo Testamenta, Tria Symbola, Quatuor Priora Concilia, Quinque saecula, Patrumque per ea series, trecentos ante Constantinum annos, ducentos a Constantino, regulam nobis Religionis figunt.'
[63] Welsby, *Andrewes*, 155.
[64] Andrewes, *Concio*, 92–3; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 486–7.

Gappe, that only the Scriptures should be used in their Pulpits.'[65] Heylyn observed that their churches and discipline were 'naked of all Antiquity.'[66] In contrast, the Church of England 'retained such an excellency of Discipline' that French Catholics did not think of it uncharitably.[67] Heylyn scorned French presbyterianism: 'The power and calling of Bishops they abrogated with the Masse, upon no other cause then that Geneva had done it. As if that excellent man Mr. Calvin had been the Pythagoras of our age . . . . The Hierarchie of Bishops thus cast out, they have brought in their places the Lay-Elders, a kind of Monster never heard of in the Scriptures . . . . God be magnified, and our late King praised, by whom this weed hath been snatched up out of the garden of this our Israel.'[68] Heylyn clearly connected the French Reformed with English Puritans. After describing the defacement of a Catholic church by Huguenots, he commented that 'this I perswade myself had been the fate of most of our Churches, if that faction had got the upper hand on us.'[69] When recounting the salaries of French pastors Heylyn noted that 80*l*. per year was 'Peter de Moulins pension, when he Preached at Charenton.'[70] Heylyn probably wrote his account in 1625, but the book was not published until 1656. The manuscript circulated in the 1620s, however.[71] Although du Moulin probably was unaware of Heylyn's writing in 1626, he would have come into contact with similar opinions during his time in England.

Richard Montagu, who referred to Lancelot Andrewes as 'our Gamaliel', increased the tensions between Calvinists and anti-Calvinists in the Church of

---

[65] Heylyn, *A Full Relation of Two Journeys* (London, 1656), 245.
[66] Heylyn, *A Full Relation of Two Journeys*, 243.
[67] Heylyn, *A Full Relation of Two Journeys*, 242.
[68] Heylyn, *A Full Relation of Two Journeys*, 242.
[69] Heylyn, *A Full Relation of Two Journeys*, 136.
[70] Heylyn, *A Full Relation of Two Journeys*, 245.
[71] A. Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth Century England* (Manchester, 2012), 17, 61–2.

England with his reply to Roman Catholic apologist John Heigham. Montagu, a royal chaplain, published *A New Gagg for an Old Goose* in 1624.[72] According to Montagu, the book was printed by King James's special warrant.[73] In response to Heigham's list of forty-seven errors of the Church of England, Montagu claimed that only eight were actual doctrines and that some of Heigham's alleged errors were 'raked together out of the lay-stals of deepest Puritanisme, as much opposing the Church of England as the Church of Rome.'[74] Montagu attempted to distance the English Church from the Calvinist/Puritan positions that Heigham attacked and advanced the notion that the English Church must disassociate from Calvinistic doctrine and anti-Catholic hostility in order to establish its claim of catholicity.[75]

When the House of Commons examined Montagu's book in May 1624, Calvinist John Pym claimed that the book was 'full fraught with dangerous Opinions of Arminius, quite contrary to the Articles established, in Five several Points.'[76] The Commons referred the matter to Archbishop Abbot, who gave Montagu a 'grave and fatherly' admonition and requested that he revise his book.[77] King James interviewed Montagu and concluded, 'If thou be a Papist, I am a Papist.'[78] The king told Montagu to disregard Abbot's requests and granted him permission to issue another volume in his own defence. Montagu's next volume, *Appello Caesarem*, was printed by the

---

[72] R. Montagu, *A Gagg for the new Gospel? No: a new Gagg for an Old Goose* (London, 1624); J. Heigham, *The Gagge of the New Gospel . . .* (St Omer, 1623).
[73] S. R. Gardiner, ed., *Debates in the House of Commons in 1625* (London, 1873), 46.
[74] Montagu, *A New Gagg*, *2*v*.
[75] Ornsby, *Correspondence of Cosin*, i. 70; Fincham and Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I and Charles I', in Fincham, *Early Stuart Church*, 35.
[76] *Journal of the House of Commons*, 788. Pym referred to the Canons of the Synod of Dort, which King James had supported but did not adopt officially for the Church of England. For more on Pym, see C. Russell, 'The Parliamentary Career of John Pym, 1621–1629' in Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603–1642* (London, 1990), 205–28. A 1626 reprint of the petition appears in Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 148. Based on voting records and recorded statements, Tyacke concluded that Calvinists had a majority in the House of Commons between 1624 and 1629. *Anti-Calvinists*, 128–39
[77] Gardiner, *House of Commons*, 47.
[78] Gardiner, *House of Commons*, 46.

king's warrant in 1625.[79] James died before the book was published, so Montagu dedicated it to King Charles. In the book, Montagu continued to distance the Church of England from Calvinism. He believed that Calvinists and Puritans, even the conformists, intended to introduce 'Genevanisme' (i.e., presbyterian government) into the Church.[80]

In an attempt to silence disruptive Calvinists and Arminians, Charles issued a *Proclamation for the Establishing of the Peace and Quiet of the Church of England* on 14 June 1626.[81] The king prohibited any writing, preaching, printing, or conferences that contradicted the 'Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England, heretofore published, and happily established by authoritie.'[82]

Charles carefully concealed his theological convictions early in his reign. He made Montagu a chaplain and took the case into his own hand, then distanced himself from Montagu in 1626 and issued a proclamation suppressing *Appello Caesarem* in 1629.[83] Bishop Laud officiated at Charles's coronation and preached at the openings of Parliament in 1625 and 1626.[84] Calvinist Richard Senhouse preached at Charles's coronation, and fellow Calvinist Cornelius Burges was a chaplain-in-ordinary along with Montagu.[85] King Charles did not freely reveal his theological convictions until the 1630s.

In the dedication to King Charles of his 1626 work against Montagu, Bishop George Carleton listed two great dangers that were assailing the kingdom: the plague and the 'Pelagian heresie'.[86] Carleton continued: 'When the Church is in danger, to

---

[79] R. Montagu, *Appello Caesarem* (London, 1625); Gardiner, *House of Commons*, 46.
[80] Montagu, *Appello Caesarem*, 72.
[81] Larkin, ed., *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 2: Royal proclamations of King Charles I, 1625–1646* (Oxford, 1983), ii. no. 43.
[82] Larkin, *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, ii. no. 43.
[83] Larkin, *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, ii. no 43.
[84] Laud, *Works*, iii. 165, 182.
[85] Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 78–9.
[86] G. Carleton, *An Examination* . . . (London, 1626), A3*v*.

who may we flie unto for helpe next under God, but only to your M^tie, whom God hath set a nursing father of his Church here.'[87] Pierre du Moulin expressed similar sentiments in his own dedication to Charles in *The Novelty of Popery*.

By observing the public record and through his personal relationships during his 1624–1625 residence in England, Pierre du Moulin would have been aware of the theological and ecclesiastical change in tone from his previous stay in England in 1615.[88] Yet, he attempted to become a Bishop in the Church of England. He openly expressed a desire to build a relationship with King Charles similar to the one he had with King James and likely hoped that Charles would extend an invitation to settle permanently in England.[89] First, however, he had to convince Charles to be on his side.

The Novelty of *The Novelty of Popery*

King James, being 'especially interessed and provoked by that book', before his death commissioned Pierre du Moulin to respond on his behalf to Cardinal du Perron's posthumous work.[90] Du Moulin, writing in 1627, had to be strategic with his response, not only to refute du Perron convincingly but also to satisfy his English benefactors. The question is: how could Pierre du Moulin deliver a definitive response to Cardinal du Perron's latest book in a manner that would not jeopardise his standing with King Charles? More specifically, could du Moulin refute du Perron's argument that the Roman Catholic Church was the one true Church based on its conformity with the Church Fathers without offending those in the Church of England

---

[87] Carleton, *Examination*, A3*v*.
[88] For du Moulin's close relationship with Theodore de Mayerne, James's court physician, see Trever-Roper, *Europe's Physician*, 272–3.
[89] See TNA SP 78/84 f. 239; SP 78/87 f. 78.
[90] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', *****v*; Letter from du Moulin to King Charles I, 11/21 August 1629. TNA SP 78/84 f. 239.

who held a high view of Church Tradition, including the succession of episcopal sees? And could du Moulin defend King James's claim to catholicity based on his affirmation of doctrines necessary to salvation held by the church of the first four centuries without leading his colleagues in the French Reformed churches to question his adherence to *sola Scriptura*?

Pierre du Moulin had to walk a tightrope between the admiration of the Church Fathers and church tradition by many in the leadership in the Church of England, possibly including King Charles, and the strict adherence to *sola Scriptura* of many in the French Reformed churches. Du Moulin attempted to use the Church Fathers primarily in a negative sense against the claims of Cardinal du Perron and the Roman Catholic Church while establishing his positive arguments for King James's catholicity using *sola Scriptura*. In the end, du Moulin espoused a similar view of the Church Fathers as that expressed by Jean Daillé in *Employ des Peres* but refrained from presenting it explicitly in order to remain on good terms with King Charles and the Church of England.

Seeking a New Advocate

After accepting King James's invitation to return to England in 1624 to work on his response to Cardinal du Perron, Pierre Du Moulin suffered twenty-two months of illness, which nearly killed him. He departed London soon after the death of King James in 1625 and never returned to English soil. He finally published his response in 1627.[91] Du Moulin dedicated the work to King Charles, heir of James's crown and virtue.[92] The pastor told the young king that Satan attempted to nestle in the houses of

[91] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, ***iiiiij*v**. Rimbault stated that 'ce grand ouvrage trop ignoré est peut-être l'oeuvre maîtresse de du Moulin.' *Pasteur Classique*, 109.
[92] Moulin, *Nouveauté*, *iij.

great monarchs and there hatch his offspring, vices and errors, which he made conspicuous. If by zeal and virtue a wise king could defeat him, Satan would hate such a king more than anyone on earth and would devote all his efforts 'to disturb his rest or shake his stability.'[93] The 1662 English edition of *The Novelty of Popery*, translated and edited by Pierre's son, inserted a margin note at this point: 'This came forth, *An*. 1626.'[94] Du Moulin then prayed that God would use the young king to do great things and to repair the 'ruines' of the Church that had come about under James and continued under Charles. Du Moulin did not identify these 'ruines', but the pastor was confident that the young king was sensitive to the wound of the Church and that he possessed zeal for God's glory.[95]

When speaking of the 'ruines' of the Church and the unrest of 1626, it is possible that Pierre du Moulin referenced the controversy involving anti-Calvinism, or what Carleton called the 'Pelagian heresie', and specifically the Montagu case.[96] Although the tensions between Calvinists and anti-Calvinists had erupted in 1624 with Montagu's publication of *A New Gagg*, the controversy had been brewing for some time.[97] Alternatively, du Moulin could have been referencing an outbreak of the plague, the other unsettling event in England in 1626. Carleton had noted it as a danger to Charles. The London outbreak was worse in 1625 than 1626, however. Parliament had convened in Oxford in July 1625 to avoid the plague but opened in Westminster in February 1626.[98] Du Moulin probably would not have described the plague as one of Satan's offspring that he hatches in the house of a monarch.

---

[93] Moulin, *Nouveauté*, *iij*v*: 'pour troubler son repos, ou esbranler sa constance.'
[94] Du Moulin, *Novelty of Popery*, (London, 1662), *******v*.
[95] Moulin, *Nouveauté*, *iiij.
[96] Carleton, *An Examination*, A3*v*.
[97] Lambert noted that 'the controversy was fully in the public domain long before Montagu appeared on the scene'. Lambert, 'Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship', 51.
[98] J. F. D. Shrewsbury, *A History of the Bubonic Plague in the British Isles* (Cambridge, 1970), 318–47.

Du Moulin most likely referred to the conflict between Huguenots and Catholics in France and between Protestants and Catholics in the Thirty Years War. As noted earlier, the policy of King Louis XIII towards the Huguenots differed from that of his father, King Henri IV, and new wars of religion had consequently broken out.[99] In 1627, the year that *Nouveauté du Papisme* was published, both the siege of La Rochelle and the Anglo-French War began.

The Royal Unknown

Living in England during the final year of James's reign, du Moulin would have known that James, despite his support of the Synod of Dort, did not seek to have the canons adopted officially by the Church of England. Bishop Carleton pressed Archbishop Abbot in May 1624 that the canons 'might have some approbation in the convocation'.[100] However, James never let any attempt come to fruition. Du Moulin would have heard that James had issued instructions to Abbot in August 1622 concerning preaching and preachers that the archbishop was to communicate to all the bishops. The third of his six directives stated that only deans and bishops could preach on predestination, election, reprobation, or the universality, efficacy, and irresistibility of God's grace.[101] Du Moulin probably was unaware that *A New Gagg* was printed by the king's warrant and that James had endorsed Montagu, unless he heard it through court gossip. He would have noticed, though, that James did not

[99] See Chapter 3.
[100] TNA SP 14/164 f. 19*v*.
[101] TNA SP 14/132 f. 214*v*. For a treatment of the multiple drafts and published editions of the letter, see J. Marshall, 'Reading and Misreading King James' in D. Fischlin and M. Fortier, eds., *Royal Subjects* (Detroit, 2002), 482–5. John Donne preached a sermon at Paul's Cross in September 1622 in which he defended James's call for orderly preaching. John Chamberlain reported that people were growing sceptical of James's commitment to Reformed theology: 'On the 15th of this present the Dean of Paules preached at the Crosse to certifie the Kings goode intention in the late orders concerning preachers and preaching, and of his constancie in the true reformed religion, which the people (as shold seeme) began to suspect.' Chamberlain, *Letters*, ii. 451.

issue a public condemnation of the book and order it burned. Thus, when he accepted James's commission to reply to du Perron, du Moulin could not take for granted that James would approve of a work presenting his usual unapologetic Calvinist position.

Although du Moulin had returned to Sedan soon after James's death in 1625, he retained his benefices in Canterbury and Llanarmon and entertained the possibility of settling permanently in England. At the time of the publication of his reply to du Perron, one of his sons had taken up residence in England and two more would follow.[102] As he was writing his reply to du Perron in 1626, du Moulin could not have known Charles's personal theological convictions. No one did. Even Montagu felt uneasy about his relationship with Charles after the long parliamentary proceedings and the king's proclamation for the peace and quiet of the Church.[103] Du Moulin had dedicated his 1621 *Bouclier de la Foy*, a defence of the *Confession of Faith of the French Reformed Churches* against Roman Catholic attacks, to Charles, then Prince of Wales. He elaborated his rhetorical praise of Charles: 'Your virtue, which exceeds your years, makes you a capable judge of these matters. And your good nature, which I have experienced, allows me this access.'[104] Du Moulin undoubtedly considered Charles a capable judge between Catholics and Protestants in 1627, when he published *Nouveauté du Papisme*. He certainly did not believe that 'the accession of

---

[102] Son Peter du Moulin had come to London from Leiden in 1624 to attend to Pierre during his illness and eventually made a home in England. Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', *****2. Peter became a minister in the Church of England and took over his father's benefice at Canterbury. He became a chaplain to King Charles II. See *ODNB*, *sub voce*. Peter left a copy of his translation of *Nouveauté du Papisme*, which had cost him 'much labour and expense', to his nephew in his will. *Archaeologia Cantiana: Volume 15* (London, 1883), 36. Lewis du Moulin arrived in London in 1630. Although he was trained as a physician, he became a professor in history at Oxford in 1649. He was ejected from his post after the Restoration and returned to medical practice in London. See *ODNB*, *sub voce*. Cyrus du Moulin briefly pastored the French-speaking congregation in Canterbury, but spent the majority of his life in France.

[103] Lambert, 'Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship', 43–56; Fincham and Lake, *Early Stuart Church*, 38–9.

[104] Du Moulin, *Bouclier de la Foy*, Aij*r–v*: 'Vostre vertu qui va plus viste que vos ans, vous rend iuge capable de ces matieres: et vostre debonnaireté que I'ay experimentee me donne cet accés.'

Charles I in 1625 meant the overthrow of Calvinism.'[105] He would not have dedicated his reply to du Perron to a known enemy of Calvinism.

Pierre du Moulin, writing in 1627, thus had to be strategic with his response, not only to refute Cardinal du Perron convincingly but also to satisfy his English benefactors. He faced the near impossible task of defending King James's catholicity by proving that the king conformed to the doctrines necessary to salvation as taught by the Church Fathers of the first four centuries. Du Moulin indirectly revealed that he did not believe that conformity to the Fathers proved catholicity; conformity to Scripture did. He went through the motions and used the Fathers in defence of James but primarily used them offensively against du Perron. Without expressing it, however, he undermined the validity of the Church Fathers as arbiters of controversies between Catholics and Protestants. Du Moulin's arguments anticipated those that Jean Daillé would publish five years later. Openly challenging the role of the Church Fathers as judges would have eliminated any possibility for du Moulin of advancing his position with King Charles and the Church of England.[106] Although he could not have known Charles's theological convictions, he certainly was astute enough to recognise that an overt denigration of the authority of the Church Fathers would have confirmed his reputation as a French Puritan and presbyterian proselytiser. Du Moulin had nearly three decades of experience in royal courts in two countries. He pressed all that experience into use in an attempt to win the favour of

---

[105] Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, 8.

[106] Quantin described a similar dilemma for some ministers in the Church of England: 'It may be said that there was a de facto solidarity between patristic learning and anti-Puritanism, hence the deeply ambiguous position of those senior clergymen of the early seventeenth century who might be theologically sympathetic to the Puritan case but whose own career had made them fully accept the axiom: "take away the reward of learning and learning will decay."' Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 113.

King Charles and the leadership of the Church of England, not only for his own benefit, but for the benefit of all Huguenots.

Du Moulin faced an opposite pressure from the French Reformed churches. The same presbyters who approved the 1603 censure of preachers who quoted from the Church Fathers in their sermons and who brought their books into the pulpit would have approved the censure of du Moulin for abandoning *sola Scriptura* if he placed too much emphasis on the Fathers in his reply to du Perron. Du Moulin had to follow the pattern of Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr, and John Jewell, as Jean Daillé would do, in using the Fathers for the overthrow of Roman Catholic opinion but not for the establishment of Reformed opinion.[107] If du Moulin leaned too far to one side, he would have fallen out of favour with either the Church of England or the French Reformed churches.

Errors of Citations and Errors in Judgement

In *Nouveauté du Papisme*, Pierre du Moulin immediately extinguished any suspicion that he would soften his attack due to the death of his opponent. Cardinal du Perron's demise did not alleviate du Moulin's dislike of him. The pastor claimed that sources close to the cardinal had informed him that du Perron had torn up many drafts of his reply to King James, as another Saturnus devouring his own children. Like Penelope with her web, du Perron would have continued to tantalise his admirers with the possibility of his book but never issue it, if his death had not intervened. The book was like a child who owed its life to the death of its father, said du Moulin. On his death bed, du Perron had delivered it to his friends to be published.[108]

---

[107] J. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des saincts pères* (Geneva, 1632), 443.
[108] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **ij.

Du Moulin sarcastically pointed out the cardinal's mistakes through the book. When du Perron mistakenly connected the scribes in Matthew 15 with Rabbis Sammay and Hillel, du Moulin remarked that the cardinal had added this information in order to demonstrate his wide reading.[109] He questioned 'the little comprehension ('le peu d'intelligence') that du Perron had in Greek, as well as his understanding of Hebrew and Latin.[110] As he had done in his speech before the Estates General, du Perron selectively quoted the Church Fathers or misunderstood their sense, according to du Moulin.[111] The pastor mocked the cardinal for believing that St Paul wrote his letter to the Galatians before he wrote to the Romans.[112]

Du Moulin delivered his most distasteful comment against the cardinal in a discussion of ascetic practices of certain Church Fathers. The pastor mentioned du Perron's reference to St Simeon, who stood atop a pillar for thirty years and allowed his legs to be eaten by bugs. Du Moulin then noted that the cardinal's legs 'were scarcely better. But this had not come to him by austerity.'[113] The 1662 English edition, produced by his son, added a marginal note that read: 'But by voluptuousness, which got him a body tormented with Venerean diseases, if the world saith true.'[114]

Du Moulin did regard du Perron a worthy adversary, despite his criticisms of the cardinal. He confessed that 'il est certain que nul de ceux qui en France ont broüillé le papier en faueur du Pape ne luy peut estre comparé.'[115] In his biography of his father, Peter du Moulin acknowledged the weight of du Perron's reply: 'The truth

---

[109] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 200.
[110] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 227, 235.
[111] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 236–8.
[112] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 274.
[113] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 608. 1633 edition: 'n'estoient gueres meilleures. Mais cela ne lui estoit pas venu d'austerité.'
[114] Du Moulin, *Novelty of Popery*, 500.
[115] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, ***ijv: 'it is certain that none of those in France who have blurred paper in favour of the pope can be compared to him.'

is, that it is the most learned and subtil piece of work that ever appeared in French in defence of popery.'[116]

Immediately following his preface, du Moulin included a list of falsifications in du Perron's reply to King James, which stretched to eighteen pages. He did not equal du Perron's allegation of 500 errors in Mornay's work at the Conference at Fontainebleau but claimed that falsities were rampant throughout du Perron's reply.[117] Du Moulin also identified du Perron's misinterpretations of the Fathers throughout his work.

Scripture Alone and the Church Fathers

Pierre du Moulin disapproved of Cardinal du Perron's rejection of Scripture as the primary judge in controversies between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Rather, 'the entire goal of his book is to demonstrate that the Roman Church is the true Church by the conformity with the Fathers.'[118] Du Moulin charged that the cardinal 'spits out nothing but the Fathers and leaves the word of God.'[119] The cardinal's replacement of Scripture with human judges, the Church Fathers, consequently exiled his readers into 'a labyrinth with no exit'.'[120] Du Moulin answered by arguing that Scripture alone should resolve controversies between Protestants and Roman Catholics because 'in this alone we seek the doctrine of salvation.'[121] In response to the questions of his opponents as to who had the right to interpret Scripture, du Moulin replied that Scripture needed no interpreter for doctrines necessary to

---

[116] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', *****v*.
[117] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, ***ij.
[118] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **ij*v*: 'tous son liure butte à cela de monstrer que l'Eglise Romaine est la vraye Eglise par la conformité auec les Peres.'
[119] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 640: 'ne crache que Peres et laisse le parole de Dieu.'
[120] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **ij*v*: 'un labyrinthe sans issue'.
[121] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iiiij*v*: 'en iceluy seul nous cherchons la doctrine de salut.'

salvation. Creation, the cross and resurrection, love for God and neighbour, and the law did not require an infallible interpreter. Du Moulin concluded that in 'Scripture the things which are clear are sufficient for salvation.'[122] He considered expositions of Scripture by ministers in preaching or writing to be judgments of discretion, not authority. A judgement of discretion came from Scripture itself and revealed only the minister's opinion, not a binding law.

Du Moulin also claimed that 'the writings of the ancient doctors near to the times of the Apostles cannot be despised.'[123] Although they were subject to error, their consent carried great authority. In both his positive and negative arguments du Moulin leaned heavily on the Church Fathers.[124] For example, in his affirmation of the doctrine of predestination, du Moulin referenced six passages of Scripture, then cited nine passages from works by four different Church Fathers.[125] He turned to four passages from Augustine in support of Scripture holding greater authority than the Church.[126] Du Moulin even included an entire chapter of references from Fathers to prove the sufficiency of Scripture against church tradition.[127]

Du Moulin primarily used the Fathers to argue negatively against du Perron's claim that the Roman Catholic Church was the same Church as that of the Church Fathers. He listed multiple examples from the Fathers to illustrate the differences between them and Roman Catholics.[128] In book seven of his reply, du Moulin examined thirteen disputed doctrines, including the invocation of saints, prayers for the dead, and private masses. He repeatedly referenced the Church Fathers to refute

---

[122] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iiiij*v*: 'l'Escriture les choses qui sont ainsi claires suffisent à salut.'
[123] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 163: 'les escrits des anciens docteurs proches du temps des Apostres ne peuuent estre mesprisez.'
[124] For support of positive arguments, see 233–5, 243–5, among others. For negative, see 255–8, 275–7, 531–43, 554–63.
[125] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 8–10.
[126] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 77.
[127] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 200.
[128] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 168–192.

du Perron's arguments for the antiquity of these doctrines.[129] Du Moulin either cited Fathers who taught a different doctrine than the Roman Catholic position or offered an explanation for du Perron's misunderstanding of a Father's teaching.

Consistent Inconsistency

In his defence of James's catholicity, du Moulin explained that the reason why true faith is universal or catholic 'n'est pas pource qu'elle soit receuë par tout, car cela ne fut iamais, ni ne sera, mais pource que tous sans exception la doiuent receuoir.'[130] The obligation was universal, not the reception. Du Moulin then claimed that the Fathers called their church catholic or universal because it spread across Europe, Asia, and Africa, contrary to the contemporary Roman Catholic Church, which was limited to Western Europe.[131]

Du Moulin argued that the canon of Vincent of Lérins better supported Protestant teaching than Roman Catholic, despite the incessant objections of du Perron and other Catholic apologists.[132] Du Moulin offered his own interpretation of the canon (*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditur*). Vincent, said du Moulin, believed that Scripture was sufficient to judge all things and that cases of dispute about the interpretation of Scripture, should be decided by interpreting 'according to the standard of the Ecclesiastical and Catholic sense'.[133] The catholic sense was that which was believed everywhere, always, by all. The Vincentian

[129] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 494–500, 514–25, 531–40, 553–63, 572–82, 612–24, 625–7, 657–8, 667–70, 711–2, 725, 731–3, 879–84, 899–903, 911–2, 932–4, 937–55, 955–67, 968–9, 970–5, 997–1003, 1010–20, 1021–37, 1040–5,1049–59, 1079–81.
[130] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 105: 'is not because it is received everywhere, for that never was the case, nor will it be, but because all without exception must receive it.'
[131] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 107.
[132] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 107.
[133] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 107: 'secundum Ecclesiastici et Catholici sensus normam'.

Canon, said du Moulin, referred to universally received interpretations of Scripture. These were 'truly and properly Catholic'.[134]

Du Moulin had added that Vincent had suggested the application of this 'Tradition Catholique' only to new heresies. Deeply rooted heresies required the use of Scripture alone along with the authority of the universal councils.[135] Du Moulin boldly asserted that the Vincentian Canon 'not only does not harm us in anything, but also cuts the throat of popery.'[136] Roman Catholics labelled Protestantism a deeply rooted heresy; therefore, it could be refuted only by Scripture alone and the universal councils. Of course, said du Moulin, Scripture and the councils supported Protestantism, not Catholicism.

Du Moulin appeared to be inconsistent with his application of the canon and left the reader asking unanswered questions. If the canon was nothing more than the universally received interpretations of Scripture, as du Moulin said, what was this 'Tradition Catholique'? If these deeply rooted heresies must be addressed by Scripture alone *and* the universal councils, what was the meaning of 'seule'?

Du Moulin attempted to apply the Vincentian Canon to Roman Catholic doctrines, such as papal primacy, the worship of relics, and papal deposing power. He claimed that these appeared nowhere in Scripture or the universal councils. Du Moulin thus concluded that 'if Vincent of Lérins were believed, there would be no more popery on earth.'[137] Reformed Protestants, on the other hand, believed and received all the doctrines necessary to salvation, 'which have been believed by all and everywhere. And we cannot be reproached that in such matters we ever departed from

---

[134] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 107: 'vrayement et proprement Catholique'.
[135] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 107.
[136] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 107: 'non seulement ne nous preiudicie en rien, mais aussi coupe la gorge au Papisme.'
[137] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 109: 'si Vincent de Lerins estoit creu, il n'y auroit plus de Papisme en la terre.'

the universal consent of all the ages.'[138] Du Moulin's selective and inconsistent use of the Church Fathers through his application of the Vincentian Canon preceded a more consistent approach by his French Reformed colleague, Jean Daillé.

William Whitaker's Influence

Nouveauté du Papisme relied heavily on the form of argument and citations of the Church Fathers by William Whitaker in *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura*.[139] Whitaker had identified his task as addressing Scripture, the nature of the church, the sacraments, the righteousness of Christ, and the fundamentals of the faith. He arranged these topics in three categories: Christ's offices of prophet, king, and priest. Whitaker devoted the first volume, the *Disputatio*, to the office of prophet, which included the doctrine of Scripture. In that volume, he addressed the issues of the canon, vernacular translations, perspicuity, authority, interpretation, perfection, and tradition.[140] Whitaker indicated that his method for handling each aspect of the controversy would be to first examine the Scriptures and then to incorporate the teaching of the councils and the Church Fathers. He even attempted to use his Roman Catholic opponents as reluctant witnesses in his cause.[141]

In *Nouveauté du Papisme*, du Moulin addressed many of the same issues related to Scripture and authority as Whitaker's *Disputatio*. His reply to du Perron primarily dealt with the authority of Scripture over the Church. He also addressed the topics of canon, interpretation, tradition, and translation. In this work du Moulin

---

[138] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 109: 'qui ont esté creuës par tous, et par tout. Et ne nous peut estre reproché qu'en telles matieres iamais nous nous soyons departis du consentement universel de tous les siecles.'
[139] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté du Papisme* (Sedan, 1627). All citations in this section come from the expanded Geneva edition of 1633.
[140] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, Biiij.
[141] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, Biij.

displayed clear examples of influence from Whitaker, although he nowhere cited his former tutor.

Pierre du Moulin's reliance upon William Whitaker appears in his citations of the Church Fathers. Although many of the citations in their treatises are in direct response to those of their respective Catholic opponents, at certain points du Moulin explicitly followed his polemical forebear. The clearest example of du Moulin's borrowing from Whitaker comes from a chapter documenting the positions of the Fathers on the biblical canon. Both Whitaker and du Moulin replied to Bellarmine's argument for the Catholic canon as defined by the Council of Trent. Du Moulin presented a similar list of citations as Whitaker and in nearly the same order:

Whitaker[142]	Du Moulin[143]
Council of Laodicea – Canon 59	Council of Laodicea – Canon 59[144]
Council of Trullo	Council of Trullo
Melito of Sardis (Eusebius, *History*, IV. 26)	Melito of Sardis (Eusebius, *History*, IV. 26)[145]
Origen (Eusebius's *History*, VI. 25)	Jerome, Prologues on Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, Kings
Pseudo-Athanasius, *Synopsis*	Origen (Eusebius *History*, VI. 25[146])

[142] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 32–40.
[143] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 234–7.
[144] Du Moulin recorded it as Canon 58. *Nouveauté*, 234.
[145] In the 1627 Geneva edition, du Moulin recorded it as V. 24. *Nouveauté*, 174. Peter du Moulin's English translation recorded it as I. 26. *Novelty of Popery* (1664), 193.
[146] Du Moulin recorded it as VI. 24. *Nouveauté*, 234.

Hilary of Poitiers, Prologue of the Psalms	Eusebius, *Chronicle*
Gregory Nazianzen, 'Concerning the Genuine Books of Divinely Inspired Scripture'	Pseudo-Athanasius, *Synopsis*
Cyril of Jerusalem, Fourth Catechetical Discourse	Cyril of Jerusalem, Fourth Catechetical Discourse
Epiphanius, *Against Heresies*, VIII; *On Weights and Measures*;	Gregory Nazianzen, 'Concerning the Genuine Books of Divinely Inspired Scripture'
Rufinus, Commentary on the Apostles' Creed	Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium, *Iambics for Seleucus*
Jerome, Prologue to Kings	Epiphanius, *On Weights and Measures*; *Against Heresies*, VIII
Gregory the Great, Commentary on Job	Chrysostom, Fourth Homily on Genesis
Josephus, (Eusebius's *History*, III. 10)	John of Damascus, *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, IV. 17[147]

Du Moulin also followed Whitaker in citing Rufinus's commentary on the Apostles' Creed, Hilary of Poitiers from his prologue to the Psalms, and Gregory the Great's commentary on Job.[148]

In his *Disputatio* Whitaker asserted that the Church was subject to Scripture; therefore, it must not judge Scripture. He quoted Augustine's work against Faustus

[147] Du Moulin recorded it as IV. 18. *Nouveauté*, 237.
[148] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 238–40.

the Manichean in support. Du Moulin also stated that Scripture was the judge of the Church and inserted the identical quotation from Augustine.[149] Both men might have been borrowing from Lutheran theologian Martin Chemnitz, who proved the same point by quoting the identical passage in his 1573 work, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*.[150] Whitaker did not cite Chemnitz on this point, although he did cite Chemnitz multiples times throughout the *Disputatio*.[151]

Whitaker and du Moulin both referenced Augustine's statement that he would not have believed the gospel had the authority of the church not moved him to do so. Whitaker cited the arguments of Calvin, Musculus, and Martyr that Augustine was speaking of himself as a Manichean. He then recorded Musculus's interpretation that Augustine took *crederem* for *credidissem* and *commoveret* for *commovisset*.[152] Without citing Whitaker, Calvin, Musculus, or Martyr, du Moulin argued that Augustine was speaking of himself before he became a Christian and included the exact observations that Whitaker (and Musculus) had given on Augustine's Latin style.[153] Du Moulin could have been borrowing directly from Musculus; but even if he did, he likely had read the argument in Whitaker as well.

In the section addressing unwritten tradition, Whitaker quoted Augustine's comments on the twentieth chapter of the Gospel of John in *Tractatus* 49 *in Evangelium Johannis*. He then quoted Cyril of Alexandria's commentary on John concerning the same passage.[154] In his own comments on John 20, du Moulin quoted the identical passages of Augustine and Cyril in the same order as Whitaker.[155] Both

---

[149] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 380; du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 71.
[150] Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridentini* (Frankfurt, 1707), i. 67. Nicholas Lossky posited that Lancelot Andrewes might also have been inspired by Chemnitz's citations. Lossky, *Lancelot Andrewes*, 101.
[151] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 560, 693.
[152] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 337–8.
[153] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 62.
[154] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 620–1.
[155] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 149–50.

Whitaker and du Moulin followed Chemnitz, who cited the same passages of these two Fathers in identical order.[156] Du Moulin also followed Chemnitz, but not Whitaker, in quoting Augustine from *De Consensus Evangelistarum*.[157]

In response to their respective opponents' understanding of unwritten tradition, Whitaker and du Moulin expounded upon Galatians 1:8: 'But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you a gospel beside (παρα) that which we preached to you, let him be accursed.' Cardinal du Perron had argued that παρα refers to what is against (*contra*) Paul's teaching.[158] Whitaker and du Moulin countered by stressing that παρα signals that anything beside the gospel is also against it. Du Moulin followed Whitaker in citing Chrysostom and Theophylact of Ohrid in support of the claim.[159]

Due to the polemical nature of their treatises, du Moulin and Whitaker shaped most of their claims in response to the arguments of their respective Catholic opponents. However, du Moulin still mimicked aspects of Whitaker's reasoning in defence of the Reformed Protestant doctrine of Scripture and in opposition to Roman Catholic understandings of Scripture and Tradition. Whitaker structured his *Disputation* to address six subjects (*quaestiones*): 1. The number of canonical books of Scripture. 2. The versions of Scripture and the use of vernacular languages. 3. The authority of Scripture. 4. The perspicuity of Scripture. 5. The interpretation of Scripture. 6. The perfection of Scripture.[160] In his *Nouveauté*, du Moulin addressed all six subjects in nearly the same order as Whitaker. In the first book of his reply to du Perron, du Moulin consecutively covered the authority, perspicuity, interpretation,

---

[156] Chemnitz, *Examen*, i. 35.
[157] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 149. Chemnitz, *Examen*, i. 35–6.
[158] Du Perron, *Réplique*, 798.
[159] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 645; *Nouveauté*, 151.
[160] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 2.

and perfection of Scripture. He closed the first book by addressing the canon of Scripture. Du Moulin also expounded upon the use of vernacular languages in a treatise appended to the *Nouveauté* as book 8.

In his reply to Thomas Stapleton's claim that there is no more certain authority than that of the church, Whitaker argued that what is taught is more certain than him who teaches. He compared the relationship of God, the Scriptures, and the church to a prince, his law, and a herald. The authority of the prince and his law is greater than that of the herald. Likewise, the authority of God and his Word is greater than that of the church. Nothing is more certain than Scripture because God teaches through it. The church, therefore, possesses merely a ministerial function.[161]

Although he did not quote Whitaker, du Moulin presented a similar argument in his own defence of the authority of Scripture over the church. He began by stating that that unto which the church is subject possesses greater authority than the church. He then referenced the laws of a prince as being above the prince's subjects. The church is subject to Scripture because it contains the laws of God; therefore, Scripture has more authority than the church.[162] Du Moulin offered a similar analogy of a king's edicts and a herald to argue that Scripture can reprove the errors of the church.[163]

In response to Stapleton's claim that Christians could not be certain of the authenticity of the Bible without the church's approbation of it, Whitaker asserted that the Bible has divine authority within itself and should be believed by itself and for itself. Otherwise, Christians would ascribe more to the church (i.e., to men) than to God.[164] Similarly, du Moulin argued that believing that God speaks through

---

[161] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 303.
[162] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 57.
[163] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 59.
[164] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 310.

Scriptures only because the church commands it makes men more believable than God.[165]

Both Whitaker and du Moulin also responded to the Roman Catholic teaching that one can be certain of the authenticity of Scripture based on the authority of the church. Whitaker claimed that the church commends Scripture by its testimony (*testimonio*) but denied that one could not believe the Scripture without this testimony.[166] Du Moulin also argued that one can identify the Scripture based on the testimony (*tesmoignage*) of the church, not its authority.[167]

Du Moulin's treatment of the Apocryphal Book of Judith appeared to borrow from Whitaker. Both apologists rejected the book as canonical primarily due to the evidence of the book itself. Whitaker and du Moulin began their critiques by citing the suspicious dating of the book. The book claims to have been written after the return of the Jewish people from captivity under King Nebuchadnezzar, who ruled the Assyrians from Nineveh. Bellarmine and du Perron claimed that the events of the book took place during the reign of King Manasseh of Judah. Both Whitaker and du Moulin critiqued the book's dating by pointing out that the timeline of the book could not have coincided with the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar and Manasseh. They both cited inconsistencies in chapter five of Judith and quoted the original Greek text of verse eighteen that speaks of the destruction of the Jewish temple in Jerusalem. They also noted that Josephus made no mention of Judith. Finally, both Whitaker and du Moulin mentioned that Judith lived more than 105 years and that Israel experienced victory both during and after her life, which does not match the historical context of Manasseh and his successors.[168]

---

[165] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 57.
[166] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 291.
[167] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 72.
[168] Whitaker, *Disputatio*, 63–9; du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 215–8.

Although Pierre du Moulin did not explicitly cite his polemical forefather and theological mentor in one of his most important works, he evidently did rely upon him for references to the Church Fathers and elements of argumentation in his treatise against Cardinal du Perron. There is the possibility that both Whitaker and du Moulin relied upon a common source for their citations and argumentation. Whitaker was also not averse to referencing sourcebooks for some of his quotations of the Fathers. In the *Disputatio* he repeatedly cited Lombard's *Sentences*, Gratian's *Decretum*, and Hyperius's *De Theologo*. However, Whitaker offered no citation in the passages of the *Disputatio* borrowed by du Moulin. Tracing Whitaker's undocumented sources would therefore offer a profitable avenue for future study.

One only can speculate as to the reason for the lack of a reference to Whitaker in *Nouveauté du Papisme*. Standards of citation, of course, were more informal in the seventeenth century than today. A possible explanation for du Moulin's omission of Whitaker concerns the timing of the publication of *Nouveauté du Papisme*. Du Moulin, hoping to cultivate Charles as a patron, probably would not have risked damaging such a portentous relationship by being so audacious as to disclose that one of his principal sources was a notorious Puritan.

The simplest explanation, however, is that du Moulin refrained from citing Whitaker for the same reason he refrained from citing any Protestants except Martin Luther and John Calvin. Du Moulin was a polemicist, not a systematic theologian. He never produced a comprehensive work of theology. The majority of his writings were either polemical or devotional. As a polemicist, his primary task was to take down his opponent, not to document all his sources. Although du Moulin missed an opportunity to honour one of the most influential theologians in his life in one of his

most popular books, he still was able to benefit from his academic mentor when it mattered most.

Jean Daillé and the *Right Use of the Fathers*

In order to fully understand the far-reaching influence of *Nouveauté du Papisme*, we must examine a later work by Pierre du Moulin's contemporary Jean Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des Sancts Peres*. In 1626, Jean Daillé was named pastor of the Reformed congregation at Charenton, du Moulin's former church.[169] According to his son, Daillé wrote *Traicté de l'employ des Sancts Peres* in 1628, although it was not published until 1631.[170] In this work, Daillé outlined two points to examine: 'The first, whether we can know today certainly and clearly what has been the opinion of the holy Fathers on different subjects. The second, whether their authority is such that every faithful man knowing certainly and clearly what their opinion has been on any one article of the Christian religion, he is bound to believe as true.'[171] If the Roman Catholic Church could prove both of those points, Daillé said that 'it is beyond doubt that its procedure is good and appropriate to the purpose that it sets itself, putting forward at the present so many writings of the ancient Doctors.'[172] In a

---

[169] Daillé's son attached 'Abbregé de la vie de Monsieur Daillé' and 'Le catalogue de ses oeuvres' to *Les deux derniers sermons de Monsieur Daillé prononcez à Charenton le jour de Pasques, sixiéme Avril 1670 et le Jeudy suivant: avec un abrégé de sa vie et le catalogue de ses oeuvres* (Geneva, 1671), 1–92. For analysis of Daillé's work, particularly in the English context, see Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 228–51.
[170] Daillé, 'La vie de Daillé', 37.
[171] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères* (Geneva, 1632), 6–7: 'Le premier, si l'on peut auiourd'huy certainement et clairement sçavoir quelle a esté l'opinion des saincts Peres sure les differents susdits. Le second, si leur authorité est telle, que tout homme fidele sçachant certainement et clairement quelle a esté leur opinion sur quelque article de la Religion Chrestienne est obligé de la croire comme vraye.'
[172] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 7: 'il est hors de doute que sa procedure est bonne et convenable au but qu'elle se propose, mettant auiourd'huy en avant tant d'escrits des anciens Docteurs.'

clear and cogent manner, Daillé set out to prove that 'the Fathers cannot be judges of the controversies today between those of the Roman Church and Protestants'.[173]

Daillé delivered a more straightforward critique of the use of the Fathers as judges of theological controversy than most of his fellow Reformed Protestants. Writing after du Moulin, Rainolds, et al., Daillé demonstrated respect for the Fathers but did not shy away from criticising them openly. Below I present strong evidence that Daillé used du Moulin's *Nouveauté du Papisme*, even though he did not cite du Moulin in *Traicté de l'employ des pères*.[174]

Brian Armstrong presented Daillé as something of an innovator in his denial that the Fathers were 'speaking to the issues of our time'.[175] This approach 'seems to deny the importance of history, but since the position taken demanded a masterful knowledge of the early Fathers, it served rather to increase research in the history of the Church. And in the Reformed communion the Amyraldians led the way.'[176] However, Armstrong overlooked the works of Rainolds, du Moulin, and other Calvinists that exhibited knowledge of the Church Fathers and encouraged research in church history while taking a sceptical view of the Fathers as judges in theological controversy. These works predated the rise of Amyraldianism within Reformed Protestantism. Thus, Armstrong's claim that the Amyraldians 'led the way' is untrue.

In *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, Daillé outlined two primary reasons for rejecting the role of Church Fathers as judges of theological controversy. First, it was difficult, if not impossible, to know clearly and precisely what had been their 'sentiment' on these matters. Second, supposing that their 'sentiment' could be

---

[173] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, ¶ 5: 'les Peres ne peuuent estre iuges des controuerses auiourd'hui agitees entre ceux de l'Eglise Romaine et les Protestans'.
[174] See Chapter 7.
[175] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 12.
[176] Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy*, 13.

understood with certainty and clarity, the Fathers were not infallible, nor outside the possibility of error. The first was a question of history and the second of theology, or of fact and right.[177]

Daillé attempted to prove the first reason by eleven means:

- 1) Few of the writings of the Fathers were extant, particularly those of the first three centuries.
- 2) Those that were extant addressed matters very different from the current controversies.
- 3) Many of the writings alleged to have been written by the Fathers were ancient or recent forgeries.
- 4) The genuine writings of the Fathers have been altered in many aspects over the centuries, either by ignorance, accident, or malice.
- 5) The writings of the Fathers were difficult to understand because of the language and style that they used. The meanings of many words had shifted since the time of the Fathers.
- 6) The teaching of the Fathers was difficult to discern because they often expressed opinions that were not their own. They related the beliefs of authors without naming them and spoke cautiously in sermons in order to accommodate some of their hearers.
- 7) Supposing that it was certain that a Father held a particular opinion, it also must be certain that this Father did not change his opinion at a later point.
- 8) If it could be proven that a Father consistently held a belief, it must be determined if he held it to be necessary or merely probable.

[177] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, ¶ 5.

- 9) Whether the Father advanced the belief as a private opinion (and not necessary to the faith) or as a belief common to the church of his era must be ascertained.
- 10) It must be distinguished if the Father attributed the opinion to the universal church or to his particular church. The beliefs of the majority of the church were not always received by each part.
- 11) It was impossible to determine exactly the beliefs of the ancient church, either universal or particular, and then apply them to the current controversies between Roman Catholics and Protestants.[178]

Daillé argued six points in support of his second reason:

- 1) The testimony and teaching of the Fathers were fallible.
- 2) The Fathers themselves testified that they should not be believed absolutely or simply on their word.
- 3) Their manner of writing revealed that they did not intend to be judges.
- 4) They erred on many points, both individually and collectively.
- 5) They contradicted one another and held contrary opinions in matter of great importance.
- 6) Neither Roman Catholics nor Protestants recognised them as judges.[179]

Daillé elaborated on each of the points under his two reasons in separate chapters and provided numerous citations from the Church Fathers in support.

[178] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, ¶ 5*r*–¶ 7*r*.
[179] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, ¶ 7*r*–¶ 7*v*.

Daillé focused on Cardinal du Perron, who differed from other Roman Catholic apologists in the method that he used in disputations.[180] He even acknowledged du Perron's second rule of *consensus Patrum*, that the Fathers often spoke as witnesses of the church in their day and not always as authoritative doctors.[181] Unlike the cardinal, Daillé concluded that the testimony of the Fathers was insufficient to judge between Roman Catholics and Protestants because it could not be received as infallibly true. The Fathers made errors and held biases, as all humans do.[182]

Daillé concluded that the only appropriate use of the Church Fathers by Protestants in their controversies with Roman Catholics was negative. Their collective silence on particular doctrines proved that these doctrines did not originate with Christ and the Apostles.[183] Daillé's work seemed to mark a radical break from earlier Reformed apologists and caused a stir in England over the next century.[184] Yet in fact, his main points had been anticipated by Pierre du Moulin.

A Silent Rejection

Four years prior to the publication of *Traicté de l'employ des saincts pères*, Pierre du Moulin had espoused each of Jean Daillé's points in his *Nouveauté du Papisme* either explicitly or implicitly, with one exception. Du Moulin, of course, produced a polemical treatise that did not warrant an extended discourse in positive methodology, unlike Daillé's volume. Also unlike Daillé, he did not outline these points in separate chapters but displayed them within the context of his polemical treatise. Du Moulin's

[180] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 49.
[181] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 291.
[182] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 291–3.
[183] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 523–6; Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 238–9.
[184] Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 238–411.

primary purposes were to defend King James and to attack Cardinal du Perron. Along the way, however, he revealed his opinions regarding the use of the Church Fathers and drew nearly the same conclusions which Daillé would later espouse.

Du Moulin criticised Cardinal du Perron for his rejection of Scripture as the primary judge in controversies between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Rather, 'the entire goal of his book is to demonstrate that the Roman Church is the true Church by the conformity to the Fathers'.[185] Du Moulin argued that the Church Fathers could not serve as judges in controversies between Roman Catholics and Protestants because Scripture alone was sufficient. Du Moulin had made a similar claim in his 1609 volume on the Eucharist: 'In the end these people cry "the Fathers, the Fathers!" and make a pretense of requiring them for judges in order to avoid the word of God.'[186]

Du Moulin made claims similar to the points under Daillé's first reason, that it was difficult, if not impossible, to know clearly and precisely what had been the 'sentiment' of the Fathers on matters of contemporary controversy. Du Moulin repeatedly emphasised that the centuries had altered the doctrines and changed the customs. Many theological words used by the Fathers had shifted in sense.[187] For example, du Moulin questioned if du Perron or anyone could know whether the words pope, merit, sacrifice, indulgence, mass, consecration, prayer for the dead, and satisfaction had lost their ancient meaning.[188] He noted that numerous works ascribed to Church Fathers were supposititious and impossible to verify, including the

---

[185] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iij*v*: 'Cependant tout son liure butte à cela de monstrer que l'Eglise Romaine est la vraye Eglise par la conformité avec les Peres.'
[186] Du Moulin, *Apologie pour la saincte cene du seigneur* (La Rochelle, 1609), 288*r*: 'Et au bout ces gens crient les Peres, les Peres, et par feintise les demandent pour iuges, asin d'euiter la parole de Dieu.'
[187] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iij*v*, 7, 169. This corresponds to Daillé's second point under reason one. Daillé, *Employ des Peres*, 19–24.
[188] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 191.

mystagogical catechetical lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem.[189] Amongst the writings of the Fathers that were more certain, new corruptions were discovered 'tous les jours.'[190] For example, to the Catechetical Oration of Gregory of Nyssa 'were added other pieces written in various centuries.'[191] Furthermore, the works of the Church Fathers were in Greek and Latin, which common people could not understand, and were endlessly long and infinite in number.[192] Du Moulin also affirmed that the writings of the Fathers must be understood in the sense in which they had been written. He charged du Perron with taking passages from the Fathers in the wrong sense, of quoting dubious works, and of not respecting the context.[193] For example, du Perron claimed that St Jerome had been induced by his Jewish associates to doubt the veracity of the Epistle to the Hebrews in addition to Tobit, Judith, and the Maccabees. Du Moulin called this accusation 'a conjecture without proof and a crime of disloyalty against the Christian Church'.[194] Du Moulin pointed out that a Father sometimes contradicted himself at a later point.[195] When someone proposed a passage of a Father as proof of something, du Moulin questioned: 'Who knows if the same Father does not say otherwise somewhere else, as is the practice of the Ancients?'[196] Du Moulin acknowledged that the Church Fathers located doctrines in multiple degrees of importance. The most important category was composed of doctrines

---

[189] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 1039, **iij*v*, 163, 191, 568. This corresponds to Daillé's third point under reason one. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 24–59.
[190] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 163, 191, 542, 1046–9. This corresponds to Daillé's fourth point under reason one. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 59–113. The pagination in this section of *Traicté de l'employ des pères* contains errors.
[191] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 1047: 'ont esté a dioustees des pieces escrites en divers siecles.'
[192] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iij*v*, 3, 163, 196. This corresponds to Daillé's fifth point under his first reason. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 113–58.
[193] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 191–2, 237–43, 671, 674–8. This corresponds to Daillé's sixth point under his first reason. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 159–85.
[194] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 236: 'une coniecture sans preuue, et un crime de desloyauté & preuarication contre l'Eglise Chrestienne'.
[195] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 261. This corresponds to Daillé's seventh point under reason one. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 185–94.
[196] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 164: 'Qui sçait si le mesme Pere ne parle point autrement ailleurs, comme c'est la coustume des Anciens?'

necessary to salvation.[197] Du Moulin demonstrated that it had to be determined if a doctrine was the private opinion of one or more Fathers or was adopted by the entire ancient church. Some erroneous doctrines were even believed by various Fathers and even church councils, but were not accepted by the whole ancient church.[198] For example, du Perron took Augustine's argument for the veracity of the church based on its numerical size and proposed 'with much pageantry' ('beaucoup d'apparat) that this was a universal opinion. Du Moulin replied that Augustine must not be believed 'against himself and against the other Fathers, much less against the word of God, and against experience.'[199] Also, one must determine if a doctrine was held by the universal church or by particular churches.[200] Finally, Du Moulin argued that it was impossible to determine exactly the beliefs of the ancient church, either universal or particular, and then apply them to the current controversies between Roman Catholics and Protestants. A consensus of the Fathers could not be determined because consensus was not the goal. Du Moulin claimed that 'the true faith is called catholic or universal, not because it is received by all – for it never was, nor will it be – but because all without exception must receive it.'[201]

---

[197] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 3, 82, 100, 109, 164, 186, 195, 210–2. This corresponds to Daillé's eighth point under his first reason. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 194–215. Du Moulin did reject what he considered to be unnecessary distinction of doctrine by du Perron in the third observation of his letter to Casaubon. Du Moulin charged that du Perron unnecessarily piled up the distinctions of necessity to display his learning rather than to instruct the reader. *Nouveauté*, *ij*v.

[198] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 156, 175–86, 188, 193–5, 233–4. This corresponds to Daillé's ninth point under his first reason. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 215–26. William Haaugaard noted that a principal contribution of sixteenth-century Reformed Protestant patrologists was 'the recognition that there was no such thing as a patristic consensus'. Haaugaard, 'Renaissance Patristic Scholarship and Theology in Sixteenth-Century England', *SCJ*, 10 (Autumn, 1979), 58 n. 71.

[199] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 153: 'contre soy-mesme, et contre les autres Peres, moins encore contre la parole de Dieu, et contre l'experience.'

[200] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 33–4, 74, 76–7, 104–5, 117, 210–2. This corresponds to Daillé's tenth point under his first reason. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 226–37.

[201] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 105: 'la vraye foy est appellee Catholique ou Uniuerselle, n'est pas pource qu'elle soit receuë par tout: car cela ne fut iamais, ni ne sera: mais pource que tous sans exception la doiuent receuoir.' This corresponds to Daillé's eleventh point under his first reason. Daillé, *Employ des Peres*, 237–55.

The table below lists Daillé's points under his first reason and quotations of du Moulin that correspond to each point:

Daillé	Du Moulin
1. Few of the writings of the Fathers are extant, particularly those of the first three centuries	
2. Those writings that are extant address matters very different from the current controversies	'Les siecles alterét la doctrine et changent les coustumes.'[202]
3. Many of the writings alleged to have been written by the Fathers are ancient or recent forgeries.	'Et y a parmi les escrits des Peres plusieurs liures supposés dont la supposition est malaisée à recognoistre.'[203]
4. The genuine writings of the Fathers have been altered in many aspects over the centuries, either by ignorance, accident, or malice.	'Nouuelles corruptions se descouurent tous les iours.'[204]
5. The writings of the Fathers were difficult to understand because of the language and style that they used.	'Les Escrits des Peres sont liures Grecs et Latins et d'une lógueur et multitude infinie, et dont le peuple ne peut auoir aucune cognoissance.'[205]
6. The teaching of the Fathers was difficult to discern because they often expressed opinions that were not their own.	'Car que sçait le Lecteur si ces passages sont fidelement cottez? Qui sçait si un Pere ou deux ayans parlé ainsi, les autres parlent de mesme?[206]
7. Supposing that it was certain that a Father held a particular opinion, it also	'Qui sçait si le mesme Pere ne parle point autrement ailleurs, comme c'est la coustume des Anciens?'[207]

[202] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iij*v*: 'The centuries alter the doctrine and change the customs.' See also *Nouveauté*, 7, 169.
[203] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iij*v*: 'Also, there are among the writings of the Fathers several suppositious books whose supposition is difficult to recognise.' See also *Nouveauté*, 163, 191, 568.
[204] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 163: 'New corruptions are discovered every day.' See also *Nouveauté*, 191, 542, 1046–9.
[205] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iij*v*: 'The writings of the Fathers are Greek and Latin books, infinite in length and number, of which the people can have no understanding.' See also *Nouveauté*, 3, 163, 196.
[206] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 191: 'For who knows if these passages are quoted faithfully? Who knows if a Father or two having spoken this way, the others speak of the same thing?' *Nouveauté*, 237–43, 671, 674–8.
[207] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 164: 'Who knows if the same Father does not say otherwise somewhere else, as is the practice of the Ancients?' See also *Nouveauté*, 261.

must be certain that this Father did not change his opinion at a later point.	
8. If it could be proven that a Father consistently held a belief, it must be determined if he held it to be necessary or merely probable.	‘En ce passage Augustin ne parle point des matieres necessaires à salut, mais de quelques coustumes indifferentes de leur nature’.[208]
9. Whether the Father advanced the belief as a private opinion (and not necessary to the faith) or as a belief common to the church of his era must be ascertained.	‘Il n’y a gueres de Peres qui n’ait chacun à part quelque opinion particuliere, que l’Eglise Romaine reiette aussi bien que nous’.[209]
10. It must be distinguished if the Father attributed the opinion to the universal church or to his particular church.	‘Que nous n’auons nulle Loy ni reiglement establi par l’Eglise uniuerselle, hors mis les loix et reiglemens qui ont esté establis par les Apostres, lesquels gouuernoient l’Eglise uniuerselle, et la representoient.’[210]
11. It was impossible to determine exactly the beliefs of the ancient church, either universal or particular, and then apply them to the current controversies between Roman Catholics and Protestants	‘La vraye foy est appellee Catholique ou Uniuerselle, n’est pas pource qu’elle soit receuë par tout: car cela ne fut iamais, ni ne sera: mais pource que tous sans exception la doiuent receuoir.’[211]

Du Moulin also expressed opinions that corresponded to Daillé’s points under reason two. He rejected the infallibility of the Church Fathers.[212] The Fathers, indeed, had acknowledged their own fallibility.[213] Du Moulin claimed that the Fathers never desired for their writings to be judges. They wanted their writings tested

[208] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 82: ‘In this passage, Augustine does not speak of matters necessary to salvation but of some customs of an indifferent nature’. See also *Nouveauté*, 3, 100, 109, 164, 186, 195, 210–2.
[209] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 175: ‘There are few Fathers that do not have some particular opinion that the Roman Church rejects as well as we’. See also *Nouveauté*, 156, 176–86, 188, 193–5, 233–4.
[210] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 74: ‘That we have no law or rule established by the universal church, apart from the laws and rules which were established by the Apostles, who governed the universal church and represented it.’ See also *Nouveauté*, 33–4, 76–7, 104–5, 117, 210–2.
[211] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 105: ‘The true faith is called catholic or universal, not because it is received by all – for it never was, nor will it be – but because all without exception must receive it.’
[212] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, ***iiij*r*, 3, 33–4, 163. This corresponds to Daillé’s first point under reason two. Daillé, *Traicté de l’employ des pères*, 256–302. The pagination in this section of *Traicté de l’employ des pères* contains errors.
[213] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iij*v*, 164. This corresponds to Daillé’s second point under reason two. Daillé, *Traicté de l’employ des pères*, 341–415.

against Scripture and they expected to be believed only as they spoke in accordance with Scripture, the only infallible rule.[214] Du Moulin also pointed out that the Church Fathers erred in many ways, both individually and collectively.[215] He noted that the Church Fathers also disagreed with one another on many issues.[216] Finally, du Moulin acknowledged that both Protestants and Roman Catholics rejected the Church Fathers as judges over the controversies. He charged that the 'the Roman Church of today opposes not only each Father separately, but also the agreement of a great number of Fathers, and that our adversaries pretend to honour the Fathers, in order to amuse the people, nevertheless, they make little of them.'[217] Du Moulin had made similar statements in his 1621 volume against Jean Arnoux.[218]

The table below lists Daillé's points under his second reason and quotations of du Moulin that correspond to each point:

Daillé	Du Moulin
1. The testimony and teaching of the Fathers were fallible.[219]	'On conteste sur l'exposition d'un passage d'un Pere, autant ou plus que sur le sens d'un passage de l'Escriture: et au bout ce Pere n'est Dieu, et est suiet

[214] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iij*v*, 77, 95–6, 164, 201–2. This corresponds to Daillé's third point under reason two. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 302–11. The pagination in this section of *Traicté de l'employ des pères* contains errors.
[215] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 82, 244, 175–86. See table below. This corresponds to Daillé's fourth point under reason two. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 341–415. The pagination in this section of *Traicté de l'employ des pères* contains errors.
[216] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iij*v*, 3, 163, 535–7. This corresponds to Daillé's fifth point under reason two. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 415–33.
[217] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 3, 21–2, 165–8, 196, **iij*v*: 'l'Eglise Romaine de ce temps s'oppose non seulement à chasque Pere à part, mais aussi au consentement de grand nombre de Peres, et que nos adversaires feignans d'honorer les Peres, pour amuser le peuple, neantmoins au fonds en font fort peu de cas.' This corresponds to Daillé's sixth point under reason two. Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 434–508.
[218] Du Moulin, *Bouclier de la Foy* . . . (Sedan, 1621), C ij.
[219] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 256.

	à faillir, et nos aduersaires condamnent chasque Pere en plusieurs choses.'[220]
2. The Fathers themselves testified that they should not be believed absolutely or simply on their word.[221]	'[Les Peres] ne veulent estre creus qu'autant qu'ils parlent selon l'Escriture, à laquelle ils veulent que leurs escrits soient examinés comme à la seule reigle infaillible.'[222]
3. Their manner of writing revealed that they did not intend to be judges.[223]	'S. Augustin est fort exprés en ceste question. Au Liure onzieme contre Faustus Manicheen chap. 5. *La S. Escriture est establie en un certain siege de hautesse, auquel tout entendement fidele et craignant Dieu doit seruir.*'[224]
4. They erred on many points, both individually and collectively.[225]	'Ne faut aussi dissimuler que les Eglises des Gaules trouuolent mauuais que S. Augustin se seruoit en ses escrits des tesmoignages des liures non Canoniques, comme tesmoigne Hilaire Euesque d'Arles en son Epistre à Augustin.'[226]
5. They contradicted one another and held contrary opinions in matter of great importance.[227]	'Et les Peres à tout propos se discordent entre eux.'[228]
6. Neither Roman Catholics nor Protestants recognised them as judges.[229]	'Au bout il y a en l'Eglise Romaine grand nombre de traditions dont les

[220] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 3: 'There is as much or more contention on the exposition of a passage of a Father than there is on the sense of a passage of Scripture. And after all, this Father is not God and is fallible, and our adversaries condemn each Father in several things.' See also *Nouveauté*, ***iiij*r*, 33–4, 163.
[221] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 302.
[222] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **ij*v*: '[The Fathers] do not want to be believed but in so far as they speak according to Scripture, against which they want their writings to be examined, as the only infallible rule.' See also *Nouveauté*, 164.
[223] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 312.
[224] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 77: 'Saint Augustine is very purposeful on this question. In the eleventh book against Faustus the Manichean, chapter five, 'The Holy Scriptures are established on a certain high foundation, to which all faithful and God-fearing understanding must serve.' See also *Nouveauté*, **ij*v*, 77, 95–6, 164, 201–2.
[225] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 341.
[226] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 244: 'We must not conceal the fact that the Gallican churches found troubling that Saint Augustine made use in his writings of the testimonies of non-canonical books, as Hilary, Bishop of Arles, testifies in his Epistle to Augustine.' See also *Nouveauté*, 82, 244, 175–86.
[227] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 415.
[228] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **ij*v*: 'And the Fathers disagree among themselves about many things.' See also *Nouveauté*, 3, 163, 535–7.
[229] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 434.

> Peres se taisent, et d'autres ausquelles ils sont contraires.'[230]

The major exception to du Moulin's similarity in argumentation to Daillé was the first point under Daillé's reason one: few of the writings of the Church Fathers were extant, particularly those of the first three centuries. Whether or not du Moulin espoused the idea, he could not consider presenting it because King James's claim to the title of Catholic, dating back to Isaac Casaubon's reply to du Perron in 1612, was founded on the notion that his doctrine of salvation conformed to that of the church of the first three centuries.[231] Du Moulin would have undermined the entire Oath of Allegiance controversy by disputing James's primary claim. In addition, du Perron had argued repeatedly that the Church Fathers of the period of the first four councils, roughly the fourth and fifth centuries, served as superior judges to those Fathers of the first three centuries. Du Moulin did his duty as a paid polemicist in service to the king and argued that the writings of the Fathers of the first three centuries displayed a truer sense of the Apostolic church than those of the first four councils and stood in greater opposition to popery.[232] Fathers of later centuries, after all, owed their knowledge and theological vocabulary to those of the first three centuries. However, du Moulin never proposed that the Fathers of the first three centuries could serve as judges in the current controversies between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Scripture alone was sufficient to stand in judgement.

Daillé also differed significantly from du Moulin with regard to Vincent of Lérins. Du Moulin attempted to interpret Vincent and the canon in his own favour,

---

[230] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 196: 'In the end, there are a great number of traditions in the Roman Church on which the Fathers are silent, and others to which they are contrary.' See also *Nouveauté*, **iij*v*, 3, 21–2, 165–8.
[231] Casaubon, *Responsio*, 38–42.
[232] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, **iij, 54.

which resulted in confusion. Daillé, on the other hand, saw no value in Vincent, who was suspected of heresy, or his canon. In fact, the canon increased his doubt in the authority of the Fathers because Vincent had believed that the Fathers should adjudicate every religious dispute with their infallible judgement.[233] Even if the canon were sound, Vincent had made so many qualifications to it that no one could apply it consistently.[234] Rather, Daillé preferred Augustine's rule that 'we are not bound to believe any author unless he can persuade us either by the Canonical Scriptures or by some probable reason.'[235] In the end, Daillé used Vincent's own words against him and concluded that the canon 'should be separated from the authority of public declarations and placed among the small particular and private opinions.'[236]

Pierre du Moulin drew the same conclusions as Daillé, that adherence to Scripture determined the value of an author, but he still felt the need to acknowledge the Vincentian Canon. He moved towards Daillé's position with his reinterpretation of the canon but could not maintain consistency. Daillé, in contrast, rejected Vincent and the canon outright and refused to pay deference to a suspected heretic with a poor appreciation for Scripture.

Acknowledging a Predecessor

Jean-Luis Quantin acknowledged that Daillé's *Traicté de l'employ des pères* was a 'synthesis of half a century of Protestant controversy', but apparently did not pick up its relationship to du Moulin's previous arguments.[237] Quantin highlighted Daillé's

---

[233] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 299.
[234] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 299.
[235] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 308: 'ne nous oblige a croire le dire d'aucun autheur s'il ne nous le persuade ou par les Escritures Canoniques ou par quelque raison probable.'
[236] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 311: 'doit estre separee d'avec l'authorité des sentences publiques et mise à part entre les petites particulieres et cachees opinions.'
[237] Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 231.

treatment of Justin Martyr's assertion that a statue dedicated to Simon Magus had stood in Rome. Multiple Roman Catholics and Protestants had addressed the matter following the 1574 discovery in Rome of the base of a statue with an inscription to Semo Sancus.[238] Daillé concluded that Justin mistakenly took 'Semoni' for 'Simoni' and 'Sanco' for 'Sancto'.[239] Quantin noted that Daillé cited Protestant critic Didier Hérauld but claimed that Daillé 'was the first to use the story against the credit of the Fathers.'[240]

Pierre du Moulin, however, used the story against the credit of the Fathers four years prior to the publication of Daillé's volume. In his reply to du Perron, du Moulin referenced Justin Martyr's claim about the statue to Simon Magus. Unlike Daillé, he did not cite Hérauld but he did reference Cardinal Baronius regarding the inscription 'Semoni Sango Deo'.[241] Du Moulin concluded that 'it is believable that the ancient Christians little educated in Roman antiquity, seeing this inscription on the base of a statue, thought that it was the statue of Simon Magus.'[242]

One might argue that du Moulin did not 'use the story against the credit of the Fathers' because he did not address it in a chapter comprised of the 'errors and mistakes' ('beveuës et mesprises') of the Fathers, as Daillé's did.[243] Du Moulin, however, discredited the Fathers more blatantly than Daillé, primarily by his mocking tone. He referenced the Justin Martyr story in a chapter devoted to denying that St Peter ruled as the bishop of Rome, despite the fact that 'this opinion has been received among the Fathers'.[244] Du Moulin claimed that his purpose was not to oppose the

---

[238] For du Perron's treatment, see *Réplique*, 191–2.
[239] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 322.
[240] Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 232.
[241] Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, 12 vols (Paris, 1864–83), ad ann 44, i. 362–3.
[242] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 272: 'est croyable que les anciens Chrestiens peu instruits en l'antiquité Romaine voyans ceste inscription en las base d'une statue, ont pensé que c'estoit la statue de Simon le Magicien.'
[243] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 312–40.
[244] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 270: 'ceste opinion a esté receuë entre les Peres'.

testimony of the Fathers, but he felt burdened to say that 'this matter is so enveloped in fables, that the falsities added to it can bring the truths into question.'[245] One of those fables was St Peter's battle with Simon Magus in Rome, which was recounted by many Church Fathers, including Augustine.[246] The heretic was carried into the air in a fiery chariot only to be brought crashing to the ground by the prayers of Peter, breaking his neck. Du Moulin mockingly noted that pagan authors of the era such as Suetonius, Tacitus, Seneca, Pliny, and others had not chosen to record an event so public and so marvellous. Even Augustine admitted that most Romans believed the tale to be false. Du Moulin then referenced the reports by Justin Martyr and Tertullian of the statue honouring Simon Magus. Du Moulin joked that if the Romans 'l'eussent veu ainsi precipité à la priere de S. Pierre, ils eussent plustost erigé une statue à S. Pierre, au lieu de le crucifier.'[247]

Quantin also claimed that 'Daillé's list of doctrinal errors into which the Fathers had fallen, both singly and collectively, was of unprecedented comprehensiveness and remained unsurpassed.'[248] He cited Daillé's chapter: 'Que les Peres se sont abusez en divers poincts de la Religion, et à part et plusieurs ensemble.'[249] Quantin did not notice, however, that du Moulin delivered a list of heterodox teachings by the Fathers that included the majority of Daillé's examples and many more.[250] Du Moulin's chapter was not devoted explicitly to listing the errors of the Fathers, but to identifying the doctrines of the Fathers rejected by the Roman Catholic Church. However, du Moulin himself rejected all of the doctrines he

---

[245] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 270–1: 'ceste matiere est tellement enveloppee de fables, que les choses fausses qu'on y a adjoustees, peuvent faire douter des vrayes.'
[246] Augustine to Casulanus, epistle 86. Augustine, *Operum Tomus II* (Paris, 1586), 143–9.
[247] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 272: 'had seen him thrown headfirst at St Peter's prayer, they rather would have erected a statue to St Peter instead of crucifying him'.
[248] Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 232.
[249] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 341–415: 'That the Fathers have erred in various points of Religion, both individually and several together'.
[250] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 175–86.

listed, excluding those that directly contradicted Roman Catholic teaching on the sacraments, church government, the Apocrypha, and the veneration of the Virgin Mary.

In accordance with the data provided in Appendix 1, although I have found no acknowledgement of consultation in the works themselves or in external sources, based on the specific additions in the 1633 edition of *Nouveauté du Papisme* Pierre du Moulin appears to have consulted Daillé's 1631 edition of *Employ de Peres*. It is also highly probable that Daillé consulted du Moulin's 1627 edition of *Nouveauté*, a monumental work of the most well-known pastor in the French Reformed churches.

Du Moulin addressed some of these errors individually in other passages of his reply.[251] Throughout the work, he listed additional errors of the Fathers, including the invocation of saints by Gregory of Nazianzus,[252] ascetic practices approved by Jerome, Augustine, and others,[253] and the dietary regulations of Jerome, Chrysostom, and others.[254] Du Moulin noted the errors of unwritten tradition adopted by multiple Fathers, including prayer for the dead, tasting milk and honey in baptism, and praying only when facing East.[255] Du Moulin even devoted an entire chapter to Jerome's strange opinions on marriage.[256]

Although Quantin does not point out the similarities between Daillé and du Moulin, he does highlight the work of John Downe, nephew of Bishop John Jewel. Downe reached many of the same conclusions regarding the Fathers as du Moulin in an undated text published four years after his death.[257] Quantin notes that 'readers of

---

[251] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 891.
[252] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 531.
[253] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 634–41.
[254] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 646–54.
[255] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 211,
[256] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 527–31.
[257] J. Downe, 'Not consent of Fathers but Scripture the ground of Faith . . .' in Downe, *Treatise of Justifying Faith* . . . (Oxford, 1636), 211–72.

Rainolds and Whitaker, as well as of continental Reformed writers, would have recognised, not only arguments, but even examples and quotations here with which they were already familiar.'[258] Downe and du Moulin both had studied at Cambridge at the end of the sixteenth century and perhaps developed their shared opinions of the Fathers under Whitaker's influence. The use of the Fathers was perhaps their only subject of agreement, however, as Downe's works reveal him to be 'an archetypal anti-puritan.'[259]

Succession

In his treatment of the doctrine of succession Pierre du Moulin displayed the difficulty of his mission to please King Charles, his desired patron, and the leadership of the Church of England without causing suspicion amongst his French Reformed colleagues. Although he did not use the terms, he identified the succession of episcopal sees (*chaires*), rightly understood, as part of the wellbeing (*bene esse*) of the church and not the essence (*esse*). Du Moulin had made a similar case for episcopal government in general.[260]

To appeal to both groups, du Moulin repeatedly emphasised that the succession of episcopal sees must not be separated from the succession of doctrine. At the opening of the chapter, he declared: 'Certainly, this succession is a beautiful adornment, provided that with the succession of persons there might be the succession of doctrine and conformity of virtue.[261] Du Moulin explained that the succession of chairs could not be a mark of the church (and thus, not of the essence) because it

[258] Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 205.
[259] K. Fincham and P. Lake, 'Popularity, Prelacy and Puritanism', *EHR*, 111 (1996), 865.
[260] See Chapter 6.
[261] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 111–2: 'Certainement ceste succession est un bel ornement, pourveu qu'avec la succession de personnes il y ait succession de doctrine et conformité de vertu.'

required another mark to prove it, adherence to Apostolic doctrine. A knowledge of the succession of Apostolic doctrine was required to know whether or not the succession of chairs was valid. Also, some churches that confessed Apostolic doctrine could not prove a continual succession of chairs. Du Moulin referred, of course, to the French Reformed churches and other Reformed Protestant communions.

Whether or not he intended it, du Moulin made a subtle statement on the unity of the French Reformed churches with the Church of England when he noted that heretical bishops of the ancient church did not receive a new ordination after they adopted orthodox doctrine. Du Moulin proposed that the nature of the bishop's charge and the promise that he made in the reception of it sufficiently authorised him 'to change language in this same chair and to teach the truth.'[262] In the same way, the Church of England did not require a new ordination for presbyterian ministers who entered their communion. If the ordination of former heretics was honoured, so should be the ordination of fellow Reformed Protestants.[263]

Du Moulin learned from his indiscretion in *De la Vocation des Pasteurs* and made no mention of bishops of the Church of England in his attack in *Nouveauté du Papisme* on the Roman Catholic understanding of the succession of episcopal sees.[264] He also refrained from linking the succession of Reformed pastors to Waldensians and Albigensians, which he had done in *la Vocation*.[265] Du Moulin did reference the two sectarian groups, however, as forerunners of Martin Luther in a chapter on the visible church.[266] Apparently, he was not aware of the controversy caused by

---

[262] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 118: 'changer de langage en ceste mesme chaire et à enseigner la verité.'
[263] See Chapter 2.
[264] See Chapter 6.
[265] Du Moulin, *Vocation des Pasteurs*, 168–9.
[266] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté*, 30.

Archbishop Abbot's 1624 volume on the visibility of the true church.[267] Abbot had argued that the visible church could be traced through the Waldensians, Albigensians, and other medieval groups antagonistic towards the Roman Church, prior to making its way to Luther.[268] William Laud, Bishop of St. David's, showed the book to King James, who 'was hard of belief' that Abbot was the author.[269] Charles undoubtedly disapproved of the book, as well. Unfortunately for du Moulin, his carefulness was all for nought because King Charles paid little notice. The Oath of Allegiance controversy thus ended anticlimactically.

Desperate for Attention

Pierre du Moulin continued to seek the patronage of King Charles after the publication of *Nouveauté du Papisme*. He reminded the king in August 1629 of King James's commission 'to defend his cause' and claimed that his work against du Perron testified to the 'ardent zeal of such a great king.' [270] In April 1629, England concluded its ill-fated war with France that it had waged, in part, on behalf of the Huguenots. Du Moulin expressed gratitude to the young king for not holding the war against him and not excluding him from royal graces, noting that James 'honored me with his' good graces.[271] The pastor concluded his letter by declaring to Charles that 'I will be all my life your very humble and very obedient servant.'[272]

Du Moulin's letter to Charles appears to have been a subtle request for the king to continue his financial support. The pastor mentioned that he completed his

---

[267] G. Abbot, *A Treatise of the Perpetuall Visibilitie and Succession of the True Church in all Ages* (London, 1624).
[268] Abbot, *A Treatise of the Perpetuall Visibilitie*, 82–4.
[269] Laud, *Works*, iii. 145. Abbot's name did not appear on the title page. See Davies, *Caroline Captivity*, 56.
[270] Du Moulin to Charles I, 11/21 Aug 1629, TNA SP 78/84 f. 239: 'defendre sa cause.'
[271] TNA SP 78/84 f. 239: 'm'ayant honore des siennes.'
[272] TNA SP 78/84 f. 239: 'Je seray toute ma vie tres humble et tres obeissant serviteur.'

work against du Perron more than two years prior, but the war had broken off trade. This might have been a delicate hint to Charles to resume his financial support of the pastor, now that the war was over. Du Moulin recounted his faithfulness to James and expressed his loyalty to Charles as a reminder of his usefulness to the king.

Du Moulin got the attention of the king, who communicated to the pastor through Dudley Carleton, secretary of state and 1st Viscount Dorchester. Du Moulin wrote to Carleton in June 1630 and deferentially commented that he did not warrant a man of Carleton's stature conveying to him that Charles looked favourably upon his work.[273] Du Moulin wrote to the king and thanked him for affirming the quality of *Nouveauté du Papisme* through Carleton. Once again, he reminded Charles that he wrote in defence of James. He informed the king that he soon would be communicating through the mouth of Charlotte Stanley, Duchesse de la Trémoïlle [Trémouille] and Countess of Derby.[274]

Born into one of the most prominent Protestant families in Europe, the duchess accompanied Henrietta Maria, Charles's new queen, to England in June 1625. She married James Stanley, then known as Lord Strange, in June 1626 and waited in attendance upon the queen in August 1626. The couple soon fell out of favour with the king and queen, however, due to Charles's mistrust of Strange as a possible threat to his crown and Henrietta Maria's distaste for Huguenots.[275] Peter du Moulin, Pierre's son, became chaplain to Lord Strange in 1628.[276]

Du Moulin's employment of the duchess as his mouthpiece displays just how far he was from the king's sphere of influence. His partnership with King James in the attempted reunion of Christendom and his participation in the royal tour of

---

[273] Du Moulin to the Secretary Dorchester, 22 June/2 July 1630, TNA SP 16/171 f. 68.
[274] Du Moulin to Charles I, 26 July/5 August 1630, TNA SP 78/87 f. 78.
[275] See ODNB, *sub voce*.
[276] ODNB, *Peter du Moulin*.

Cambridge and Oxford were a distant memory for du Moulin. He lacked the proximity to power that he possessed when he stayed in the home of Théodore de Mayerne and Philip Burlamachi, the financier.[277] Instead, the closest that he could get to King Charles and the seat of power at Whitehall was a Huguenot duchess living in Lancashire and out of favour at Court.

In a July 1630 letter, du Moulin informed the duchess that King James had commissioned him to write against Cardinal du Perron and that Charles was pleased with the work. Aware that he himself was old and had ten children, du Moulin requested that the king demonstrate his goodwill by allowing him to pass on his prebend at Canterbury, which netted him 1,000 francs per year, to his son Cyrus. The pastor mentioned the prebend of Isaac Casaubon, which had passed on to his son after Casaubon's death in 1614, as precedent for his request. Du Moulin had intended to make this proposal to the king while he was still in England, but his illness had prevented him. He now asked the duchess to intercede on his behalf.[278] In 1660, King Charles II answered the renewed request of Peter du Moulin and conferred to him his father's spiritual estate.[279]

The Oath of Allegiance controversy was nearly forgotten by the time Pierre du Moulin published *Nouveauté du Papisme*. King James and Cardinal du Perron were dead, and King Charles expressed no interest in waging a treatise war with Catholics. The plan for the reunion of Christendom had failed. Du Moulin had been exiled from France and faced serious financial struggles. In the *Nouveauté* he fulfilled his commission to defend King James and sought to win a royal patron in King Charles.

---

[277] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', *****2.
[278] Du Moulin to the Duchess Dowager de la Tremouille, 20/30 July 1630, TNA SP 16/171 f. 28.
[279] TNA SP 29/1 f. 217.

Du Moulin attempted the formidable task of pleasing Charles and the majority of the bishops in the Church of England by upholding a high view of church tradition while not abandoning the position of *sola Scriptura* held by the French Reformed churches. He aimed to display a knowledge of and appreciation for the Church Fathers, two qualities he had not displayed to Isaac Casaubon while serving as Casaubon's pastor in Paris in the first decade of the seventeenth century. Du Moulin simultaneously devalued the importance of the Church Fathers as judges in the present controversies between Protestants and Catholics, though he struggled to remain consistent. Nevertheless, du Moulin had done his best to adapt to his changing circumstances, showing that he could stand his ground against the various offensives launched by his opponents.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

In 1687, Benedict Pictet, professor of theology in Geneva, delivered the funeral oration for his colleague Francis Turretin. Pictet noted that Francis Turretin's father had attended the 1620 Synod of Alés of the French Reformed churches. That synod, remarked Pictet, was presided by Pierre du Moulin, 'about whom it is better to remain silent than to say only a little, since indeed France, Germany, Britain, Switzerland, Holland, all of Europe, the whole of the Christian world, knew how great he was.'[1] Thus, nearly thirty years after his death, du Moulin maintained his exalted reputation. Much of his renown was due to his polemical writings and his ecclesiastical involvement, particularly his partnership with King James for the reunion of Christendom. Du Moulin's participation in international polemics led to lucrative benefices, but also exile. His passion for defending the faith motivated him to fight for the wellbeing of the French Reformed churches, but in the process he had to suppress his theological convictions, particularly his ecclesiology. In the end, du Moulin left behind a legacy of ecclesiastical devotion and sacrifice, as well as political manoeuvring and financial opportunism.

Du Moulin lived through the French Reformed churches' lowest point in history, the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre, and their period of greatest flourishing (1598–1628), as well as their renewed struggles during the 1620s and afterwards. He must be re-evaluated as a churchman and polemicist in light of events in his personal life and his theological context. His polemical methodology and ecclesiastical

[1] B. Pictet, 'Funeral Oration of Benedict Pictet Concerning the Life and Death of Francis Turretin', trans. D. Lillegard in F. Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, ed. J. T. Dennison, 3 vols (Phillipsburg, NJ, 1992–7), 661.

activity evolved over the course of his career through international influences and exchanges with his contemporaries. Contrary to assertions in earlier scholarship, du Moulin's thoughts and actions were not motivated by an 'upper-class mentalité and lifestyle' but by his desire to provide his family with the emotional and financial stability that he lacked in his youth. He worked (and schemed) to ensure that his children were not subject to the difficult circumstances that he had faced—a frequently absent father, persecution from Catholics, and extreme poverty—all the while seeking to remain a faithful servant of the French Reformed churches. At various points, though, du Moulin did waver in his commitment to the theology and practice of the French Reformed churches.

Pierre du Moulin was not the archetypal man of God that Gordon Tait portrayed him to be or 'authoritarian through and through' as Brian Armstrong claimed.[2] He was a man of contradictions. He was proud of his noble heritage, yet lived his adult life in fear that he would be forced into the poverty that he experienced as a child. He fought valiantly to defend the French Reformed churches, particularly their presbyterian government, yet sought to be made a bishop in the Church of England. He upheld *sola Scriptura* and rejected the use of the Church Fathers as judges of theological controversy, yet he argued that Reformed Protestantism closely resembled the church of the first five centuries.

Despite suggestions that du Moulin rejected the French humanism of John Calvin in favour of scholastic methodology in order to combat the Arminian crisis, du Moulin's theology and methodology followed in the wake of Calvin, expressing reverence for the Church Fathers while rejecting their usefulness as judges of contemporary theological controversies. He often avoided crediting Calvin, lest he

[2] Armstrong, 'Influence of Pierre du Moulin', 139.

confirm the accusations of Roman Catholic opponents that the Reformed adhered to Calvin's thought more than *sola Scriptura*. Contrary to Tait's claim that du Moulin 'will always be numbered with those who represent pure Calvinism'[3], whatever that is, du Moulin was critical of Calvin at points and drew from a wide array of Reformed Protestant theologians beyond Geneva.

Du Moulin did alter his ecumenical stance in order to combat the Arminian crisis. His plan with King James for the reunion of Christendom initially welcomed Arminian participation by prohibiting a discussion of free will, perseverance of the saints, and predestination in the hypothetical joint confession that would be composed at an ecumenical gathering to reunite Protestantism. Only when preparations began for the Synod of Dort did he harden his resolve against the Arminians. He knew by then that his fledgling plan for the reunion of Christendom would fail immediately if it called for Arminian participation.

Du Moulin also showed a divided spirit in his involvement in the Oath of Allegiance controversy. He altered his polemical methodology after he entered into the controversy in 1610 but did not alter his theology. Like most Reformed before him, he rejected the use of the Fathers as judges of theological controversies but maintained their usefulness as reliable secondary authorities in support of the Reformed interpretation of Scripture. Tait wrongly claimed that Du Moulin 'admitted just one authority. It was the authority of the Bible without interpretation. If a person set about to interpret Scripture, it was tantamount to setting himself above Scripture.'[4] Tait's characterization is closer to that of the Anabaptists or the Socinians than to the

[3] Tait, 'Pierre du Moulin', 234.
[4] Tait, 'Pierre du Moulin', 226.

Reformed Protestant approach. Du Moulin regularly cited secondary authorities, including the Church Fathers, church councils, and ancient creeds and confessions.

After du Moulin entered into the service of King James, he had to veil his scepticism of the use of the Fathers while arguing that the Church of England closely resembled the church of the first five centuries, at least in terms of what was necessary for salvation. The evidence produced in this thesis proves that if du Moulin had maintained his more critical use of the Church Fathers after 1610 and produced a work that systematised his approach, Jean Daillé would have been regarded not as an innovator in the use of the Fathers but as a disciple of du Moulin.

In light of his highly significant and eventful life, an investigation of Pierre du Moulin's ecclesiastical activity and polemical methodology reshapes our understanding of the debates between Roman Catholics and Protestants during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and provides insight into the political and ecclesiastical climates in early modern England and France.

In Service of Stuart Kings

Following his return to Sedan in 1625, du Moulin resumed his role as pastor and theological professor. According to his son, du Moulin's 'devotion to the service of King James' brought him nothing but 'disfavour' in France.[5] His fortunes in England did not fare much better. After his attempts at cultivating a relationship with King Charles were ignored, du Moulin abandoned his aspirations of receiving a permanent place in a royal court and of obtaining financial security through the Church of

[5] Peter du Moulin to Dudley Carleton, 3 Feb 1631. TNA SP 16/184 f. 13.

England and English kings. His son Peter, however, achieved what his father could not in that regard.[6]

Peter du Moulin followed in the footsteps of his father and honoured King James in 1625 with *Carmen heroicum ad regem*.[7] The younger du Moulin had studied at Sedan and Leiden prior to visiting his father in London. In 1628, he secured the position of chaplain from Lord Strange and appeared to be on the path towards a prominent position in English society. By 1628, however, Peter confessed to Dudley Carleton that he was worried that his 'obscurity' could not exempt him 'from the knowledge and displeasure' of King Charles. Despite his 'sobriety and reservedness', Peter was 'represented for a lewd and debauched fellow', since someone with 'little knowledge or little charity' had informed the king that Peter was 'consuming in idlenesse an Ecclesiasticall benefice.' In his defence, Peter claimed that Lord Strange and Bishop Joseph Hall, his father's long-time friend, could vouch for his life and conduct. Peter made it clear to Carleton, though, that his benefice, worthy eighty pounds per year, was 'without care and charge of soules'. If he were 'thought worthy of his Majesties good opinion', Peter said that he 'would be more earnest to begg employment then recompence.'[8] Thus, Peter du Moulin clearly adopted his father's approach of always angling for advancement, especially in times of desperation.

After his defence of King James, Pierre du Moulin never again defended a king. The support of Stuart kings by du Moulins continued, however, in Peter's anonymous vindication of King Charles in 1649, the year of the king's execution, in a volume whose use of Latin indicated that it was addressed to a continental European

---

[6] For more on Peter du Moulin, see ODNB, *sub voce*.
[7] P. du Moulin, *Petri Molinaei filii carmen heroicum ad regem* (London, 1625).
[8] TNA SP 16/184 f. 13.

audience.[9] The following year, Peter issued another volume in defence of Charles, this time for the Francophone market, which he dedicated to Charles II. He predicted that 'the centuries to come will write in letters of gold the great name of CHARLES in the Kalender of Saints.'[10] The younger du Moulin also defended the Reformed religion against charges that it was seditious and republican. He condemned the actions committed by 'les Ligueux d'Angleterre' and made it clear that the truth of the gospel never was advanced 'in this way, but patience and suffering multiplied the Christian religion and made the church powerful and glorious.'[11] Peter likely authored another anonymous tract against regicide in 1652.[12]

Before the changing political situation had demanded English royalist propaganda for an international audience, Peter had demonstrated that he had inherited his father's ecumenical spirit in his letter to a Scottish Covenanter in 1640. He called the Scottish presbyterians to repent of their anti-episcopal and anti-monarchical activity, for which they 'had neither president nor incouragement' from the French Reformed churches. 'My Reverend Father Doctor Du Moulin in his *Buckler of the Faith*, is altogether for Episcopacie and proveth the Antiquitie of it, and that it begun a yeere after our Saviours death', he wrote.[13] Peter even asserted that the French Reformed would install bishops if given the opportunity by the French crown. They lived under the cross, however, and their lack of bishops could not be a precedent for the Covenanters' 'putting down of Bishops.'[14] He concluded by saying that the French Reformed do not 'busie their heads about points of Discipline; else it

---

[9] [P. du Moulin], *Ecclesiae Gemitus sub Anabaptistica Tyrannide* ([London], 1649).
[10] P. du Moulin, *Defence de la Religion Reformee et de la Monarchie et Eglise Anglicane* ([The Hague], 1650), *4: 'les siecles a venir escriront en letters d'or le grand nom de CHARLES au Calendrier des Saints.'
[11] Du Moulin, *Defence de la Religion Reformee*, **4*v*: 'par ceste voye, mais la patience et les souffrances mesmes ont provigné la Religion Christienne, et rendu l'Eglise puissante et glorieuse.'
[12] [P. du Moulin], *Regii sanguinis clamor ad coelum aduersus paricidas Anglicanos* ([London], 1652).
[13] P. du Moulin, *A Letter of a French Protestant to a Scotishman of the Covenant* (London, 1640), 16.
[14] Du Moulin, *Letter of a French Protestant*, 27.

would be seene in their writings. But wheresoever they like the Doctrine, they embrace the Discipline.'[15] Peter argued for episcopal government but not against presbyterian government, whereas his father did the opposite.[16]

Peter du Moulin's full embrace of episcopacy undoubtedly aided his ascent up the ecclesiastical ladder in England, graduating from his chaplaincy to Lord Strange to rectories in Leicestershire, Yorkshire, and Kent. He reached the summit in his appointment as a royal chaplain to Charles II in 1660. Along the way, he received a D.D. from Cambridge in 1640 and interestingly, one from Oxford in 1656 – a mark of how the University was already then prepared to reveal the strength of royalist sympathies and its anger at external Cromwellian pressures, even before the restoration of Charles II.[17] Peter du Moulin did not match his father's literary output nor his fame, but through his relationship with the Stuart kings, he acquired both a stable position in the royal court and financial security, two aspirations his father never realised.

In Service of Reformed Protestant Polemics

Following the publication of *Nouveauté du Papisme* against Cardinal du Perron in 1627, Pierre du Moulin produced *Du Iuge Des Controverses* in 1630 and *Des Traditions* the next year.[18] Rather than defend a king, du Moulin took up the defence of Scripture itself in these two volumes. He followed his arguments advanced in *Nouveauté du Papisme* against the authority of the Church Fathers as judges between

---

[15] Du Moulin, *Letter of a French Protestant*, 28.
[16] See Chapter 2.
[17] R. A. Beddard, 'Restoration Oxford', in *The History of the University of Oxford IV: Seventeenth Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), 809–12; and note Peter du Moulin's remarks to Richard Baxter on this theme, ibid., 810n.
[18] Du Moulin, *Du Iuge Des Controverses* . . . (Sedan, 1630); du Moulin, *Des Traditions* . . . (Sedan, 1631).

Catholics and Protestants, contending in favour of Scripture as the only judge. Du Moulin also expanded the target area of his critiques from du Perron in *Nouveauté du Papisme* to Cardinal Bellarmine, Thomas Stapleton, Jean Arnoux, and others. In the English edition of *Des Traditions*, which appeared in 1631, translator George Cottington praised du Moulin for 'his ingenuous perseverance to this very day, in vindicating the sacred honour of his late Majestie (the learned King James of most happy immortall memory) from the unjust redargurion of Cardinall Perron'.[19]

Du Moulin turned his pen against Catholics once again in his 1636 *Anatomie de la Messe*, his last significant work.[20] During his final years, his published works consisted mostly of sermons. Although du Moulin believed that sermons should present doctrine 'with simplicity and without affectation', his sermons still contained much polemical content.[21]

Du Moulin passed down the polemical tradition which he received from William Whitaker and other Reformed Protestants to younger ministers in the French Reformed churches. His successors at the congregation in Paris, Jean Mestrezat and Jean Daillé, waged their own treatise wars with Roman Catholics. Although less heralded than Daillé, Mestrezat's polemical works on the Eucharist, justification, the church, and other doctrines earned him a place amongst the most capable Reformed Protestant polemicists of the seventeenth century.[22] Mestrezat wrote against Cardinal du Perron but did not adopt du Moulin's tactic of minimising the importance of the Church Fathers.[23] He defended du Moulin against Jesuit François Regourd's

---

[19] Du Moulin, *A Learned Treatise of Traditions . . . faithfully done into English by G. C.* (London, 1631), A 6.
[20] Du Moulin, *Anatomie de la Messe* (Geneva, 1636).
[21] Du Moulin, *Cinquieme Decade de Sermons* (Geneva, 1642), 177: 'auec simplicité et sans affectation'.
[22] Mestrezat, *De la Comunion a Iesus Christ . . .* (Sedan, 1625); Mestrezat, *Discours de la Grace, contre les pretendus merites et la iustification par les oeuures* (Charenton, 1638); Mestrezat, *Traitté de l'Eglise* (Geneva, 1649).
[23] Mestrezat, *Traicté de l'Escripture Saincte . . .* (Geneva, 1633).

allegations that du Moulin had committed errors in citations.[24] Following his *Traicté de l'employ des Sancts Peres*, Daillé wrote on behalf of the Reformed churches against charges of schism and addressed the use of images by the Church Fathers.[25] Most of Daillé's published works were sermons, which also included polemical content.[26]

Theologians across Europe took notice of Daillé's approach to the Church Fathers, the seeds of which, as I have argued, appeared in du Moulin's *Nouveauté du Papisme*. Daillé received the credit, however, while du Moulin remained in 'disfavour' in France, as well as in England.[27] For example, Bishop of Gloucester William Warburton wrote in 1751 that Daillé's work 'had great consequences, and especially with us here at home. . . . In a word, it may be truly said to be the storehouse, from whence all who have since written popularly on the character of the Fathers, have derived their materials.'[28] Daillé's ideas were embraced first in England by a variety of religious mavericks, ranging from anti-Trinitarians in the Great Tew circle, to Jeremy Taylor, an early proponent of religious toleration as well as an independent-minded High Church Anglicans. Later, Puritans such as John Owen and Richard Baxter co-opted Daillé's approach to the Church Fathers for their own non-conformist purposes.[29] In their appropriations, all of these figures were unconsciously indebted to du Moulin's labours and achievements.

The majority of du Moulin's French Reformed colleagues esteemed him, electing him Moderator of the 1620 Synod at Alès and tasking him on multiple

---

[24] Mestrezat, *Traicté de l'Escripture Saincte*, 213, 237, 242, 255.
[25] Daillé, *Apologie des Églises Réformées* (Charenton, 1633); Daillé, *De la Créance des Pères sur le fait des Images* (Geneva, 1641).
[26] For a treatment of the polemical sermons of du Moulin, Daillé, and others, see Françoise Chevalier, *Prêcher sous l'Édit de Nantes* (Geneva, 1994), 193–211.
[27] TNA SP 16/184 f. 13.
[28] W. Warburton, *Julian* . . . (London, 1751), vii–viii.
[29] For a thorough treatment of the influence of Daillé's *Traicté de l'employ des Sancts Peres* in England, see Quantin, *Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 238–67.

occasions to speak on their behalf in debates and treatises. Contemporaries outside of France also expressed their admiration for du Moulin. William Twisse, Prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly during the English Civil War, said that he 'would willingly learne French to understand [du Moulin]' and that he had 'along time desired and still to get any thing that he hath written.'[30] English presbyterian William Bates noted that du Moulin 'was strong in many faculties, but most prominent of all was his debating skill'.[31]

Underlining that reputation was the abuse heaped on him by many of his Roman Catholic adversaries. Jesuit François Garasse named du Moulin the leader of *Le Rabelais Reformé* and attributed to the pastor 'the impiety of Lucian [of Samosata], the rage of Calvin, and the nonsense of Rabelais.'[32] Blaise Pascal complained that he was being called a 'disguised Calvinist, disciple of du Moulin, possessed by a legion of devils'.[33] When someone remarked to Cardinal du Perron that 'du Moulin was an ass', the cardinal replied, 'You do him wrong, sir; he is such an ass that no man ever rubbed against him but returned with a kick.'[34]

Pierre du Moulin outlived his greatest French Catholic adversary and delivered the last word in their rivalry. Through his children, his influence extended far beyond that of du Perron. Du Moulin left a legacy of polemics that was unmatched by any other theologian of the French Reformed churches.

---

[30] W. Twisse, *The Riches of Gods Love unto the Vessells of Mercy . . . Book Two* (Oxford, 1653), 81. Twisse, however, did critique du Moulin's position on the doctrine of reprobation.
[31] W. Bates, *Vitae Selectorum Aliquot Virorum . . .* (London, 1681), 699: 'Molinaeus quidem multis artibus pollebat: Sed omnium eminentissima fuit disputandi peritia'.
[32] F. Garasse, *La Rabelais Réformé . . .* (Brussels, 1619), 7: 'l'impieté de Lucian, la rage de Calvin, et les sornettes de Rabelais'.
[33] B. Pascal, *Les Provinciales*, 2 vols (Paris, 1891), i. 238: 'Calviniste désguisé, Disciple de Du Moulin, Possedé d'une legion de Diables'.
[34] Du Moulin, 'Authors Life', ***2.

Appendix

The table below lists the specific theological errors of various Church Fathers as recorded by du Moulin and Daillé. Du Moulin's 1627 Sedan edition of *Nouveauté du Papisme* contained many of the errors that Daillé included in his 1632 edition of *Employ des Peres*. Du Moulin's 1633 Geneva edition of *Nouveauté* added to the 1627 list multiple errors that also appeared in Daillé's volume.

Church Father	Du Moulin 1627	Daillé 1632	Du Moulin 1633
Justin Martyr			
1. Chiliasm[1]	X	X	X
2. Essence of God is finite and not omnipresent[2]	X	X	X
3. Angels procreated with women and produced demons[3]	X	X	X
4. Souls of Old Testament saints[4]	X	X	X

[1] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 171; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 345; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 161.
[2] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 175; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 346; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633),
[3] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 171; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 346; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 154.
[4] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 175; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 346; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 161.

were under Satan's power			
5. Socrates, Heraclitus, and others who lived according to reason were Christians[5]		X	X
6. God gave[6] Gentiles the stars to worship	X		X
Irenaeus			
1. Disembodied souls await resurrection in an invisible place[7]	X	X	X
2. Jesus began to preach around the age of 40 or 50[8]	X	X	X

[5] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 347; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 161.
[6] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 175; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 161.
[7] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 178; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 350; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 163.
[8] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 178; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 348; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 163.

3. Disembodied[9] souls retain the character of their former bodies	X	X	X
4. The righteous before Moses did not need the Law[10]	X		X
5. Physical feasts after the resurrection will be the reward for hospitality[11]	X		X
Clement of Alexandria			
1. Heathen prior to coming of Jesus were justified by philosophy[12]	X	X	X
2. Jesus and the[13] Apostles	X	X	X

[9] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 178; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 348; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 163.
[10] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 178; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 163.
[11] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 178; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 163.
[12] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 175; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 350; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633),
[13] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 176; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 351; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 161.

descended into hell to preach the gospel and many were saved			
3. Punishment in[14] hell is purgative and finite		X	
4. Angels fell in[15] love with the first women	X	X	X
5. Jesus preached[16] only one year		X	
6. Christ[17] celebrated Passover only once		X	
Tertullian			
1. Montanism[18]	X	X	X
2. God was subject to human passions:	X	X	X

[14] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, .
[15] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 176; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 352; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 161.
[16] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 352.
[17] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 359.
[18] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 176; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 229; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.

anger, hatred, grief[19]			
3. God is a body[20]	X	X	X
4. The soul is corporeal[21]	X	X	X
5. Angels procreate with women[22]		X	X
6. Disembodied souls await resurrection in an invisible place[23]		X	X
7. Chiliasm[24]		X	X
8. Re-baptism of heretics[25]		X	X
9. Deferral of baptism (Proto-Anabaptist)[26]		X	
10. Pacifism[27]		X	

[19] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 176; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, ; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.
[20] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 176; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 129; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.
[21] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 176; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 354; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.
[22] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 345; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.
[23] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 348; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.
[24] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 461; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.
[25] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 430; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.
[26] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 358.
[27] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 504.

11. Jesus died at age of 30[28]		X	
12. Heavenly grace and prophecy ended with John the Baptist[29]		X	
13. Christ celebrated Passover only once[30]		X	
Cyprian			
1. Re-baptism of heretics[31]	X	X	X
2. In support of re-baptism were Firmilianus and Dionysius[32]	X	X	X
3. Council of[33] Nicaea decreed re-	X	X	X

[28] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 359.
[29] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 359.
[30] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 468.
[31] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 178; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 238; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 164.
[32] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 178; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 411; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 164.
[33] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 179; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 360; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 164.

baptism of Samosatenians (or Paulianists)			
4. Basil called for re-baptism of Saccofori, Encratites, and Apotactics[34]	X	X	X
5. Second general council called for re-baptism of Eunomians, Montanists, Phrygians, or Sabellians[35]		X	
6. Pope Stephen denied need for re-baptism of heretics[36]	X	X	X
7. Eucharist for infants[37]		X	X

[34] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 179; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, ; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 164.
[35] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, ;
[36] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 179; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, ; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 164.
[37] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 413; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 164.

8. Baptism immediately after birth[38]		X	
9. Eucharist was necessary to salvation[39]		X	

Origen

1. Unnamed accusations of Epiphanius[40]		X	
2. Omnipotence of God[41]	X		X
3. Divinity of the Son and Spirit[42]	X		X
4. Resurrection of the flesh[43]	X		X
5. Eternity of Paradise and Hell[44]	X	X	X

[38] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 467.
[39] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 523.
[40] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 364.
[41] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 177; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.
[42] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 177; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.
[43] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 177; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.
[44] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 177; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 352; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.

6. Devils will become angels[45]	X	X	X
Methodius			
1. Humans become like angels after resurrection[46]		X	
2. Angels desire women[47]		X	
3. Providence only extends to persons, not things[48]		X	
4. Angels have corporeal nature[49]		X	
Lactantius			
1. Denies that Spirit is distinct person[50]		X	X
2. Angels procreated with[51]		X	X

[45] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 177; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 352; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 162.
[46] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 141.
[47] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 141.
[48] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 141.
[49] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 412.
[50] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 366; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 171.
[51] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 366; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 171.

women and produced demons			
3. Disembodied souls await resurrection in an invisible place[52]		X	X
4. Chiliasm[53]		X	X
5. Jesus Christ is not God[54]	X		X
6. God divided the world into East and West. He took the East for himself and gave the West to the devil[55]	X		X
7. Before creation, God created two spirits. The good one is his son; the evil one is the devil[56]	X		X

[52] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 366–7; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 171.
[53] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 366–7; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 171.
[54] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 185; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 171.
[55] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 185; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 171.
[56] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 185; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 171.

Hilary			
1. Christ's body felt no pain[57]	X	X	X
2. Souls are corporeal[58]		X	X
3. Virgin Mary shall undergo purging on judgement day[59]	X	X	X
Ambrose			
1. Believers and unbelievers are proved by fire on judgement day[60]		X	X
2. Degrees of merit in the resurrection[61]		X	X
3. Abraham did[62] not sin with Hagar	X	X	X

[57] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 180; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 367; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 165.
[58] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 367; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 166.
[59] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 180; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 463; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 166.
[60] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 372; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 166.
[61] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 374; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 166.
[62] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 375; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 166.

because Law had not been received		
4. God showed Noah an allegorical bow, not a rainbow[63]	X	
5. Baptism should be done in name of Son or Spirit, but not Trinity[64]	X	
Epiphanius		
1. Jesus born on 6 January[65]	X	X
2. Christians should celebrate Passover in same manner and at same time as Jews[66]	X	
3. Before Christ's advent, the devil[67]	X	

[63] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 376.
[64] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 376.
[65] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 377; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 169.
[66] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 378.
[67] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 378.

hoped for grace and pardon			
Jerome			
1. Providence only extends to persons, not things[68]		X	X
2. Disembodied souls of saints extend to infinity[69]		X	
3. Souls of saints and angels are subject to sin[70]		X	
4. Marriage was unclean in various ways[71]	X	X	X
5. Eating of flesh is forbidden[72]		X	X
6. Oaths are forbidden[73]	X	X	X

[68] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 378–9; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 170.
[69] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 380.
[70] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 380–1.
[71] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 184; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 147; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 170.
[72] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 382–3; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 170.
[73] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 184; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 145; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 170.

7. Jewish ceremonies were forbidden for Christians (quarrelled with Augustine)[74]		X	
8. Spoke disrespectfully of authors of Scripture[75]		X	X
Augustine			
1. Infants who die before baptism suffer in hell[76]	X	X	X
2. Eucharist necessary for infants[77]	X	X	X
3. Souls are corporeal[78]	X	X	X

[74] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 419.
[75] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 293–4; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 170.
[76] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 181; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 392; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 167.
[77] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 181; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 413; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 167.
[78] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 181; Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 355; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 167.

4. Angels have corporeal nature[79]			X	
5. Instantaneous Creation[80]			X	X
6. Disembodied souls await resurrection in an invisible place[81]			X	X
Clement of Rome				
1. All goods should be common[82]	X			X
Ignatius				
1. To fast on Saturday or Sunday is to be a murderer of Christ[83]	X			X

[79] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 412.
[80] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 392; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 167.
[81] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 128; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 167.
[82] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 176; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 161.
[83] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 176; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 161.

Athanasius			
1. Jesus was crucified to overcome the devil in the air[84]	X		X
2. Jesus drew the devil into combat by quoting Psalm 22[85]	X		X
3. St Peter's throat was cut[86]	X		X
4. Angels have corporeal nature[87]		X	
Gregory of Nazianzus			
1. Condemned second marriages[88]	X		X
2. Baptism[89] should be administered to infants in danger	X		X

[84] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 179; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 164.
[85] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 179; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 164.
[86] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 179; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 164.
[87] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 412.
[88] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 179; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 169.
[89] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 179; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 169.

of death but withheld from healthy until they can profess faith			
3. Rejected all church councils without exception[90]	X		X
Basil			
1. God's love is not acquired in teaching but is in humans by nature[91]	X		X
2. Angels have corporeal nature[92]		X	
3. Oaths are forbidden[93]		X	
4. Punishment for all sins is equal[94]	X		X
5. Alms to unbelieving poor forbidden[95]	X		X

[90] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 179; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 169.
[91] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 180; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 165.
[92] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 412.
[93] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 412.
[94] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 180; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 165.
[95] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 180; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 165.

Chrysostom

1. Oaths are forbidden[96]		X	
2. Approved of fraud, lying, and impersonating, which can be necessary, if no harm done[97]	X		X
3. Denied need for grace to move human wills towards good[98]	X		X
4. Romans 10 teaches that Adam's sin made humans subject to punishment, but does not teach original sin and sin nature[99]	X		X

[96] Daillé, *Traicté de l'employ des pères*, 412.
[97] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 181; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 167.
[98] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 181; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 167.
[99] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 182; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 168.

5. Accused Virgin Mary of vain ostentation, presumption, and unbelief[100]	X	X
6. Souls of saints shall not receive reward until after resurrection[101]	X	X

Theodoret

1. Antichrist will be a devil covered in human flesh[102]	X	X
2. Law does not forbid evil thoughts or desires[103]	X	X
3. Woman was not created in the image of God[104]	X	X

[100] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 182; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 168.
[101] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 182; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 168.
[102] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 183; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 168.
[103] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 183; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 168.
[104] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 183; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 168.

Gregory of Nyssa		
1. Souls without bodies cannot be tormented[105]	X	X
2. God does not create new souls but created them all at beginning of world[106]	X	X
Cassian		
1. Fasting on Saturday forbidden[107]	X	X
2. Lying and hypocrisy are not condemned if they profit our neighbour[108]	X	X
3. Law promises[109] only temporal goods to observers	X	X

[105] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 183; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 169.
[106] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 183; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 169.
[107] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 184; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 169.
[108] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 184; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 169.
[109] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 184; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 169.

Arnobius

1. Souls of wicked are mortal and will be reduced to nothing[110]	X	X
2. Establishes several gods[111]		
3. Men are subject to illness by a certain importune cruelty that wills it[112]	X	X

[110] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 185; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 171.
[111] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 185; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 171.
[112] Du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1627), 185; du Moulin, *Nouveauté* (1633), 171.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archival Sources

Edinburgh

National Records of Scotland

CH2/185/1 [*Minutes of the Presbytery of Haddington*, *1587–1596*]

London

The British Library

Burney MS. 363: Correspondence of Isaac Casaubon
Burney MS. 367: Correspondence of Isaac Casaubon

The National Archives

SP 12: State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth I
SP 14: State Papers, Domestic, James I
SP 16: State Papers, Domestic, Charles I
SP 29: State Papers, Domestic, Charles II
SP 52: State Papers Scotland Series I, Elizabeth I
SP 78: State Papers Foreign, France
SP 84: State Papers Foreign, Holland
SP 85: State Papers Foreign, Italian States and Rome

Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquess of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House

Oxford

MS Rawlinson D 538 [Two series of the acts of the national synods of the French Reformed churches]

Printed Sources

Acts of the Privy Council of England, Volume 35: 1616–1617. Ed. by J. V. Lyle (London, 1927).

A Book of the Valuations of All the Ecclesiastical Preferments in England and Wales . . . (London, 1680).

Ames, William. *Bellarminus Enervatus* (Oxford, 1629).

Anonymous. *A true and perfect relation of the whole proceedings against the late most barbarous traitors* (London, 1606).

Anonymous. *Sommaire de la Vie de M^r^ Moulin* . . . (Charenton, 1658).

Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland, 1127–1707. Ed. by Thomas Thomson and Cosmo Innes. 12 vols (Edinburgh, 1814–75).

Acts of the Privy Council of England, *Vol. XXXII. 1601–1604*. Ed. by John Roche (London, 1907).

Advis à un des grands de ce Royaume, sur la harangue faicte au Tiers Estat le 2 Janvier 1615. par Monseigneur le Cardinal du Perron . . . (n.p., 1615).

Andrewes, Lancelot. *Tortura Torti: sive, ad Matthaei Torti librum Responsio* . . . (London, 1609).

——— *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini* . . . (London, 1610).

——— *XCVI Sermons* . . . (London, 1629).

——— *Concio Latine Habita, Coram Regia Maiestate, XIII Aprilis, A.D. MDCXIII* . . . (London, 1629).

——— *Reverendi in Christo Patris, Lanceloti Episcopi Wintoniensis, Opuscula quaedam Posthuma* (London, 1629).

Arrest de la Cour de Parlement du 2. Janvier 1615: Touchant la souveraineté du Roy au temporel, et contre la pernicieuse doctrine d'attenter aux personnes sacrées des Roys (Paris, 1615).

D'Aubigné, Théodore Agrippa. *Confession Catholique du Sieur de Sancy*, in E. Réaume and F. de Caussade, *Oeuvres Complétes de Théodore Agrippa d'Aubigné*. 6 vols (Paris, 1873–7).

Augustine, *Operum Tomus II* (Paris, 1586).

Aymon, Jean, ed. *Tous les Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Réformées de France*. 2 vols (The Hague, 1710).

Bacon, Francis and William Cecil. *The Felicity of Queen Elizabeth: and her times, with other things* (London, 1651).

Bagshaw, Christopher. *A true relation . . . of the faction begun at Wisbich* . . . (London, 1601).

Bancroft, Richard. *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse the 9 of February . . . 1588* (London, 1588).

Barclay, John. *Ioannis Barclaii Pietas, sive Publicae pro Regibus, ac principibus, et privatae pro Guilielmo Barclaio parente vindiciae* (Paris, 1612).

Barclay, William. *De potestate papae* . . . Ed. by John Barclay (London, 1609).

—— *Of the Authoritie of the Pope: Whether and How Farre Forth He Hath Power and Authoritie over Temporall Kings and Princes* (London, 1611).

Barlow, William. *The Summe and Substance of the Conference . . . at Hampton Court* (London, 1604).

Baronius, Caesar. *Annales Ecclesiastici*, 12 vols (Paris, 1864–83).

Barret, William. *Ius Regis, sive, De absolute & independenti secularium principum dominio & obsequio eis debito* . . . ([London], 1612).

Bates, William. *Vitae Selectorum Aliquot Virorum* . . . (London, 1681).

Bellarmine, Robert. *Risposta ad une libretto intitolato 'Trattato et resolutione sopra la validità delle scommuniche* . . . (Rome, 1606).

—— *Risposta al oppositioni di fra'Paolo servita contra la scrittura del cardinale Bellarmino* (Rome, 1606).

—— *Matthaei Torti, presbyteri & theologi papiensis, responsio ad librum inscriptum Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus* . . . (Cologne, 1608).

—— *Apologia Roberti S. R. E. Cardinalis Bellarmini pro responsione sua ad librum Iacobi Magnae Brittaniae Regis cuius titulus est Triplici nodo triplex cuneus* . . . (Cologne, 1610).

—— *Responsio ad Librum inscriptum, Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus* . . . (Cologne, 1610).

—— *Apologia . . . pro Responsione sua ad Librum . . . Triplici nodo triplex cuneus* . . . (Cologne, 1610).

—— *Tractatus de Potestate Summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus adversus Gulielmum Barclaium* . . . (Rome, 1610).

—— *Apologia Adolphi Schulckenii Geldriensis, ss. Theologiae apud ubios doctoris, et professoris, atque ad D. Martini pastoris,: pro illustrissimo Domino D. Roberto Bellarmino* . . . (Cologne, 1613).

—— *Hieratikon Doron*, in X. M. Le Bachelet, ed. *Auctarium Bellarminianum* (Paris, 1913).

Bigne, Marguerin de la. *Sacra Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum* . . . (Paris, 1576).

Birch, Thomas. *Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, From the Year 1581 till her Death*. 2 vols (London, 1754).

——— *The Court and Times of James the First*. 2 vols (London, 1849).

Blakwell, George. *A Large Examination taken at Lambeth According to his Maiesties Direction* . . . (London, 1607).

——— *His Answeres upon Sundry His Examinations; Together with His Approbation and Taking of the Oath of Allegeance* . . . (London, 1607).

Boderie, Antoine le Fèvre de la. *Ambassades de Monsieur de La Boderie en Angleterre, sous le regne d'Henri IV. & la minorité de Louis XIII. depuis les années 1606 jusqu'en 1611*, 5 vols (Paris, 1750).

Pope Boniface VIII. *Unam Sanctam* (1302).

Bray, Gerald, ed. *Documents of the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 1994).

Bruce, John, ed. *Letters of Queen Elizabeth and King James VI of Scotland* (London, 1849).

———, ed. *Correspondence of King James VI of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and Others in England during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1861).

Bullen, A. H., ed. *The Works of Thomas Middleton*. vol 7 (London, 1886).

Calderwood, David. *The History of the Kirk of Scotland*. 8 vols (Edinburgh, 1844).

Calendar of Border Papers, Ed. by Joseph Bain. 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1894–6).

Calendar of Letters and State Papers Relating to English Affairs preserved in, or originally belonging to the Archives of Simancas. Ed. by Martin A. S. Hume. 4 vols (London, 1892–9).

Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547–1603. Ed. by Joseph Bain, et al. 13 vols in 14 parts (Edinburgh, 1898–1969).

Calendar of State Papers, The Scottish Series. Ed. by Markham John Thorpe. 2 vols (London, 1858).

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in Other Libraries of Northern Italy. Ed. by Horatio F. Brown, et al. 38 vols (London, 1864–1947).

Camden, William. *Annales or the History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princesse Elizabeth* . . . Trans. by R. N. Gent (London, 1635).

Cameron, Annie and Robert Rait, eds. *The Warrender Papers.* 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1931–2).

Canaye, Philippe. *Lettres et Ambassade*. 3 vols (Paris, 1645).

Carleton, George. *An Examination of those things wherein the Auhtor the Late Appeale holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and the Arminians to be the Doctrines of the Church of England* (London, 1626).

Casaubon, Isaac. *De Libertate ecclesiastica liber singularis: ad viros politicos, qui de controversia inter Paulum V. Pontificem Maximum & Rempublicam Venetam . . .* (Paris, 1607).

——— *Ad Frontonem Ducaeum S. J. theologum epistola, in qua de apologia disseritur communi Iesuitarum nomine ante aliquot menses . . .* (London, 1611).

——— *De rebus sacris et ecclesiasticis exercitationes XVI. ad Cardinalis Baronii prolegomena in Annales & primam eorum partem* (n. p., 1612).

——— *Ad Epistolam Illustr. et Reverendiss. Cardinalis Perronii, Responsio* (London, 1612).

——— *The Answere of Master Isaac Casaubon to the Epistle of the Most Illustrious and Most Reuerend Cardinall Peron . . .* (London, 1612).

——— *Ephemerides*. 2 vols (Oxford, 1850).

Chemnitz, Martin. *Examen Concilii Tridentini* (Frankfurt, 1707).

Cobbett, William, et al., eds., *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials . . .* 34 vols (London, 1809–28).

Coeffeteau, Nicolas. *Response à l'auertissement, addressé par le Serenissime Roy de la grande Bretagne, Iaques I . . .* (Paris, 1609).

Colomiès, Paul and J. A. Fabricius. *Pauli Colomesii . . . Opera, Theologici* (Hamburg, 1709).

Commonefactio Et Postulationes Regiorum Cognitorum, Necnon Arrestum Curiae Parlamenti Parisiensis die 26. Novembr. 1610. latum Adversus librum inscriptum Tractatus de Potestate Summi Pontificis in rebus Temporalibus adversus Guilielmum Barclaium, autore Roberto S.R.E. Cardinali Bellarmino, excusum Rom[a]e anno 1610 . . . (Paris, 1611).

Cosin, John. *The Works of . . . John Cosin*. Ed. by J. Sansom. 5 vols (Oxford, 1843–55).

Craig, Thomas. *The Right of Succession to the Kingdom of England* (London, 1703).

Daillé, Jean. *Traicté de l'employ des saincts pères, pour le iugement des differends, qui sont auiourd'hui en la religion* (Geneva, 1632).

——— *Apologie des Églises Réformées* (Charenton, 1633).

——— *De la Créance des Pères sur le fait des Images* (Geneva, 1641).

——— *Les deux derniers sermons de Monsieur Daillé prononcez à Charenton le jour de Pasques, sixiéme Avril 1670, et le Jeudy suivant: avec un abrégé de sa vie et le catalogue de ses oeuvres* (Geneva, 1671).

Davidson, John. *D. Bancrofts Rashnes in Rayling Against the Church of Scotland . . .* (Edinburgh, 1590).

Dominis, Marcus Antonius de. *Suae Profectionis Consilium Exponit* (London, 1616).

——— *De Republica Ecclesiastica [Libri X]* (London, 1617).

——— *A Manifestation of the Motives, whereupon the most Reuerend Father, Marcus Antonius de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato . . . undertooke his departure thence . . .* (London, 1616).

——— *Sui Reditus ex Anglia Consilium exponit* (Paris, 1623).

——— *Scritti giurisdizionalistici inediti*. Ed. by Antonio Russo (Naples, 1965).

Downe, John. 'Not consent of Fathers but Scripture the ground of Faith . . .', in Downe, *Treatise of Justifying Faith . . .* (Oxford, 1636).

Du Pin, Louis Ellies. *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques . . .* vol 17 (Amsterdam, 1711).

Edmondes, Thomas. *Remonstrance faicte par l'Ambassadeur de la Grande Bretagne au Roy et à la Reyne sa mère, en Juin 1615* (Paris, 1615).

L'Estoile, Pierre de. *Journal du règne de Henri IV . . .* 4 vols (The Hague, 1741).

Féret, Pierre. *Le Cardinal du Perron* (Paris, 1876).

Ferguson, James. *Papers Illustrating the History of the Scots Brigade in the Service of the United Netherlands, 1572–1782*. 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1899–1901).

Garasse, François. *La Rabelais Réformé par les Ministres . . .* (Brussels, 1619).

Hales, John. *A Declaration of the Succession of the Crowne Imperiall of Ingland* (n.p., 1563), in George Harbin. *The hereditary right of the crown of England asserted* (London, 1713).

Hall, Joseph. *The Works of Joseph Hall*. Ed. by P. Wynter. 10 vols (Oxford, 1843).

——— *The Complete Poems of Joseph Hall*. Ed. by A. B. Grosart (Manchester, 1879).

Heigham, John. *The Gagge of the New Gospel: contayning a briefe abridgement of the errors of the protestants of our time . . .* (St. Omer, 1623).

Henri II, Prince of Condé. *Double de la lettre escritte par Monseigneur le Prince de Condé . . . le 19 fevrier* (n.p., 1615).

Heylyn, Peter. *A Full Relation of Two Journeys* (London, 1656).

—— *Cyprianus Anglicus* . . . (London, 1668).

Howard, Henry, Earl of Northampton. *A true and perfect relation* . . . (London, 1606).

James VI and I of Scotland and England. *Ane fruitfull meditatioun . . . of the 20 chap. of the Revelation* (Edinburgh, 1588).

—— *Basilikon Doron* (Edinburgh, 1599; repr. London, 1887).

—— *His Maiesties Speach . . . with a Discourse of the Maner of the Discouery of this Late Intended Treason* (London, 1605).

—— *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus, or, An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance by James, king of Great Britaine, together with a premonition of his maiesties to all monarches . . .* (London, 1607).

—— *The Kings Majesties speach to the Lords and Commons . . . xxi. of March. Anno Dom. 1609* (London, 1609), in J. P. Sommerville, ed. *King James VI and I: Political Writings* (Cambridge, 1994).

—— *A Premonition to All Most Mightie Monarches, Kings, Free Princes, and States of Christendome* (London, 1609), in Charles McIlwain, ed. *The Political Works of James I* (Cambridge, MA, 1918).

—— *A proclamation . . . Whereto are added the penall statutes, made in the same kingdome, against Catholikes* (Saint-Omer, 1611).

—— *Declaration du serenissime Roy Iaques I. Roy de la Grand' Bretaigne, France et Irelande, Defenseur de la Foy . . . contre la harangue de l'illustrissime Cardinal du Perron* . . . (London, 1615).

—— *Serenissimi Iacobi, Magnae Britanniae, Franciae, et Hiberniae Regis, fidei defensoris, declaratio pro iure region, sceptrorumque immunitate . . . Aduersus illuss. Cardinalis Perronii orationem* . . . (London, 1615).

—— *A Remonstrance . . . for the Right of Kings* (Cambridge, 1616).

—— and James Montagu. *The workes of the most high and mightie prince, James by the grace of God, King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland* . . . (London, 1616).

—— *A Speach, as it was delivered in the Upper House of the Parliament . . . the XIX. Day of March 1603* . . . (London, 1620), in J. P. Sommerville, ed. *King James VI and I: Political Writings* (Cambridge, 1994).

—— *A Pattern for a King's Inauguration* (London, 1620).

St. Jerome, 'Against Vigilantius', in eds. Philip Schaff and H. Wace, eds. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, *Volume VI* (New York, 1912).

Jewel, John. *Ioannis Iuelli . . . aduersus Thomam Hardingum volumen alterum, ex Angl. conuersum a G. Whitakero* (London, 1578).

Journal of the House of Commons, Volume 1: 1547–1629 (London, 1802).

Journal of the House of Lords, Volume 3: 1620–1628 (London, 1802).

Knox, John. *The Works of John Knox*. Ed. by David Laing. 5 vols (Edinburgh, 1864).

Larkin, James. *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume 2: Royal proclamations of King Charles I, 1625–1646* (Oxford, 1983).

—— and Paul Hughes, eds. *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Volume I: Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603–1625* (Oxford, 1973).

Laud, William. *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*. Ed. by James Bliss. 7 vols (Oxford, 1847–60).

Law, T. G. *A Historical Sketch of the Conflicts between Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1889).

——, ed. 'Documents Illustrating Catholic Policy in the Reign of James VI., 1596–1598', in *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*. First Volume (Edinburgh, 1893), 1–70.

Le Jay, L'Avocat. *Tocsin au Roy, à la Royne régente aux Princes du sang contre le livre della puissance temporelle du Pape par le Cardinal Bellarmin* (Paris, 1610).

Lecey, John. *A Petition Apologeticall, presented to the kinges most excellent maiesty, by the lay Catholikes of England* (Douai, 1604).

Leigh, Edward. *A Treatise of Religion and Learning* (London, 1656).

Liévin, Jean. *L'Evangile de Rome, comme il a esté immediatement recue du pape et publié par Messire Iaques Davy Sieur du Perron* (Geneva, 1600).

Ligny, César de ed. *Les ambassades et negotiations de . . . Cardinal du Perron . . .* (Paris, 1623).

Luders, Alexander, et al., eds. *The Statutes of the Realm: From Original Records and Authentic Manuscripts*. 12 vols (London, 1810–28).

McClure, Norman, E., ed. *The Letters of John Chamberlain*. 2 vols (Philadelphia, 1939).

Marcelline, George. *The Triumphs of King James the First . . .* (London, 1610).

Médicis, Marie de. *Double de la response de la Royne regente . . .* (Paris, 1614).

Le Mercure François, ou la suitte de l'histoire de la paix. Commençant l'an M.D.CV. & finissant au Sacre du Tres-Chrestien Roy de France & de Nauarre Loys XIII. (Paris, 1611).

Mestrezat, Jean. *De la Comunion a Iesus Christ* . . . (Sedan, 1625).

—— *Traicté de l'Escripture Saincte* . . . (Geneva, 1633).

—— *Discours de la Grace, contre les pretendus merites et la iustification par les oeuures* (Charenton, 1638).

—— *Traitté de l'Eglise* (Geneva, 1649).

Middleton, Thomas. *The Peace-Maker* . . . (London, 1619).

Montagu, Richard. *A Gagg for the new Gospel? No: a new Gagg for an Old Goose* (London, 1624).

—— *Appello Caesarem: A Just Appeale from Two Uniust Informers* (London, 1625).

Mornay, Philippe de, seigneur du Plessis-Marly. *Traicté de l'Église* (London, 1578; Geneva, 1595).

—— *Response pour le Traité de l'Église* (Geneva, 1595).

—— *De l'institution, usage et doctrine du sainct sacrament de l'eucharistie* (La Rochelle, 1598).

—— *Discours véritable de la Conference tenue a Fontainebleau* (Montpellier, 1600).

—— *Advertissement du sieur du Plessis à Messieurs de l'Église romaine sur l'escrit naguères publié par le sieur Êvesque d'Évreux* (Saumur, 1601).

—— *Response au livre publie par le Sieur Evesque D'Evreux sur la conference tenue à Fontaine-Bleau le quatriesme de May, 1600* (Saumur, 1602).

—— *Mémoires de Messire Philippes de Mornay*. 2 vols (Amsterdam, 1652).

—— *Mémoires et Correspondance*. 12 vols (Paris, 1824–5).

Du Moulin, Peter. *Petri Molinaei filii carmen heroicum ad regem* (London, 1625).

—— *A Letter of a French Protestant to a Scotishman of the Covenant* (London, 1640).

—— *Ecclesiae Gemitus sub Anabaptistica Tyrannide* ([London], 1649).

—— *Defence de la Religion Reformee et de la Monarchie et Eglise Anglicane* ([The Hague], 1650).

—— *Regii sanguinis clamor ad coelum aduersus paricidas Anglicanos* ([London], 1652).

—— 'The Authors Life' in Pierre du Moulin, *The Novelty of Popery, opposed to the antiquity of true Christianity, against the book of Cardinal Du Perron . . .* (London, 1662).

Du Moulin, Pierre. *Apologie pour la saincte cene du seigneur* (La Rochelle, 1609).

—— *Defense de la Foy Catholique . . . Contre la Response de F. N. Coeffeteau . . .* (Paris, 1610).

—— *A Defence of the Catholicke Faith . . .* (London, 1610).

—— *Anticoton, ou Refutation de la Lettre Declaratoire du Pere Coton* (n. p., 1610).

—— *Defense de la Foy Catholique . . .* (Geneva, 1612).

—— *The accomplishment of the prophecies . . .* (Oxford, 1613).

—— *De Monarchia Temporali Pontificis Romani . . .* (London, 1614).

—— [Under King James], *Declaration . . . contre la Harangue de l'illustrissime Cardinal Du Perron* (London, 1615).

—— and François Lobéran de Montigny, Samuel Durand, Jean Mestrezat, *Defense de la Confession des Eglises Reformees de France, contre les accusations du sieur Arnould Iesuite . . .* (La Rochelle, 1617).

—— *Anatome Arminianismi . . .* (Lyon, 1619).

—— *Buckler of the Faith* (London, 1620).

—— *Bouclier de la Foy ou defense de la Confession . . .* (Paris, 1618).

—— *Bouclier de la Foy ou defense de la Confession . . .* (Sedan, 1621).

—— *De la Vocation des Pasteurs* (Geneva, 1624).

—— *Accomplissement des Prophéties* (Geneva, 1624).

—— *Nouveauté du Papisme, opposee a l'antiquité du vray Christianisme: Contre le livre de monsieur le cardinal Du Perron . . .* (Sedan, 1627).

—— *Du Iuge Des Controverses . . .* (Sedan, 1630).

—— *Des Traditions . . .* (Sedan, 1631).

—— *A Learned Tratise of Traditions . . . faithfully done into English by G. C.* (London, 1631).

——— *Anatomie de la Messe* (Geneva, 1636).
——— *Cinquieme Decade de Sermons* (Geneva, 1642).

——— *The Novelty of Popery, opposed to the antiquity of true Christianity, against the book of Cardinal Du Perron . . .* Trans. by Peter du Moulin (London, 1662).

——— 'Autobiographie de Pierre du Moulin d'après le Manuscrit Autographe', in *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, 71 (Paris, 1858).

d'Ossat, Arnauld. *Lettres de Cardinal D'Ossat* (Rouen, 1643).

Pascal, Blaise. *Les Provinciales de Blaise Pascal . . .* 2 vols (Paris, 1891).

Penry, John. *A Briefe Discovery of the Untruthes and Slanders . . . contained in a sermon preached the 8. Of Februarie 1588. by D. Bancroft . . .* (Edinburgh, 1590).

Persons, Robert [R. Doleman (pseud.)]. *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Ingland, divided into two partes. . . .* ([Antwerp], 1594 [1595]).

——— *A briefe apologie, or defence of the Catholike ecclesiastical hierarchie . . .* (London, 1601).

Du Perron, Jacques Davy, *Discours véritable de l'ordre et forme qui a esté gardée faicte à Fontainebleau . . .* (Anvers, 1600).

——— *Actes de la conférence . . avec la refutation de faux discourse . . .* (Evreux, 1601).

——— *Lettre de Monseigneur le Cardinal Du Perron: Envoyée au Sieur Casaubon en Angleterre . . .* (Paris, 1612).

——— *A Letter written from Paris, by the Lord Cardinall of Peron, to Monsr. Casaubon in England* (St. Omer, 1612).

——— *Harangue faicte de la part de la Chambre ecclesiastique en celle du Tiers estat, sur l'article du serment* (Paris, 1615), in *Les Diverses Oeuvres* (Paris, 1629).

——— *An Oration Made on the Part of the Lordes Spirituall, in the Chambre of the Third Estate (or Communalty) of France, upon the Oath (Pretended of the Allegiance) Exhibited in the Late Generall Assembly of the Three Estates of That Kingdome.* (St. Omer, 1616).

——— *Réplique à la response du serenissime Roy de la Grand Bretagne par l'illustrissime et reverendissime cardinal du Perron, archeuesque de Sens . . .* (Paris, 1620).

——— *Les Ambassades et Negotiations* (Paris, 1623).

——— *Les Diverses Oeuvres* (Paris, 1629).

——— *The Reply of the Most Illustrious Cardinall of Perron to the Answeare of the Most Excellent king of Great Britain*. Ed. by Lady Elizabeth Cary (Douai, 1630).
——— *Perroniana sive Excerpta ex ore Cardinalis Perronii*. Ed. by Jacques Dupuy and Pierre Dupuy (Geneva, 1667).

Pictet, Benedict 'Funeral Oration of Benedict Pictet Concerning the Life and Death of Francis Turretin'. Trans. by David Lillegard, in Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*. Ed. by James T. Dennison. 3 vols (Phillipsburg, NJ, 1992–7).

Pithou, Pierre. *Les Libertez de L'Eglise Gallicane* (Lyon, 1594).

Preston, Thomas. *Apologia Cardinalis Bellarmini pro iure principum, authore Rogero Widdringtono* (Paris, 1611).

Proceedings in Parliament, 1626: House of Commons. Ed. by William Bidwell and Maija Jansson. 4 vols (London, 1992).

Quick, John, ed. *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata: or, The acts, decisions, decrees, and canons of those famous national councils of the reformed Churches in France*. 2 vols (London, 1692).

Richer, Edmond. *De Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate* . . . (Paris, 1612).

Roe, Thomas. *The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe, in his embassy to the Ottoman Porte, from the year 1621 to 1628* . . . (London, 1740).

Sarpi, Paolo. *Istoria dell'Interdetto e altri scritti editi ed inediti*. Ed. by Giovanni Gambarin. 3 vols (Bari, 1940).

Sheldon, Richard. *Certain General Reasons, proving the lawfulnesse of the Oath of Allegiance* . . . (London, 1611).

Spottiswoode, John. *History of the Church of Scotland*. 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1847–51).

Sully, Maximilien de Béthune, duc de. *Mémoires du Duc de Sully*. Ed. by P. A. N. B. Daru. 6 vols (Paris, 1822).

Tesimond, Oswald. *The Gunpowder Plot: The Narrative of Oswald Tesimond alias Greenway*. Ed. and trans. by Francis Edwards (London, 1973).

Thou, Jacques-Auguste de. *Histoire Universelle*. 16 vols (London, 1734).

Twisse, William. *The Riches of Gods Love unto the Vessells of Mercy* . . . Book Two (Oxford, 1653).

Vincent of Lérins. *Pro Catholicae fidei antiquitate et veritate: adversus prophanas omnium haerese* (Paris, 1586).

Warburton, William. *Julian. or a Discourse concerning the Earthquake and Firey Eruption, which defeated that Emperor's Attempt to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem . . .* (London, 1751).

Warmington, William. *A Moderate Defence of the Oath of Allegiance . . .* (London, 1612).

Watson, William. *A decacordon of ten quodlibeticall questions . . .* (London, 1602).

Weldon, Anthony. *The Court and Character of King James* (London, 1650).

Whitaker, William. *Ad Rationes decem Edmundi Campiani Iesuitae . . .* (London, 1581).

——— *An Answere to the Ten Reasons of Edmund Campian . . .* (London, 1581).

——— *Responsionis ad decem illas rationes: quibus fretus Edmundus Campianus . . . defensio contra confutationem Ioannis Duraei . . .* (1583).

——— *Ad Nicolai Sanderi demonstrationes quadraginta, in octouo visibilis Monarchiae positas, quibus romanum Pontificem non esse Antichristum docere institué, Responsio Guilielmi Whitakeri . . .* (London, 1583).

——— *An Answere to a Certeine Booke written by M. William Rainolds . . .* (London, 1585).

——— *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura, contra huius temporis papistas, imprimis Robertum Bellarminum . . .* (Herborn, 1590).

——— *Adversus Thomae Stapletoni Anglopapistae . . .* (Cambridge, 1594).

——— *Praelectiones doctissimi viri Builielmi Whitakeri . . . in quibus tractatur Controversia de ecclesia . . .* (Cambridge, 1599).

——— *Praelectiones doctissimi viri Guilielmi Whitakeri nuper sacrae theologiae in Academia Cantabrigiensi . . . in quibus tractatur Controversia de conciliis contra Pontificios* (Cambridge, 1600).

——— *Praelectiones in controversiam de Romano Pontifice . . .* (Hanau, 1608).

Williams, John. *Great Britain's Solomon, A Sermon Preached at the Magnificent Funerall, of . . . King James . . .* (London, 1625).

Secondary Sources

Adams, S. L. 'The Protestant Cause: religious alliance with the West European Calvinist communities as a political issue in England, 1585–1603' (unpublished University of Oxford DPhil Thesis, 1973).

—— 'Foreign Policy and the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624', in Kevin Sharpe, ed. *Faction and Parliament: Essays on Early Stuart History* (Oxford, 1978).

Agnew, David C. A. *Protestant Exiles from France in the Reign of Louis XIV*. 3 vols (2nd edn. London, 1871–4).

Akrigg, G. P. V. *Letters of King James VI & I* (Berkeley, 1984).

Allen, Paul, C. *Philip III and the Pax Hispanica, 1598–1621: The Failure of Grand Strategy* (New Haven, 2000).

Anselme, Pére, Augustins Déchaussés, and M. du Fourny. *Histoire Généalogique et Chronologique de la Maison Royale de France*. 9 vols (3rd edn. Paris, 1733).

Arber, Edward. ed. *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1640*. 5 vols (London, 1875–94).

Archaeologia Cantiana: Being Transactions of the Kent Archaeological Society, Volume 15 (London, 1883).

Armand, Émile. *Essai sur la vie de Du Moulin et quelques-uns de ses écrits* (Strasbourg, 1846).

Armstrong, Brian. *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy* (Madison, WI, 1969).

—— 'The Changing Face of French Protestantism: the Influence of Pierre Du Moulin', in Robert V. Schnucker, ed. *Calviniana: Ideas and Influence of John Calvin* (Kirksville, MO, 1988).

—— 'Semper Reformanda: The Case of the French Reformed Church, 1559–1620', in W. Fred Graham, ed. *Later Calvinism: International Perspectives* (Kirksville, MO, 1994).

—— 'Pierre du Moulin and James I: the Anglo-French programme', in M. Magdelaine, M-C. Pitassi, R. Whelan, and A. McKenna, eds. *De l'humanisme aux lumières: Bayle et le Protestantisme* (Paris, 1996).

—— *Bibliographia Molinaei* (Geneva, 1997).

Asch, Ronald. *The Thirty Years War: The Holy Roman Empire and Europe, 1618–1648* (Basingstoke, 1997).

—— *Sacral Kingship between Disenchantment and Re-enchantment: The French and English Monarchies, 1587–1688* (Oxford, 2014).

Ashton, Robert, ed. *James I by His Contemporaries* (London, 1969).

Assheton, Abdias. *An Account of the Life and Death of William Whitaker* (London, 1772).

Aveling, J. C. H. *Northern Catholics: The Catholic Recusants of the North Riding of Yorkshire, 1558–1790* (London, 1966).

—— *Catholic Recusancy in the City of York, 1558–1791* (London, 1970).
—— *The Handle and the Axe: The Catholic Recusants in England from Reformation to Emancipation* (London, 1976).

Babbage, Stuart Barton. *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft* (London, 1962).

Bagchi, David. 'Catholic theologians of the Reformation period before Trent' in D. Bagchi and D. Steinmetz, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004).

Barroll, Leeds. 'The Court of the First Stuart Queen', in Linda Levy Peck, ed. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 2005).

Bellesheim, Alphons. *History of the Catholic Church of Scotland,* 4 vols (Edinburgh, 1887–90).

Benedict, Philip. *Faith and Fortunes of France's Huguenots, 1600–85* (Aldershot, 2001).

Bercé, Yves-Marie. *The Birth of Absolutism: a History of France, 1598–1661*. Trans. by Richard Rex (Basingstoke, 1996).

Bergin, Joseph. *Politics of Religion in Early Modern France* (New Haven, 2014).

Blet, Pierre. 'L'article du Tiers aux États généraux de 1614', *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, 2 (Apr-June, 1955), 81–106.

—— *Le Clergé de France et la Monarchie*. 2 vols (Rome, 1959).

Bossy, John. *English Catholic Community, 1570–1850* (Oxford, 1976).

—— 'The English Catholic Community 1603–1625', in Alan G. R. Smith, ed. *The Reign of James VI and I* (London, 1973), 91–105.

Bourdin, Bernard. *The Theological–Political Origins of the Modern State: The Controversy between James I of England & Cardinal Bellarmine*. Trans. by Susan Pickford (Washington, DC, 2010).

Bouwsma, William. *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty* (Berkeley, 1968).

—— 'Gallicanism and the Nature of Christendom', in Anthony Molho and John Tedeschi, eds. *Renaissance Studies in Honor of Hans Baron* (DeKalb, IL, 1972).

Brodrick, James. *Robert Bellarmine: Saint and Scholar* (London, 1961).

Broeyer, F. G. M. 'Traces of the Rise of Reformed Scholasticism in the Polemical Theologian William Whitaker (1548–1595)', in W. J. van Asselt and E. Dekker, eds. *Reformation and Scholasticism: An Ecumenical Enterprise* (Grand Rapids, 2001).

Brunot, Ferdinand. *Histoire de la langue française, des origines à 1900*. 13 vols (Paris, 1924–72).

Burigny, Jean Levesque de. *Vie du Cardinal du Perron, archevêque de Sens* (Paris, 1768).

Burnet, Gilbert. *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time*. 2 vols (London, 1724–34).

Cahier, Gabriella, Matteo Campagnolo, and Micheline Louis-Courvoisier, eds. *Registres de la Compagnie des Pasteurs de Genève, XI, 1610–1613* (Geneva, 1993).

Calderwood, David. *The History of the Reformation in Scotland*. Ed. by T. Thomson. 8 vols (Edinburgh, 1842–9).

Camden, William. *History of the most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth . . .* (London, 1688).

Cameron, James K. *The First Book of Discipline* (Edinburgh, 1972).

—— 'The Office of Superintendent in the *First Book of Discipline*', in Bernard Vogler, ed. *L'Institution et les Pouvoirs dans les Eglises de l'Antiquité à nos Jours* (Brussels, 1987).

Campbell, Arabella Georgina. *The Life of Fra Paolo Sarpi* (London, 1869).

Caraman, Philip. *Henry Garnet, 1555–1606, and the Gunpowder Plot* (London, 1964).

Carter, Charles Howard. *The Secret Diplomacy of the Habsburgs, 1598–1625* (New York, 1964).

Cogswell, Thomas. *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621–1624* (Cambridge, 1989).

—— 'England and the Spanish Match', in Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, eds. *Conflicts in Early Stuart England: studies in religion and politics, 1603–1642* (Harlow, 1989).

Collinson, Patrick. *Archbishop Grindal, 1519–1583* (London, 1979).

—— *Religion of Protestants: The Church in English Society, 1559–1625* (Oxford, 1982).

—— 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement', in H. Tomlinson, ed. *Before the English Civil War* (London, 1983).

—— 'Episcopacy and Quasi-Episcopacy in the Elizabethan Church', in Bernard Vogler, ed. *L'Institution et les Pouvoirs dans les Eglises de l'Antiquité à nos Jours* (Brussels, 1987).

Colville, John. *The Historie and Life of King James the Sext . . .* Ed. by Malcolm Laing (Edinburgh, 1804).

Cornet, Enrico. *Paolo V. e La Republica Veneta. Giornale, Dal 22. Ottobre 1605 – 9. Giugno 1607* . . . (Vienna, 1859).

Cottret, Bernard. *Huguenots in England, Immigration and Settlement c. 1550–1700* (Cambridge, 2009).

Courtney, Alexander. 'The Sottish King and the English court: the secret correspondence of James VI, 1601–3', in Doran and Kewes, eds. *Doubtful and dangerous: The question of succession in late Elizabethan England* (Manchester, 2014).

Cowan, Ian B. *The Scottish Reformation: Church and Society in Sixteenth Century Scotland* (London, 1982).

Croft, Pauline. *King James*. (New York, 2002).

—— 'Rex Pacificus, Robert Cecil, and the 1604 Peace with Spain', in Glenn Burgess, Rowland Wymer, and Jason Lawrence, eds. *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences* (Basingstoke, 2006).

Crosignani, Ginevra, Thomas M. McCoog, and Michael Questier, eds. *Recusancy and Conformity in Early Modern England: Manuscript and Printed Sources in Translation* (Rome, 2010).

Cunningham, Peter. *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court, in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth and King James I* (London, 1842).

Curtis, Mark. 'The Hampton Court Conference and its Aftermath', *History*, 46 (1961), 1–16.

Cust, Richard and Ann Hughes. eds. *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (Harlow, 1989).

Dalrymple, David, ed. *Memorials and Letters relating to the History of Britain in the Reign of James the First* (2nd edn. Glasgow, 1766).

Davies, Julian. *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism, 1625–1641* (Oxford, 1992).

De Lisle, Leanda. *After Elizabeth: How James, King of Scots won the Crown of England in 1603* (London, 2004).

Denny, Edward. *The English Church and the Ministry of the Reformed Churches* (London, 1900).

Dietz, Frederick. *English Public Finance 1558–1641* (2nd edn. London, 1964).

Dodd, A. H. 'The Spanish Treason, the Gunpowder Plot, and the Catholic Refugees', *English Historical Review*, 53 (Oct 1938), 627–50.

Dodd, Charles. *The Church History of England from the Commencement of the Sixteenth Century to the Revolution in 1688*. Ed. by M. A. Tierney. 5 vols (London, 1839–43).

Donaldson, Gordon. 'The Relations between the English and Scottish Presbyterian Movements to 1604' (Unpublished University of London PhD thesis, 1938).

—— *The Scottish Reformation*. (Cambridge, 1960).

—— *Scotland: James V–James VII* (Edinburgh, 1978).

——, ed. 'Lord Chancellor Glamis and Theodore Beza', *Miscellany of the Scottish History Society*, 8 (Edinburgh, 1965).

Doran, Susan. 'Revenge her Foul and Most Unnatural Murder? The Impact of Mary Stewart's Execution on Anglo-Scottish Relations', *History*, 85 (October 2000), 589–612.

—— 'James VI and the English Succession', in Ralph Houlbrooke. ed. *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government* (Aldershot, 2006).

—— 'Polemic and prejudice: a Scottish king for an English throne', in Doran and Kewes, eds. *Doubtful and dangerous: The question of succession in late Elizabethan England* (Manchester, 2014).

—— and Kewes, Paulina. 'The earlier Elizabethan succession question revisited', in Doran and Kewes, eds. *Doubtful and dangerous: The question of succession in late Elizabethan England* (Manchester, 2014).

Dudon, Paul. 'Gallicanisme politique et théologie gallicane' *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, 19 (1929), 513–39.

Dures, Alan. *English Catholicism 1558–1642: Continuity and Change* (Harlow, 1983).

Durkan, J. 'The French Connection in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', in T. C. Smout, ed. *Scotland and Europe, 1200–1850* (Edinburgh, 1986).

Edwards, Francis. 'Still Investigating Gunpowder Plot', *Recusant History*, 21 (May 1993), 305–46.

Ferrell, Lori Anne. *Government by Polemic: James I, the King's Preachers, and the Rhetorics of Conformity, 1603–1625* (Stanford, 1998).

Fincham, Kenneth. *Prelate as Pastor: the Episcopate of James I* (Oxford, 1990).

—— *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Basingstoke, 1993).

—— and Lake. 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I', *Journal of British Studies*, 24 (1985), 169–207.

—— and Lake. 'The Ecclesiastical Policies of James I and Charles I' in Kenneth Fincham, ed. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (London, 1993).

—— and Lake. 'Popularity, Prelacy and Puritanism: Joseph Hall Explains Himself'. *English Historical Review*, 111 (1996), 856–881.

—— and Nicholas Tyacke. *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547–c.1700* (Oxford, 2007).

Forbes-Leith, William, ed. *Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI* (London, 1889).

Foster, W. R. *The Church before the Covenants: the Church of Scotland, 1596–1638* (Edinburgh, 1975).

Franceschi, S. H. De. *La Crise Théologico-Politique du Premier Âge Baroque* (Rome, 2009).

Fraser, Antonia. *The Gunpowder Plot: Terror & Faith in 1605* (London, 1996).

Fuller, Thomas. *The Church History of Britain from the Birth of Jesus Christ until the year 1648* (London, 1656).

—— *The Holy State* (London, 1663), 59–62.

Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Disgrace of Chief-Justice Coke, 1603–1616*. 2 vols (London, 1863).

—— *Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage, 1617–1623: a chapter of English History founded principally upon Unpublished Documents in this Country, and in the Archives of Simancas, Venice, and Brussels*. 2 vols (London, 1869).

——, ed. *Debates in the House of Commons in 1625* (London, 1873).

—— *History of England from the Accession of James I to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603–1642*. 10 vols (London, 1883–4).

—— *What the Gunpowder Plot Was* (London, 1897).

Gerard, John. *The Condition of Catholics under James I: Father Gerard's Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot*. Ed. by John Morris (London, 1871).

—— *What Was the Gunpowder Plot?* (London, 1897).

Goodare, Julian. *State and Society in Early Modern Scotland* (Oxford, 1999).

—— 'The Scottish Presbyterian Movement in 1596', *Canadian Journal of History*, 43 (2010), 21–48.

Goodman, Godfrey. *The Court of King James the First*. Ed. by J. S. Brewer. 2 vols (London, 1839).

Gory, Gédéon. *Essai sur sa vie, sa controverse et sa polémique* (Paris, 1888).

Graham, Michael F. *Uses of Reform: 'Godly Discipline' and Popular Behavior in Scotland and France, 1560–1610* (Leiden, 1996).

Haag, Eugène and Émile Haag, *La France Protestante* . . . 10 vols (Paris, 1846–59).

Haaugaard, William. 'Renaissance Patristic Scholarship and Theology in Sixteenth-Century England', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 10 (Autumn, 1979).

Hardy, Thomas Duffus. ed. *Syllabus (in English) of the Documents relating to England and other Kingdoms contained in the collection known as "Rymer's Foedera"*. 3 vols (London, 1869–85).

Harris, Tim. *Rebellion: Britain's First Stuart Kings, 1567–1642* (Oxford, 2014).

Hartley, T. E., ed. *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I*. 3 vols (Leicester, 1981–95).

Hasted, Edward. *History and Topographical Survey of the County of Kent*. 12 vols (Canterbury, 1797–1801).

Hayden, J. M. *France and the Estates General of 1614* (Cambridge, 1974).

Hicks, Leo. 'Sir Robert Cecil, Father Persons and the Succession, 1600–01', *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, 24 (Jan 1955), 95–139.

Holmes, Peter. 'The Authorship and Early Reception of a *Conference about the Next Succession to the Crown of England*', *The Historical Journal*, 23 (June 1980), 415–29.

Houlbrooke, Ralph, ed. *James V and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government* (Aldershot, 2006).

Houston, S. J. *James I* (London, 1973).

Hughes, Philip. *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England* (London, 1942).

Jardine, David. *Criminal Trials*. 2 vols (London, 1832–5).

——— *A Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot* (London, 1857).

Jedin, Hubert. *A History of the Council of Trent*. Trans. by Ernest Graf. 2 vols (London, 1957–61).

Jordan, W. K. *The Development of Religious Toleration in England* (Cambridge, MA, 1936).

Kenyon, J. P. *The Stuarts* (London, 1958).

——— *The Stuart Constitution, 1603–1688: Documents and Commentary, Second Edition* (Cambridge, 1966).

——— *Stuart England* (London, 1978).

Kim, Keechang. *Aliens in Medieval Law: The Origins of Modern Citizenship* (Cambridge, 2000).

Kingdon, Robert. 'The Episcopal Function in Protestant Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', in Bernard Vogler, ed. *Miscellanea Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 8 (Brussels, 1987).

Kirk, James. 'L'apparition d'une ecclésiologie réformée. Le cas de l'Ecosse', in Bernard Vogler, ed. *L'Institution et les Pouvoirs dans les Eglises de l'Antiquité à nos Jours* (Brussels, 1987).

—— 'The Polities of the Best Reformed Kirks: Scottish achievements and English aspirations in church government after the Reformation', in J. Kirk, ed. *Patterns of Reform, Continuity and Change in the Reformation Kirk* (Edinburgh, 1989).

Labrousse, Elisabeth. 'L'oeuvre de Pierre II Du Moulin', *Annuaire de l'Ecole des hautes* études, 4e section, 104 (1971–2), 529–38.

—— 'Great Britain as Envisaged by the Huguenots of the Seventeenth Century', in Irene Scouloudi, ed. *Huguenots in Britain and their French Background, 1550–1800* (Basingstoke, 1987).

—— 'Marie Du Moulin, éducatrice', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, 139 (1993), 255–68.

Lake, Peter. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, 1982).

—— 'Calvinism and the English Church, 1570-1635', *Past and Present*, 114 (Feb 1987), 32–7.

—— *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London, 1988).

—— 'Anti-popery: the Structure of a Prejudice', in Richard Cust and Ann Hughes. eds. *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (Harlow, 1989).

—— 'Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and avant-garde conformity', in Linda Levy Peck, ed. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 2005).

—— with Michael Questier, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, 2002).

—— and Michael Questier. 'Taking it to the street? The Archpriest controversy and the issue of succession', in Doran and Kewes, eds. *Doubtful and dangerous: The question of succession in late Elizabethan England* (Manchester, 2014).

Lalourcé and Duval, eds. *Recueil de pièces originales et authentiques concernant la tenue des États – Généraux*. 9 vols (Paris, 1789).

Lambert, Sheila. 'Richard Montagu, Arminianism, and Censorship', *Past and Present*, 124 (1989), 36–68.

Lamont, William M. 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 107 (May 1985), 227–31.

LaRocca, John J. '"Who Can't Pray with Me, Can't Love Me": Toleration and the Early Jacobean Recusancy Policy', *Journal of British Studies*, 23 (Spring, 1984), 22–36.

—— 'James I and his Catholic Subjects, 1606–1612: Some Financial Implications', *British Catholic History*, 18 (May 1987), 251–262.

Lee, Jr., Maurice. *James I and Henri IV: An Essay in English Foreign Policy, 1603–1610* (Chicago, 1970).

—— 'James VI and the Revival of Episcopacy in Scotland: 1596–1600', *Church History*, 43 (March 1974), 50–64.

—— 'James I and the Historians: Not a Bad King after All', *Albion*, 16 (Summer 1984), 151–63.

—— *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in his Three Kingdoms* (Chicago, 1990).

Legg, J. W. *The Coronation Order of King James I* (London, 1902).

Linder, Robert D. 'The French Calvinist Response to the Formula of Concord', *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 19 (Winter 1982), 18–37.

Lingard, John. *A History of England* . . . 10 vols (5th edn. London, 1849),

Liques, David de. *Histoire de la vie de Messire Philippes de Mornay* . . . (Leiden, 1647).

Lockyer, Roger. *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592–1628* (London, 1981).

—— *James VI and I* (New York, 1998).

Loomie, Albert J. *The Spanish Elizabethans: the English Exiles at the Court of Philip II* (New York, 1963).

—— 'Toleration and Diplomacy: The Religious Issue in Anglo-Spanish Relations, 1603–1605', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series, 53/6 (1963), 1–60.

—— 'Philip III and the Stuart Succession in England, 1600–1603', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 43, no. 2 (1965), 492–514.

—— *Guy Fawkes in Spain: the 'Spanish Treason' in Spanish Documents* (London, 1971).

—— 'King James's Catholic Consort', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 34 (1971), 303–16.

—— *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics*. 2 vols (London, 1973–8).
——, ed. *English Polemics at the Spanish Court: Joseph Creswell's Letter to the Ambassador from England* (New York, 1993).

Lossky, Nicholas. *Lancelot Andrewes, the Preacher (1555–1626)* (Oxford, 1991).

Lynch, Michael. *Scotland: a New History* (London, 1991).

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. 'Heinrich Bullinger and the English-speaking world', in E. Campi, ed. *Heinrich Bullinger (1505–1575): Leben, Denken, Wirkung* (Zurich, 2006).

MacDonald, Alan R. 'The Subscription Crisis and church-state relations 1584–1586', *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* (1994), 222–55.

—— 'James VI and the General Assembly, 1586–1618', in Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch, eds. *The Reign of James VI* (East Lothian, 2000).

—— 'James VI and I, the Church of Scotland, and British Ecclesiastical Convergence', *Historical Journal*, 48 (2005), 885–903.

McCrie, T. *Life of Andrew Melville, Containing Illustrations of the Ecclesiastical and Literary History of Scotland During the Latter Part of the Sixteenth and Beginning of the Seventeenth Century*. 2 vols (2nd edn. Edinburgh, 1824).

McCullough, Peter. *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge, 1998).

—— 'Making Dead Men Speak', *The Historical Journal*, 41 (1998), 401–24.

—— 'Donne and Court Chaplaincy' in Dennis Flynn, M. Thomas Hester, and Jeanne Shami, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of John Donne* (Oxford, 2011).

McIlwain, Charles. 'Introduction', in McIlwain, ed. *The Political Works of James I* (Cambridge, MA, 1918), xv–lxxx.

McLaren, Anne N. 'Challenging the Monarchical Republic: James I's Articulation of Kingship', in John McDiarmid, ed. *The Monarchical Republic of Early Modern England: Essays in Response to Patrick Collinson* (Aldershot, 2007).

McMahon, G. I. R. 'The Scottish Episcopate, 1600–1638' (Unpublished University of Birmingham PhD thesis, 1972).

Mackie, J. D. 'A Secret Agent of James VI', *Scottish Historical Review*, 9 (1912), 376–86.

—— 'The Secret Diplomacy of King James VI in Italy prior to his Accession to the English Throne', *Scottish Historical Review*, 25 (1924), 267–82.

—— *Negotiations between King James VI. and I. and Ferdinand I. Grand Duke of Tuscany* (St. Andrews, 1927).

—— 'Henry IV and James VI and I', in D. R. Haggis, et al, eds. *The French Renaissance and Its Heritage: Essays Presented to Alan M. Boase* (London, 1968), 81–7.

Maghenzani, Simone. 'The Protestant Reformation in Counter-Reformation Italy, c. 1550–1660: An Overview of New Evidence,' *Church History*, 83 (September 2014), 571–89.

Maitland, F. W. 'The Anglican Settlement and the Scottish Reformation', in A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, and Stanley Leathers, eds. *The Cambridge Modern History, II: The Reformation* (London, 1904).

Major, James Russell. *The Deputies to the Estates General in Renaissance France* (Madison, WI, 1960).

—— *Representative Government in Early Modern France* (New Haven, 1980).

—— *From Renaissance Monarchy to Absolute Monarchy: French Kings, Nobles, and Estates* (Baltimore, 1994).

Marsh, C. *The Family of Love in English Society, 1550–1630* (Cambridge, 1994).

Marshall, Joseph. 'Reading and Misreading King James 1622–42: Responses to the Letter and Directions Touching Preaching and Preachers', in Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier, eds. *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I* (Detroit, 2002).

Martin, Victor. *Les Origines du Gallicanisme*. 2 vols (Paris, 1939).

Marwick, J. D., ed. *Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh, 1573–1589*, vol 4 (Edinburgh, 1882).

Mason, Roger. *Kingship and the Commonweal: Political Thought in Renaissance and Reformation Scotland* (East Linton, 1998).

Meikle, Maureen and Helen Payne. 'From Lutheranism to Catholicism: The Faith of Anna of Denmark (1574–1619)', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 61 (Jan 2013), 45–69.

Meyer, A. O. 'Clemens VIII. und Jakob I. von England', *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, 7, 2 (1904), 268–306.

Michel, Francisque. *Les Éccossais en France, Les Français in Écosse*. 2 vols (Paris, 1862).

Miller, Samuel. *Letters concerning the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry* (2nd edn. Philadelphia, 1830).

Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge, 2002).

—— *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn* (Manchester, 2012).

——, ed. *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618–1619)* (Woodbridge, 2005).

Milward, Peter. *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age* (London, 1977).

—— *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: a Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1978).

Morrill, John. 'A British patriarchy? Ecclesiastical Imperialism under the Early Stuarts', in A. Fletcher and P. Roberts, eds. *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 1994).

Mousnier, Roland. *L'assassinat d'Henri IV* (Paris, 1964).

Muldoon, Andrew. 'Recusants, Church-Papists, and "Comfortable" Missionaries: Assessing the Post-Reformation English Catholic Community', *Catholic Historical Review*, 86 (April 2000), 242–57.

Mullan, David George. *Episcopacy in Scotland: the History of an Idea* (Edinburgh, 1986).

—— *Scottish Puritanism, 1590–1638* (Oxford, 2000).

Muller, Richard. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: the Rise and Development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520 to ca. 1725*. 4 vols (2nd edn. Grand Rapids, 1987–2006).

Mullinger, James Bass. *St. John's College* (London, 1901).

Murray, James. *A History of the Churches of England and Scotland, From the Reformation to this present Time*. 3 vols (Newcastle, 1771–2).

Murray, John Courtney. 'St Robert Bellarmine on the Indirect Power', *Theological Studies*, 9 (1948), 491–535.

Nelson, Eric W. 'Defining the Fundamental Laws of France: The Proposed First Article of the Third Estate at the French Estate General of 1614', *English Historical Review*, 115 (Nov 2000), 1216–30.

Newland, Henry. *The Life and Contemporaneous Church History of Antonio De Dominis* (Oxford, 1859).

Nichols, John. *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First*. 4 vols (London, 1828).

Nicholls, Mark. *Investigating Gunpowder Plot* (Manchester, 1991).

——— ‘Discovering Gunpowder Plot: The King’s Book and the Dissemination of News’, *Recusant History*, 28 (May 2007), 397–415.

——— ‘Strategy and Motivation in the Gunpowder Plot’, *Historical Journal*, 50 (December 2007), 787–807.

North, Marcy. ‘Anonymity’s Subject: James I and the Debate over the Oath of Allegiance’, *New Literary History*, 33 (Spring, 2002), 215–32.

Nuttall, Geoffrey G. ‘The English Martyrs, 1535–1680: A Statistical Review’, *Journal Ecclesiastical History*, 22 (1971), 191–7.

Oakley, Francis. ‘Complexities of Context: Gerson, Bellarmine, Sarpi, Richer, and the Venetian Interdict of 1606–1607’ *English Historical Review*, 82 (1996), 369–96.

——— *Politics and Eternity: Studies in the History of Medieval and Early-Modern Political Thought* (Leiden, 1999).

——— ‘Bronze-Age Conciliarism: Edmond Richer’s Encounters with Cajetan and Bellarmine’, *History of Political Thought*, 20 (1999), 65–86.

Okines, A. W. R. E. ‘Why was there so little government reaction to Gunpowder Plot?’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 55 (April 2004), 275–92.

O’Malley, John. *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (London, 2013).

Ornsby, G., ed. *The Correspondence of John Cosin*. 2 vols (Durham, 1869).

Pannier, Jacques. *L’Église Réformée de Paris sous Louis XIII (1610–1621)* (Strasbourg, 1922).

Parker, Geoffrey, ed. *The Thirty Years’ War* (London, 1987).

Parsons, Jotham. *The Church in the Republic: Gallicanism and Political Ideology in Renaissance France* (Washington DC, 2004).

Pastor, Ludwig Freiherr von. *The History of the Popes from the close of the Middle Ages*. 40 vols (London, 1938–61).

Patterson, W. B. ‘King James I’s Call for an Ecumenical Council’, in G. J. Cuming and D. Baker, eds. *Councils and Assemblies: Papers Read at the Eighth Summer Meeting and the Ninth Winter Meeting of Ecclesiastical History Society*, Studies in Church History, No. 7 (Cambridge, 1971).

——— ‘James I and the Huguenot Synod of Tonneins of 1614’, *Harvard Theological Review*, 65 (1972), 241–70.

——— ‘The Peregrinations of Marco Antonio De Dominis, 1616–24’, in Derek Baker ed. *Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian: Papers Read at the Sixteenth Summer Meeting and the Seventeenth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Oxford, 1978).

—— 'Pierre du Moulin's Quest for Protestant Unity, 1613–1618', in R. N. Swanson, ed. *Unity and Diversity in the Church: papers read at the 1994 Summer Meeting and the 1995 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Oxford, 1996).

—— *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997).

Pattison, Mark. *Isaac Casaubon, 1559–1614* (Oxford, 1892).

Perrens, François-Thommy. *L'Église et L'État en France sous le règne de Henri IV et la régence de Marie de Médicis*. 2 vols (Paris, 1872).

Pitts, Vincent. *Henri IV of France: His Reign and His Age* (Baltimore, 2009).

Pollen, J. H. 'The Accession of King James I', *The Month*, 101 (1903), 572–85.

—— *The Institution of the Archpriest Blackwell* (London, 1916).

Quantin, Jean-Louis. *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford, 2009).

Questier, Michael. 'Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England', *Historical Journal*, 40 (June 1997), 311–29.

—— *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c. 1550–1640* (Cambridge, 2006).

——, ed. *Stuart Dynastic Policy and Religious Politics, 1621–1625* (Cambridge, 2009).

Raab, V. H. 'Zur Geschichte und Bedeutung des Schlagwortes "ultramontan" im 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhundert', *Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-gesellschaft* 81 (1962), 159–73.

Rapine, Florimon. *Recueil très-exact et curieux de tout ce qui s'est fait et passé de singulier et memorable en l'Assemblée generale des Estats* . . . (Paris, 1651).

Reid, W. Stanford. 'French Influence on the First Scots Confession and Book of Discipline', *Westminster Theological Journal*, 35 (1972–3), 1–14.

Rhodes, Neil and Jennifer Richards and Joseph Marshall, eds. *King James VI and I: Selected Writings* (Aldershot, 2003).

Richards, Judith. 'The English Accession of James VI: "National" Identity, Gender and the Personal Monarchy of England', *English Historical Review*, 117 (2002), 513–35.

Rimbault, Lucien. *Pierre du Moulin, 1568–1658: Un Pasteur classique à l'âge classique* (Paris, 1966).

Rose, Elliot. *Cases of Conscience* (Cambridge, 1975).

Rothrock, George. 'The French Crown and the Estates General of 1614', *French Historical Studies*, 1 (Spring, 1960), 295–318.

Rushworth, John. *Historical Collections: of private passages of state . . . beginning the sixteenth years of King James, anno 1618, and ending the fifth year of King Charls, anno 1629* . . . 7 vols (London, 1659–1701).

Russell, Arthur T. *Memoirs of the Life and Works of the Right Honorable and Right Reverend Father in God Lancelot Andrewes* (London, 1863).

Russell, Conrad. *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629* (Oxford, 1979).

—— *The Causes of the English Civil War* (Oxford, 1990).

—— 'The Parliamentary Career of John Pym, 1621–1629' in C. Russell, *Unrevolutionary England, 1603–1642* (London, 1990).

Ryan, Clarence. 'The Jacobean Oath of Allegiance and English Lay Catholics', *Catholic Historical Review*, 28 (July 1942), 159–83.

Salmon, J. H. M. 'Gallicanism and Anglicanism in the age of the Counter-Reformation', in Salmon, *Renaissance and Revolt: Essays in the Intellectual and Social History of Early Modern France* (Cambridge, 1987).

—— 'Catholic resistance theory, Ultramontanism, and the royalist response, 1580–1620', in J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie, eds. *Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450–1700* (Cambridge, 1991).

Sawyer, Edmund, ed., *Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q. Elizabeth and K. James I, Collected, chiefly, from the original papers of sir Ralph Winwood*. 3 vols (London, 1725).

Schaff, Phillip. *The Creeds of Christendom*. 3 vols (New York, 1877).

Schwarz, Marc L. 'James I and the Historians: Toward a Reconsideration', *Journal of British Studies*, 13 (1974), 114–34.

Scott, Harold Spencer. *The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham* (London, 1902).

Sharpe, Kenneth. *Remapping Early Modern England: the Culture of Seventeenth-Century Politics* (Cambridge, 2000).

Shrewsbury, J. F. D. *A History of the Bubonic Plague in the British Isles* (Cambridge, 1970).

Shriver, F. 'Hampton Court Re-visited: James I and the Puritans', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 33 (1983), 48–71.

Sinnema, Donald. 'French Reformed Churches, Arminianism, and the Synod of Dort', in Martin Klauber, ed. *The Theology of the French Reformed Churches* (Grand Rapids, 2014), 98–136.

Smith, Logan Pearsall. *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*. 2 vols (Oxford, 1907).

Soden, G. *Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, 1583–1656* (London, 1953).

Solé, Jacques. *Le débat entre protestants et catholiques français de 1598 a 1685*. 4 vols (Lille, 1985).

Sommerville, Johann P. 'Jacobean Political Thought and the Controversy over the Oath of Allegiance' (Unpublished University of Cambridge PhD thesis, 1981).

Spitz, Lewis and Wenzel Lohff, eds. *Discord, Dialogue, and Concord: Studies in the Lutheran Reformation's Formula of Concord* (Philadelphia, 1977).

Stafford, Helen G. *James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England* (New York, 1940).

Steinmetz, David. 'The Council of Trent', in D. Bagchi and D. Steinmetz, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004).

Stewart, L. A. M. 'The Political Repercussions of the Five Articles of Perth: a Reassessment of James VI and I's Religious Policies in Scotland', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 38 (2007), 1013–36.

Strype, John. *Life and Acts of John Whitgift*. 3 vols (Oxford, 1821).

Suarez, Francisco. *Defensio fidei Catholicae et Apostolicae: adversus Anglicanae Sectae Errores . . .*, in *Opera omnia*. vol 24 (Paris, 1869), Book VI, Chapter IV.

Sunshine, Glenn S. *Reforming French Protestantism: The Development of Huguenot Ecclesiastical Institutions, 1557–1572* (Kirksville, MO, 2003).

Sutherland, N. M. *Henri IV of France and the Politics of Religion, 1572–1596.* 2 vols (Bristol, 2002).

Sykes, Norman. 'The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *Theology*, Occasional papers, new series, no. 11 (London, 1948).

—— *Old Priest and New Presbyter* (Cambridge, 1956).

Tait, Gordon. 'Pierre du Moulin (1568–1658), Huguenot Theologian' (Unpublished University of Edinburgh PhD thesis, 1955).

Tallon, Alain. *La France et le concile de Trente (1518–1563)* (Rome, 1997).

—— *Conscience nationale et sentiment religieux en France au XVIe siècle: Essai sur la vision gallicane du monde* (Paris, 2002).

——— 'National Church, State Church and Universal Church: The Gallican Dilemma in Sixteenth-century France' in Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie, eds. *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation* (Aldershot, 2005).

Tavard, George. *Holy Writ or Holy Church: the Crisis of the Protestant Reformation* (London, 1959).

Trevor-Roper, Hugh. *Europe's Physician: The Various Life of Theodore de Mayerne* (London, 2006).

Trollope, T. Adolphus. *Paul the Pope and Paul the Friar* (London, 1861).

Tutino, Stefania. *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth* (Oxford, 2010).

Tyacke, Nicholas. 'Puritanism, Arminianism, and Counter Revolution', in Conrad Russell, ed. *The Origins of the English Civil War* (Basingstoke, 1973).

——— *Anti-Calvinists: the Rise of English Arminianism* (Oxford, 1990).

——— and Peter White. 'Debate: The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 115 (May 1987), 201–29.

Tyard, Pontus de. *Deux discours de la Nature du Monde & de ses parties . . .* (Paris, 1578).

Usher, Roland G. *Reconstruction of the English Church*. 2 vols (London, 1910).

Van der Meij, J. 'Pierre du Moulin in Leiden, 1592-1598', *Lias*, 14 (1987), 15–40.

Venn, John and John Archibald Venn. *Alumni Cantabrigienses: a Biographical List of All Known Students, Graduates and Holders of Office at the University of Cambridge, from the Earliest Times to 1900*. 2 parts in 10 vols (Cambridge, 1922–54).

Verdouw, C. *Pierre du Moulin: Hugenotenpredikant in de strijd* (Houten, 2005).

Verheiden, Jacob. *History of the Moderne Protestant Divines: containing their parents, countries, education, studies, lives, and the yeare of our Lord in which they dyed . . .* (London, 1637).

Von Ranke, Leopold. *History of England, Principally in the Seventeenth Century*. 6 vols (Oxford, 1875).

Wadkins, Timothy H. 'The Percy-'Fisher' Controversies and the Ecclesiastical Politics of Jacobean Anti-Catholicism, 1622–1625', *Church History*, 57 (June 1988), 153–69.

Wagner, Henry. *Pedigrees of the Du Moulin and De l'Angle Families* (London, 1883).

Wagstaffe, Sally Anne 'Forms and methods of religious controversy in Paris: with special reference to Pierre du Moulin and his Catholic opponents' (Unpublished Durham University Ph.D. thesis, 1990).

Walsham, Alexandra. *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1993).

Ward, A. W. 'James VI. and the Papacy', *Scottish Historical Review*, 2 (1905), 249–52.

Warner, G. F. 'James VI and Rome', *English Historical Review*, 20 (1905), 124–7.

Waterworth, James, ed. *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent* (London, 1848).

Welsby, Paul, *Lancelot Andrewes, 1555–1626* (London, 1958).

—— *George Abbot, The Unwanted Archbishop* (London, 1962).

White, Peter. 'The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered', *Past and Present*, 101 (Nov. 1983), 34–54.

—— *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge, 1992).

Wicks, Jared. Review of *The Cambridge Companion to Reformation Theology* (Cambridge, 2004), *The Thomist*, 70 (2006), 289–92.

Williams, Charles. *James I* (London, 1934).

Willson, D. Harris. 'James I and His Literary Assistants', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 8 (Nov. 1944), 35–57.

—— *King James VI and I* (London, 1956).

Wilson, Peter. *The Thirty Years War: Europe's Tragedy* (Cambridge, MA, 2009).

Wodrow, R. *Collections upon the Lives of the Reformers and Ministers of the Church of Scotland* (Glasgow, 1848).

Wolfe, Michael. *The Conversion of Henri IV: Politics, Power, and Religious Belief in Early Modern France* (London, 1993).

—— 'Exegesis as Public Performance: Controversialist Debate and Politics at the Conference at Fontainebleau' in A. Forrestal and E. Nelson, eds. *Politics and Religion in Early Bourbon France* (Basingstoke, 2009).

Wootton, David. *Paolo Sarpi, Between Renaissance and Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 2002).

Wormald, Jenny. 'James VI & I: Two Kings or One?', *History*, 68 (June 1983). 187–209.

—— 'Gunpowder, Treason, and Scots', *Journal of British Studies*, 24 (April 1985), 141–68.

—— ‘No Bishop, No King: The Scottish Jacobean Episcopate, 1600–1625’, in Bernard Vogler, ed. *Miscellanea Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 8 (Brussels, 1987).

—— ‘Basilikon Doron and The Trew Law of Free Monarchies: the Scottish context and the English translation’, in Linda Levy Peck, ed. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991), 36–55.

—— ‘James VI & I’, *History Today*, 52 (June 2002), 27–33.

Wright, A. D. ‘Why the Venetian Interdict’, *English Historical Review*, 89 (July 1974), 534–50.