

Contents

Contents.....	1
Introduction.....	2
Jean Baptiste Stoupe.....	2
Tolerance and confessionalism in late seventeenth-century society.....	4
Reformed Internationalism.....	6
My research.....	9
Questioning Dutch confessional Identity.....	14
Ambiguous service.....	15
The Religion of the Dutch	20
Balancing arguments.....	30
The Dutch Revolt and William of Orange.....	31
Defending confessional policy.....	34
Religious war and diplomacy.....	43
Argumenti ad hominum.....	45
Conclusion.....	49
Stoupe's dichotomy.....	50
Integrating confession and politics.....	53
Implications.....	56
Bibliography.....	60

Introduction

One of the crucial moments in the 1672/73 military campaigns of Louis XIV in the Dutch Republic was the attempted breakthrough of the French Troops at Zwammerdam and Bodegraven on 27 december 1672. The inundated *waterlinie* was frozen and the Dutch were forced to retreat behind the *Oude Rijn*. With Prince William III far away, busy with the siege of Charleroi, most officers did not have the courage to stand against the duke of Luxembourg. Although the thaw set in that night and the duke was forced to leave half of his troops behind the *waterlinie* and make his way back to Woerden, the Dutch officers did not dare to confront the French and retreated to the *Goudse Sluis* and later Leiden. The French, on their way back to Woerden, found the villages of Zwammerdam and Bodegraven almost undefended and this ignited a French fury against the inhabitants of both villages.

The atrocities committed by the French in Zwammerdam and Bodegraven ignited, according to Panhuysen, a torrent of anti-French pamphlets and other written condemnations of the French actions committed there. Although many of the stories were exaggerated, the cruelties had been of such a severe nature that it even had its impact on the good name of the Duke of Luxembourg. His reputation at the court of Louis XIV was so threatened by the rumours regarding his actions, that he decided to set himself to writing a pamphlet in defence of the French cause. But, although he was a gifted writer of letters, his propagandist capacities were not of the same nature, so he decided to bestow a colonel of one of the Swiss regiments in service of the French crown, Jean Baptiste Stoupe, with the task of writing the pamphlet.¹

Jean Baptiste Stoupe

Originating from Grisons, Stoupe was educated at various places in Europe between 1639 and 1641. His first orientation was medicine and he studied at the universities of Geneva, Padua, Strasbourg and Leiden. Stoupe ultimately went back to Geneva to study theology, after which he became a pastor at the Walloon church in London in 1652. This occupation he held until 1661. In this period Stoupe became politically active as a spy for the English Commonwealth. He was asked to contact

¹ Luc Panhuysen, *Rampjaar 1672, hoe de Republiek aan de ondergang ontsnapte* (Amsterdam/Antwerpen 2009), 266-283

French Huguenot rebels in France to prove their loyalty to the young Louis XIV and try to inspire a Huguenot uprising in France, which would serve the English cause in their struggle with the French. Stoupe unfortunately had to conclude that there was too little disloyalty to the king amongst the French Huguenots to make an uprising feasible. During his time in English service Stoupe also wrote an account of the murder of the Vaudois in 1655, by the Duke of Piedmont, who was a client of the French king.

After the Restoration Stoupe became a *persona non grata* in the eyes of the royalists, because of his partisanship for Cromwell. In 1661 he left England to become a pastor once more. In 1666 he decided to pursue a military career and obtained the rank of lieutenant-colonel of one of the Swiss regiments deployed in the French army, during the Dutch war of 1672-1678.² In this occupation Stoupe was obviously instructed to write a pamphlet against the Dutch. According to Elisabeth Labrousse this might be *Avis à messieurs les Etats des provinces unies. Où ils verront qu'ils leur est tres avantageux de se separer d'avec l'Espagne & de conclure une bonne Paix avec la France* (Basle 1673),³ which was translated into Dutch⁴ and consisted of several arguments why the Dutch should give up their alliances with the Brandenburg elector and the Spaniards.

Although Panhuysen's claim that Stoupe's effort was not very fruitful may be true, his statement that his writings did not have any impact or were not known is underestimating the value of at least one of his pamphlets, because Stoupe wrote another tract to defend the French cause against the Dutch, which was widely distributed in the Republic. This book, *La Religion des Hollandois representée en plusieurs lettres par un officier d'armée du Roy a un pasteur & professeur en theologie de Berne* (Cologne 1673), consists of six letters to a professor at the University of Bern, in which Stoupe tries to defend his participation in the French army, fighting for a Catholic king against the Calvinist Dutch Republic, while being of the Reformed faith himself. Stoupe argues that the Dutch Republic was never truly of the Reformed faith and therefore he was not bound to the verdict of the professors of theology at Bern that Calvinists should not engage in combat with each other and that the Protestant soldiers in the army of Louis XIV should desert and join the ranks of the Republic.

2 Elisabeth Labrousse, *Conscience et conviction, Etudes sur le XVIIe siècle* (Oxford 1996), 60-62 ; Timothy Venning, 'Stoupe, Jean-Baptiste' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online)

3 Elisabeth Labrousse, *Conscience et conviction*, 62

4 The Dutch translation was published as *Advys of bericht aen de heeren staten der Verenigde Nederlanden, waer in sy sullen sien dat het haar lieden seer profijtelyck is, van Spanjen af te scheyden en een goeden Vrede met Vrankrijk op te richten, uyt het Fransch over-geset* (1673).

Jonathan Israel brings Stoupe's pamphlet forward as a source in his chapter on confessionalization in the Dutch Republic and argues that the *La Religion des Hollandois* was the book which claimed the Republic as the most tolerant society, but 'not to extol but to discredit it'⁵ Israel was right in claiming that *La Religion des Hollandois* was not an eulogy to the tolerant Dutch society. It was a critical, in many ways cynical document designed to discredit the confessional identity of the Republic. Stoupe attempts to show that the Republic is not Reformed in two ways. In his first five letters he argues that Dutch religious policy was not based on Reformed principles and that the historical process of the Republic becoming Reformed was not based on religious considerations. His last letter consists of an elevation of political considerations above religious affiliation in general and is directed against the Swiss University of Bern and their authorities.

We can assume that *La Religion des Hollandois* was widely distributed, because a French second edition was printed already in 1673. Two editions also existed in Dutch translation, printed in 1673 and 1674 and *la Religion des Hollandois* was also translated into English in 1680 and 1681. Furthermore, Labrousse has stressed that a German translation was published in 1673 and an Italian version in 1674.⁶ The intensive printing of Stoupe's book suggest an intensive spread and reading. This becomes clear in the refutation that was provided by Jean Brun, the Walloon pastor at Nijmegen, who had set himself to this task with all the theological dignity that he possessed. In the reply, consisting of four hundred pages and published two years after the publication of Stoupe's tract, called *La véritable religion des Hollandois* (Amsterdam 1675), Brun attempts to counter Stoupe's arguments by proving why the Dutch Republic can be regarded as a Reformed state. Another, less voluminous, refutation was written by an anonymous German author, called *Grondig bericht van de Godsdienst der Hollanders* (Amsterdam 1674). The polemic that arose in these tracts provides us with a case in which two debates concerning seventeenth-century religious history intersect on which I will elaborate in the next sections.

Tolerance and confessionalism in late seventeenth-century society

The tolerant characteristics of Dutch society are depicted by Stoupe as an indication of the non-Calvinist nature of the Dutch state. The existence of religious

5 Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic, its Rise Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806* (New York 1995), 640

6 Elisabeth Labrousse, *Conscience et conviction*, 62

toleration in Dutch society is not questioned by Stoupe, nor are there any revolutionary views to be distilled from *La Religion* concerning this topic, but it remains remarkable how the existence of tolerant policy is brought up as a non-Reformed aspect of the Republic, especially in a period of time, which was conceived as the dawn of tolerance and on the threshold of Enlightenment. Traditionally, the history of the rise of toleration was linked with the advancement of secular Enlightenment ideas from the end of the seventeenth century into the eighteenth century. The advancement of these ideas have often been equated with the disintegrating of the alliance between confession and state after the peace of Westphalia in 1648. According to Schilling, confessional Europe faced internal dissolution of orthodoxy and deconfessionalization of politics and society.⁷ The idea of a linear development of toleration as an attribution of modernity has been a presupposition in the writings of many historians of toleration in the early-modern period. The flaw in these histories of toleration is the stressing of the significance of ideas on society as a whole. Henry Kamen, in *The Rise of Toleration* (1967) states that we need to acknowledge that the people that developed these ideas were 'not merely landmarks in the history of ideas', but that they were 'themselves often representative of social forces that cannot be ignored.'⁸ Perez Zagorin argues in *How the Idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West* (2003) that the ideas of John Lock and Pierre Bayle on toleration were 'a point of transition in the concept of toleration, for they stood between the age of faith that was passing and the age of Enlightenment that was dawning.'⁹ This division between the age of faith and the age of Enlightenment suggests that the significance of religion in early-modern society waned in the second half of the seventeenth-century and that religion made way for secular political considerations.

Benjamin Kaplan has provided a different survey concerning the idea of the rise of toleration and the role of religion in early-modern society in *Divided by faith* (2007). Kaplan states that the age of religious warfare was not ended by the 1680's. The persecution following the Revocation of the edict of Nantes, the strife in England after the Restoration, the following Glorious Revolution, and many more examples testify to the argument that religious motivation for violent conflict did not ceased to exist, even until the eighteenth century. Toleration, according to Kaplan, did not develop, because the people were tired of fighting the different religious denominations into various

7 Heinz Schilling, 'Confessional Europe' in; Thomas A. Brady, Jr. Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy ed., *Handbook of European History 1400-1600 Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation Volume II: Visions, Programs and Outcomes* (Leiden, New York and Cologne 1995), 669

8 Henry Kamen, *The Rise of Toleration* (London 1967), 7

9 Perez Zagorin, *How the idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West* (New Jersey 2003), 290

stalemates, but had always existed, one way or another, where people of different confessions lived close to each other and did not engage in violent persecution or conflict.

Besides, Kaplan criticises the idea of a linear development of toleration, because of the rise of Enlightenment-ideas. To give rise to these ideas they needed people to share them. They did not share this idea primarily because of the ideas themselves. There were other catalysts to make the idea of toleration fashionable. 'One could almost say it was practised because it was fashionable, but that does not capture the sincerity and high moral purpose of its practitioners.'¹⁰ This tension between upper-class Enlightenment influence and popular every-day practice of toleration, which Kaplan argues, pre-dated any Enlightened tolerant ideas. Even though the ideas of Locke and Bayle did eventually get an institutional status in the eighteenth century, their scope was still narrowed.¹¹ However, as Ole Peter Gell and Roy Porter stated: 'The eighteenth century nowhere saw an unequivocally or comprehensively embraced toleration.'¹²

The polemic that arose as a consequence of Stoupe's tract can provide new insight regarding this discourse. Where Kamen, Zagorin and others make it appear as though confession gave way to secular tendencies, Kaplan has suggested that religious considerations remained significant, despite deconfessionalizing trends. It appears as though the rise of one concept meant the downfall of the other. Stoupe's tract and the subsequent refutations are examples in which both tendencies are brought forward. Religious considerations existed next to political ones. The relationship between these arguments can provide insight in whether the assumption of exclusive concepts is realistic. Hence comes forward a necessity to interpret the argumentative structures.

Reformed Internationalism

Philip Benedict argues in *Christ's churches purely Reformed* (2002) that the European confessional borders seemed to have been drawn at the final quarter of the century. Where the voluntary churches were permitted a privileged position, like in the Low Countries and Transylvania, the Reformed faith grew in numbers, but where they

10 Kaplan, *Divided by Faith, Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (London 2007), 345

11 Ibid. 347-350

12 Ole Peter Gell and Roy Porter, 'introduction' in: idem, *Toleration in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge 2000), 1-2

were subjected to another official religion, the support wavered over the course of time.

¹³ This accentuation of the confessional borders at the end of the century went hand in hand with internal disputes about theology within the different bastions of European Calvinism. According to Benedict 'the intellectual distance between the various Reformed churches was greater and the world of Reformed theology more conspicuously divided into distinct geographic networks of discussion and influence in 1700 than it had been a century earlier.'¹⁴ Although this separation developed, Benedict also argues that the later wars of Louis XIV also inspired an upsurge in Calvinist solidarity. Especially after the Revocation of the edict of Nantes financial support and asylum resurfaced.¹⁵

Protestantism and in particular Reformed protestantism has regularly been depicted as an internationally orientated confession. G.R. Elton, in his *Reformation Europe* (1963), has dedicated attention to the leading role of both Calvin and Geneva to the spread of the Reformation. What stands out are the implicit analogies with revolutionary ideologies of later times and the focus on Reformed citadels spreading its ideological tentacles into the rest of the world.¹⁶ Andrew Pettegree, in his afterword to Elton's book analyses Elton's contrasting visions between the individual appreciation of the ideas of Calvin and his rejection of the the strict everyday discipline practised in Reformed Geneva. Pettegree argues that Calvinism has long been regarded as an effective proto-modern insurgency movement and therefore Elton's analogies with socialist international solidarity and the resemblance of Geneva with Moscow in the twentieth century were not surprising, especially when we consider that he wrote his book in 1963, when those analogies were more common.¹⁷

Robert M. Kingdon, in his contribution to the *Handbook of European History* (1995) describes Calvinism as an international form of Protestantism from the very beginning and focuses on the international spread of Calvinist ideas in Early-modern Europe but makes clear that there were many international capitals of Calvinism. Geneva, Emden, but also Heidelberg became a nexus in the international web of Calvinist doctrine.¹⁸ Menna Prestwich has been concerned with the question how

13 Philip Benedict, *Christ's churches purely reformed, A social history of Calvinism* (New Haven and London 2002) 353-383

14 Ibid. 426

15 Ibid. 427

16 G.R. Elton, *Reformation Europe 1517-1559* (London 1973), 235-238

17 Andrew Pettegree, 'Afterword to the second Edition' in G.R. Elton, *Reformation Europe* (London 1999), 241

18 Robert M. Kingdon, 'International Calvinism' in: Thomas A. Brady, Jr. Heiko A. Oberman and James

Calvinism became a European religion and what it stood for as well. In one of her contributions to the volume *International Calvinism* (1985) she brings forward the term 'Calvinist International'¹⁹, which involuntarily creates an association with socialism in the nineteenth and twentieth century, although she does not explore this term. Much like Kingdon, she also embarks on a review of the spread of Calvinism and tries to investigate the motivation for the international connectedness of the adherents of the Reformed religion. According to Prestwich, the Reformed Churches were fortified by their belief that they held a monopoly on truth, which created a sense of international solidarity.²⁰

Graeme Murdock has provided historians with an interesting study of the international possibilities and limits of Reformed international connections. These international Reformed connections can, according to Murdock, be divided in various components. Exile and migration became the vehicle with which adherents to the Reformed cause came to establish international connections in the wake of religious persecution. However, these (forced) migrations were not always welcomed by host-communities. International charity between Reformed communities existed throughout early-modern Europe. Especially Scottish Calvinists endeavoured to help their "brethren in need" by sending money, praying and fasting for them.²¹ The academic centres in Geneva, Heidelberg, Leiden and Zurich attracted many students from various places in Europe and thus became the intellectual centres of the Reformed world. Reformed adherents and states also turned to the leading figures of the Reformed religion for advice and support in theological disputes or state-affairs, like the English exile community in Frankfurt in 1554, who requested Calvin himself to intervene in a dispute over worship and ceremony.²²

Murdock's subdivision into the migrational, charity, academic, authority, but also a diplomacy and military components of Reformed internationalism allows us to distinguish the successes and frontiers of the international orientation of the Reformed faith, although many of these aspects were always connected. According to Murdock a

D. Tracy ed., *Handbook of European History 1400-1600 Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation* (Leiden 1995), 229-245

19 Prestwich, 'The Changing face of Calvinism' in; idem., *International Calvinism 1541-1715* (Oxford 1985), 2

20 Ibid. 1-14

21 Alastair Duke, Gillian Lewis and Andrew Pettegree, ed., *Calvinism in Europe 1540-1610, A collection of documents* (Manchester/New York 1992), 206

22 Graeme Murdock, *Beyond Calvin, The Intellectual, Political and Cultural World of Europe's Reformed Churches, c. 1540-1620* (New York 2004), 31-53

clear visible boundary of Reformed internationalism was diplomacy and military conflict. For instance, 'attempts to form [military] alliances during the 1610's ended with a series of terminal disasters for Calvinists in Central Europe'²³. Murdock concludes that 'the record of diplomatic and military co-operation between Reformed courts is therefore a very mixed one, and interests of state usually prevailed over the religious ideals of princes.'²⁴ When confronted with situations in which Reformed 'brethren' were threatened by military force, Calvinist states usually were reticent in proclaiming outright solidarity. This intermingling of religious interests of solidarity and state interests is a framework in which Stoupe's statements fit perfectly. Stoupe's defence of his Reformed adherence and military service under a non-Reformed king could provide a clear example of this diplomatic and military frontier of Reformed internationalism.

Although the personal loyalties of the soldiers in the seventeenth-century French army are a difficult, if not impossible subject to study because of the little evidence of the actual measure of loyalties felt by the soldiers in the French army, John A. Lynn has attempted to describe the traditional loyalties of the French army. Despite a Catholic sovereign and increasing political pressure on Huguenots to abjure their confession²⁵, the protestant segment of society and the army was not to be underestimated. Until the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Protestants were tolerated as soldiers and generals. Lynn refers to the French historian Corvisier in stating that perhaps ten percent of the army were Huguenots, but remarks that this probably was not the actual number. Besides, many foreign regiments were allowed in the French ranks, including German and Swiss regiments (like Stoupe's). In these regiments Protestantism was allowed at all times. Lynn even goes as far as stating that, until 1685 the French army can be regarded as 'something of a haven of tolerance for Huguenots.'²⁶

My research

Reformed internationalism in the continuing decades of the seventeenth century has barely been studied, except for the one occasion in which the concept in a sense has been taken for granted. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) ignited

23 Ibid. 52

24 Ibid. 53

25 Elisabeth Labrousse, 'Calvinism in France 1598-1685' in ; idem., *International Calvinism* (Oxford 1985), 301-313

26 John A. Lynn, *Giant of the Grand Siecle, The French Army 1610-1715* (Cambridge 1997), 437

one of the greatest confessional migrations in early-modern European history and transformed an internal French affair into a European phenomenon.²⁷ This solidarity in the late seventeenth century has never been thoroughly problematized, which is peculiar because traditional enquiries into tolerance and confessionalism at the end of the century illustrate a change in confessional significance. How is this upsurge in confessional solidarity to be interpreted if confession was perceived as a waning motivational force in that period. The accounts on these subjects display a tendency to regard the emergence of institutionalized toleration and the dawn of Enlightenment-ideas as replacing the position of religious structures, ideas and motives. The polemic between Stoupe, Brun and the German author provides us with an interesting study of politics and religion which could produce further insight in the the relation between political and religious considerations in late seventeenth century. Therefore, my research will revolve around the question how Stoupe's arguments and those brought forward in the refutations of Brun and the anonymous German author are to be understood in the light of international Reformed solidarity and the historical discourse regarding confession and politics in seventeenth-century Europe.

A distinction has to be made between a personal and non-personal dimension of approaching this subject. The objective of explaining the Stoupe's confessional-political dichotomy by connecting his statements to his personal confessional persuasion, in order to understand his decision to act against the Dutch confessional identity is not my intention. Several accounts have attempted to explain the contrast between Stoupe's French service and his Reformed adherence, but Stoupe's obscure historical appearance has contributed to many two-faced accounts on his person. Elisabeth Labrousse's investigation has come closest, suggesting that his Swiss origin and profession as a mercenary would probably have contributed.²⁸ The personal convictions of Stoupe remain however, because of the scarce historical evidence based on non-personal sources, subjected to speculation. The basic intention of this study is to show how (Real)political consideration could co-exist with confessional ones within the same tracts. Investigating the set-up of the arguments used, can approach Jean Baptiste Stoupe from a different angle. A description of Stoupe's career will be used to elucidate Stoupe's *politique* nature, not his confessional adherence. I will attempt to show that his political orientation in French service was not incidental.

27 Phillipe Joutard, 'The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes: End or Renewal of French Calvinism?' in; Prestwich ed., *International Calvinism* (Oxford 1985), 345-358

28 Labrousse, *Conscience et conviction*, 67-68

Pamphlets are questionable if not erroneous sources if we are to establish their personal convictions. A scholar of pamphlets needs to acknowledge the fact that they were written in a specific political context with specific purposes.²⁹ The political and military context was obviously provided by the Dutch War. However, these tracts display slightly different purposes. As will be discussed, this was due to the dynamics of the debate. Stoupe's attack on the Dutch confessional identity probably appeared more threatening to Brun and the German author than his refusal to be sympathetic. This influenced the eventual structure and purpose of the refutations. Where Stoupe's primary incentive was to justify his French service against Reformed international claims, the refutations focused primarily on the defence of Dutch confessional identity and the unjustness of the Dutch war.

The Dutch war and Dutch-French diplomacy of the 1660's and 1670's has been referred to as being the historical occasion that, at least in the Republic, produced a great amount of the now-existing pamphlet-collection.³⁰ The French-Munsterite invasion sparked many written accounts, justifications and condemnations from both sides. It is on this polarized historical stage that our polemic takes place. The propagandistic outset of all three tracts is thus considered not to be a matter of influence but a purpose. It is the confessional orientation and international background of Stoupe that makes it interesting. Apparently, religious differences were not shunned as a tool to discredit the opponent.

Basically, Stoupe's confessional aim of clarifying why his French service in this particular conflict did not contradict his Reformed background coincided with the military and diplomatic aims of the French state to form a negative image of the Dutch and to hold on to the (Swiss) Reformed section of their armies, while at the same time attempting to reinforce their loyalty towards the King. The verdict of Reformed theologians from a significant nexus within the international Reformed community (the University of Bern) would possibly have affected the Reformed population of the armies of Louis XIV (both French and Swiss) greatly. A call for Reformed solidarity addressed the personal loyalties of the Reformed adherents within the French ranks. Would they side with their Reformed brethren in the Low Countries or would they remain loyal to their Catholic monarch? It basically confronted them with a choice between loyalty towards their earthly ruler and their confessional leaders. A published

29 Femke Deen and David Onnekink, 'introduction' in; idem, *Pamphlets and Politics in the Dutch Republic* (Leiden/Boston 2011), 7-8

30 Ibid., 16

tract rejecting Reformed solidarity in this particular conflict, written by a Swiss Calvinist in French service, who had been a preacher in his former days, would have presented a great opportunity for the French authorities to hold on to their Reformed population, which constituted a significant part of the French army among whom there were about 14000 Swiss.³¹ It is in this context that the answers of Jean Brun and the German author can be incorporated. *La Religion* and the refutations basically took the issues of religious and political justification into the public arena. By approaching the pamphlets from this angle, it will be possible to establish their significance for the understanding of the confessional alliance between religion and state-affairs in late seventeenth-century Europe. Thus evading the hard to trace personal considerations and convictions of the authors.

My first chapter will be concerned with an analysis of *La Religion des Hollandois* and the arguments that are brought forward. His arguments and the way in which he presents his enquiry into the Dutch religion are unorthodox, provocative and can be attributed as rather modern, because of his exact analysis of the religiously pluralistic constitution of the Dutch Republic. What were his arguments for his non-solidarity with his fellow Calvinists in the Republic and what can they tell us about late seventeenth-century Reformed internationalism and the significance of religion in situations of international politics and diplomacy?

To provide a more clear picture of the value of Stoupe's writings I will include a short investigation into his own life and other tracts he has written. Once again, not to provide a clear psychological insight into his confessional loyalties, but to comprehend the religio-political context of his own career to clarify that the political outset of *La Religion* and his French service followed logically out of it. Stoupe's career as a student, a preacher and a soldier makes Stoupe the perfect example of Reformed internationalism, but his refutation of the Swiss verdict illustrates the complete opposite. I will involve some of the other tracts that he has written in my analysis. One of them is the afore mentioned *Avis à messieurs les Etats des provinces unies. Où ils verront qu'ils leur est tres avantageux de se separer d'avec l'Espagne & de conclure une bonne Paix avec la France*. But also his account of the atrocities that the Duke of Savoy committed against the *Vaudois* published as *'A Collection of the Several Papers Sent to his Highness the Lord Protector (1655)* can be of value to the reconstruction of Stoupe's arguments regarding religion and politics.

31 John A. Lynn, *Giant of the Grand Siecle*, 437

The second chapter will embark on an analysis of the counter-arguments against *La Religion*. How were Stoupe's statements and arguments received in the Calvinist community and what does that imply about the status of the Reformed international solidarity and confessional priorities during the Dutch war? Understanding of both Brun's arguments and the arguments of the anonymous German writer can give us an insight into the way in which Stoupe's were received and can place Stoupe's arguments into a comparative perspective, so it can be possible to determine how the apparent ambiguity between confession and politics in *La Religion des Hollandois* is to be understood within the confessional context of the late seventeenth-century.

Questioning Dutch confessional Identity

'Why do I need to feel myself connected or allied with a state that only professes my religion in theory and not in practice?' This could have been the question that Stoupe asked himself after he read the letter of the Swiss professor, urging him and other protestants in French service to quit their employment and enter the Dutch ranks, because of the alleged sin of serving against brethren in faith. Stoupe thus states his astonishment about the words that the Swiss professor of theology wrote to him and the other protestants in French employment:

I Should not have been much startled, if I had receiv'd such a Letter from the Ministers of some country village, or from some person whose abilities rais'd him not above the ordinary rate or men. But I must acknowledge my self surpriz'd ... that you, Reverend Sir, who are a professor of Divinity, and have the reputation of being one of the most experienc'd men of Swisserland ... should write me a Letter fraught with things very strange and extravagant, and maximes absolutely inconsistent with sound sence, and Reason and contrary even to ... the preservation of and propagation of our Reform'd Religion.¹

The astonishment described above leads up to the purpose of his tract. 'To shew somewhat at large, of what nature the Religion of the Dutch is, and what sanctity is to be attributed to their Republic.'² Although the confession and catechism used by the Dutch was similar to those used by the Swiss, the nature of the religion of the Dutch and the way it was professed gave occasion to doubt the sanctity of the Dutch Republic, proclaimed by the professor from Bern. Clearly the fact that a significant part of the Dutch inhabitants professed the Reformed Religion, based on the same confession and catechism did not convince Stoupe of the necessity of sympathising with them. This ambiguous attitude towards religious affiliation and political loyalty will be the main focus of this chapter.

Before turning to *La Religion*, Stoupe's (educational) career will be surveyed. It provides an excellent example of Stoupe's international Reformed orientation, while

1 Giovanni Batista Stoppa, *The religion of the Dutch, represented in several letters from a Protestant officer in the French army, to a pastor, and professor of divinity, at Berne in Swisserland* (London 1681), 2

2 Ibid.

at the same time it also illustrates opposing political tendencies. His educational career, which took him to various Reformed centres of education in Europe, followed by his employment for the Walloon church in London and the English government is easily integrated within the contemporary studies and opinions on Reformed internationalism, while his later service to the French Crown and his efforts to discredit the Dutch Calvinists nullify any earlier notions of it.

Ambiguous service

Jean Baptiste Stoupe's education between 1639 and 1641 was already internationally oriented. After initially studying medicine at the universities of Geneva, Padua, Strasbourg and Leiden, Stoupe ultimately went back to Geneva to study theology and became a pastor at the Walloon church in London in 1652 (Threadneedle street). During his employment, Stoupe came in favour with the English Lord-protector Cromwell and was eventually sent abroad on a diplomatic mission to investigate the situation of French Protestants. Cromwell wanted to know if they were committed to their monarch, given the experiences of the *Fronde* and the raising hostilities between France and Britain.³

Stoupe thus became politically active as a spy for the English Commonwealth and he travelled through Paris, Bordeaux, Montauban and Lyon and 'was instructed to talk to them as a traveller, and to assure them of Cromwell's zeal and care for them, which he magnified everywhere.'⁴ Eventually, Stoupe had to conclude that there was too little disloyalty to the king amongst the French Huguenots to make an uprising feasible. Mazarin's zeal to uphold the edict of Nantes and the Huguenot distrust in Condé seemed to have contributed to this attitude.⁵

Stoupe's service for Cromwell presents a first indication of his ambiguous orientation. He remained involved in Protestant religious matters, but meanwhile he also was directly concerned with Cromwell's foreign policy. Moreover, Stoupe's English service demonstrates a commitment to the international Protestant cause. A few years later, Stoupe created a voluminous bundle of accounts on the persecution of the Waldensians of Piedmont in 1655. This bloody persecution by the Duke of Savoy,

3 Elisabeth Labrousse, *Conscience et Conviction, Etudes sur le XVIIIe siècle* (Paris-Oxford 1996), 60

4 Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's history of his own time: from the restoration of Charles II to the treaty of peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne* (London 1838), 48

5 Ibid. 48

himself a client of the French king, aroused a Protestant commitment in Cromwell. He presented himself as being committed to their cause and set Stoupe to the task of collecting different accounts on the atrocities. Stoupe collected about nine different tracts, consisting of different eye-witness accounts and descriptions of the consequences of the Vaudois-persecutions

Whilst committing himself to matters of a confessional nature, Stoupe found himself, once again, simultaneously involved in political matters. Again, Stoupe's effort for the sake of international protestant solidarity stands out. Stoupe dedicates the volume to Cromwell and explains why it was necessary to bundle the accounts send to him.

For that every one knowing the piety of your highness, and the fervent charity you have testified to the poor Protestants, the strait communion you hold with them, and the care you have of their preservation, it seems as if your Highness were particularly interest'd herein ... So that every one believes your Highness will expresse a deep resentment hereof, and will endeavour the consolation and reestablishment of many thousands of persons escaped from this butchery, who have chosen rather to quit their houses and goods, than to make shipwreck of their faith.⁶

These descriptions do not radically divert from the historiographical image of Stoupe as an example of Protestant internationalism. Thus far, no explicit evidence can be brought forward of contradicting confessional and political loyalties. The unity of political employment and confessional loyalty to a Protestant ruler does not divert from the traditional historical accounts of the Calvinist concord between confession and political loyalty. It is this background that could have given rise to the assumption that his later French employment indicated a break with his Reformed adherence. Given his English employment Labrousse's thus describes the the inconsequence between his earthly conduct and his confessional adherence:

Le plus étrange, peut-être, dans le cas de Jean-baptiste Stoupe, c'est que ce condottiere fut en même temps un cosmopolite, un polygolte, un homme cultivé – un sorte d'Européen par excellence – et de surcroit, apparemment, un réformé convaincu...⁷

If his Reformed adherence is to be interpreted as the only motivational

6 J.B. Stoupe, 'The epistle dedicatory' in: idem., *A Collection of the Several Papers Sent to his Highness the Lord Protector of the Common-Wealth of England, Scotland, & Ireland, & Concerning The Bloody and Barbarous Massacres, Murthers, and other Cruelties, committed on many thousands of Reformed, or Protestant dwelling in the Vallies of Piedmont, by the Duke of Savoy's Forces, Joined therein with the French Army, and severall Irish Regiments* (Paul's churchyard 1655), 2-3

7 Labrousse, *Conscience et conviction*, 68

standard in Stoupe's life, it would indeed appear strange that Stoupe made such an effort to refute any solidarity between Protestant states in 1673. But if we would assume that political and confessional considerations could provide equally strong motivations, his opportunistic historical appearance would be less peculiar. Bishop Burnet, who knew Stoupe from his service in England and his extensive knowledge of Cromwell's actions, characterizes Stoupe as a 'man of intrigue, but of no virtue; he adhered to the protestant religion as to outward appearance.'⁸ This can hardly be considered a surprise when Burnet's descriptions of Stoupe's conduct at Cromwell's court are considered. Burnet writes that Stoupe once confided in him that he was tempted by Spanish agents to investigate any of Cromwell's expansionist plans in the West-Indies.

Stoupe owned to me, he had a great mind to the money; and fancied he betrayed nothing if he did discover the grounds of these conjectures, since nothing had been trusted to him: But he expected greater matters from Cromwell, and so kept to the secret.⁹

At the same time, Stoupe also appeared committed to the preserving of Cromwell's life for he later discovered a lead to a conspiracy against the Lord-Protector, which was ultimately thwarted.¹⁰ Stoupe's English career thus already bore signs of him balancing confession and politics. The investigation of French Protestantism and the zeal he showed in collecting the Waldensian accounts, illustrate a clear interest in the international fate of Protestantism. Meanwhile, his conduct at court also creates the image of a courtier and a *politique*, who tried to establish and maintain himself in the hierarchical structure of the English court, concerned with his own affairs and progress.

After the Restoration Stoupe became a *persona non grata* in the eyes of the British royalists, because of his partisanship for Cromwell and in 1661 he left England. Between 1661 and 1666, Stoupe published a translation of a sermon provided by the English Puritan Richard Baxter concerning the gospel of Mathew. In 1665 he was invited to attend the provincial synod of Île-de-France, which was held in Vitry. The next year, he decided to pursue a military career. After first being stationed in Marseille, he obtained the rank of lieutenant-colonel of one of the Swiss regiments (commanded by his brother Pierre) deployed in the French invasion of the Dutch Republic in 1672.¹¹

⁸ Gilbert Burnet, *history of his own time* (London 1838), 42

⁹ Ibid. 49

¹⁰ Ibid. 51

¹¹ Elisabeth labrousse, *Conscience et conviction*, 60-62 ; Timothy Venning, 'Stoupe, Jean-Baptiste' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online); Miguel Benitez, 'Le jeu de la tolérance: édition de la Lettre à Madame de ... sur les différentes religions d'Hollande' in: G. Canziani *Filosofia e religione nella letteratura clandestina, secoli XVII e XVIII* (Milan 1994), 427-441

Stoupe found himself an occupation as pamphleteer against the Dutch. Next to *La Religion des Hollandois* another pamphlet from his hand was published in the same year.¹²

Avis à messieurs les Etats des privinces unies. Où ils verront qu'ils leur est tres avantageux de se separer d'avec l'Espagne & de conclure une bonne Paix avec la France was translated into Dutch and consisted of several arguments why the Dutch should give up their alliances with the Brandenburg elector and the Spaniards. This tract consists solely of political arguments for the choices that the Republic, according to Stoupe, needed to make. The alliance of the Republic with the Spaniards, Brandenburg or the Emperor were not in the interest of the Republic, for especially the Spaniards would benefit from an impaired Dutch Republic. The Spanish military conduct at Maastricht, 's Hertogenbosch and Charleroi testified of their intention to only interfere in the lands that once belonged to their realm. Furthermore, the Elector of Brandenburg and the Emperor needed to consider their bonds with Louis XIV when proclaiming support the Republic. Stoupe explains that the French had been very supportive towards the Dutch Republic during former alliances and that it would not be detrimental to have the French as a neighbour, as the examples of Spain, Savoy, Straatsbourg and Geneve would had proven.¹³

Do these pragmatical, (Real)political considerations and the combination of confessional and diplomatic employment during his English and French service detract from the image of Stoupe's being of the Reformed religion? Clearly Stoupe did not let solidarity with his Reformed brethren prevail over his political and diplomatic ambitions, but does that provide us with an occasion to doubt his Reformed conviction? There are no accounts of him openly rejecting the Reformed Religion, but as we will see further on, Brun and the German author took *La Religion* as evidence of the non-Reformed nature of the Swiss colonel. Admittedly, Stoupe rejected the concept Reformed international solidarity in favour of his French employment, but as will be illustrated, he rejected it because of his inferior conception of the Reformed nature of the Dutch Republic in favour of his own profession and employment.

In a declaration residing in the archives of the Provincial Synod of *Île-de-France* (1679) his name appears regarding ecclesiastical discipline. Stoupe needed to

12 Elisabeth Labrousse, *Conscience et conviction*, 62

13 *Advys of Bericht aen de Heeren Staten der Veenighde Nederlanden, waer in sy sullen sien dat het haerlieden seer profijtelyck is, van Spanjen af te scheyden, en een goeden Vrede met Vranckrijck op te richten* (1673)

defend his switch in employment in order to gain himself access to the Holy Supper in Paris. He argued that it was his unemployment and the necessity to manage his affairs combined with his physical conditions (asthma) that forced him to abjure his profession as a preacher and apply for a military career.¹⁴

Et comme je ne pouvois me resoudre de passer le reste de ma vie dans une honteuse oisiveté, ne sachant quelle autre vocation embrasser, je me resolus de prendre l'espée et d'accepter une commission qu'on m'avoit offer[e] depuis longtemps d'aller au pais lever une compagnie de suisses¹⁵

Stoupe very clearly regretted the fact that his choice to pursue a military career gave rise to suspicion regarding his Reformed adherence but he notes that this not meant that he had abjured his faith.

Dieu m'est témoin que je n'en ay jamais eu la pensée et que j'ai toujours eu le meme dessein que j'ay encore de vivre et de mourir dans la profession de la Religion dans laquelle j'ay esté élevé.¹⁶

Eventually, the Provincial synod accepted Stoupe's explanation and he was permitted to participate in the Lord's Supper.

The declaration attempted to make clear that his Reformed orientation had not shifted while his profession did. Apart from this publications and a few other sources, there is no account regarding the personal religious convictions of Stoupe. Burnet's account provides a little information regarding his religious loyalties during the persecution of the Huguenots after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685):

Stoupe, a brigadier-general, told me that M. de Louvoy had said to him, that the king was resolved to put an end to the business of the Huguenots that season; and since he was resolved not to change, he advised him to take a tour into Italy, that he might not seem to do anything that opposed the king's service.¹⁷

To avoid any trouble with the authorities Stoupe apparently decided to accompany Burnet on his journey to Italy.¹⁸ If there was any doubt in Stoupe's mind regarding his own personal religious affiliations, he probably would have assimilated. Meanwhile, the account also shows that Stoupe took the advice of de Louvoy to make it appear as

14 Labrousse, *Conscience et conviction*, 65

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid.

17 Burnet, *History of his own time*, 422-423

18 Labrousse, *Conscience et conviction*, 67

though he did not oppose the king's policy. This conduct contributes to Stoupe's image as considering political loyalties equal to religious affiliation. He did not want to abjure his Reformed faith, but in the meantime he did not want to seem disobedient towards the King's policy and decided to go to Italy, instead of a Reformed state. Following these sources, it would definitely be sufficient to state that Stoupe applied a pragmatic-political approach to his own religious persuasion and that diplomatic interests played at least an equal role in his considerations. However, his Reformed background and conviction remained ever present and important. Given this approach towards his background, the ambiguity between his confessional allegiance and political loyalty does not stand out as incidental, but a mere consequence of Stoupe's political conduct in his preceding employment.

But if Stoupe had always adhered to the Reformed Religion, how is the religio-political duality in *La Religion des Hollandois* to be interpreted? It is in *La Religion* that both tendencies (confessional and political) are encountered. Therefore, the next section will discuss the arguments that Stoupe brought forward to justify his service in order to establish a coherent picture of how this tract can be considered a logical consequence of his own considerations.

The Religion of the Dutch

La Religion des Hollandois is basically structured around two main statements and intentions. The first and most extensive one, consisting of the first five letters, explains that the Dutch Republic was not to be considered of the Reformed Religion, especially when compared to the Swiss cantons. The second statement is concerned with the religious nature of the Dutch war and the utility and efficiency of early-modern international Reformed solidarity. These statements were brought forward to convince the Swiss professor of the justice of Stoupe's service. However, the publishing of this justification also served the propagandistic purpose of the French war-cause. The negative approach towards the Dutch confessional identity and the emphasis on the idolatry of their mercantilist priorities fitted perfectly in the polemical context of the Dutch war. This merging of different purposes we need to keep in mind when we encounter Stoupe's arguments and the subsequent refutations.

In his first letter Stoupe created a basis upon which he would continue his argumentation concerning the Reformed nature of the Republic. This basis consists of two different arguments, concerning the actual causes of the Dutch revolt and the

conversion of William of Orange. Stoupe first attempts to point out that the Dutch revolt, which inspired the subsequent formation of the Dutch state was never a solely religious affair. According to Stoupe, the different social components of society all proclaimed different reasons of resentment towards the king of Spain and his rule in the Low Countries, resembling few religious motives. The nobles, like *Horn* and *Egmond*, were exasperated with the amount of power that *Granvelle* held, the clergy were enraged with the abolishment of their abbeys, priories and benefices to pay for the creating of new bishoprics, which they regarded as impiety. The magistrates and guilds complained about newly imposed taxes and the denial of the states to hear their grievances. The common people essentially feared the consequences of Spanish tyrannical rule. But, Stoupe remarks, there was one common denominator. The imminent threat of the inquisition and the 'fear, that under pretence of Religion, some design might be carried on, against the liberties and estates of all.'¹⁹

According to Stoupe religion was neither the cause, nor the pretence, of the disturbances, revolutions and seditions of the Low Countries,²⁰ However, that statement inconsistent when consideration is granted to the argument of the imminent threat of the inquisition and the motives of the clergy. It is necessary to bear in mind, having established this small inconsistency, that Stoupe intended to refute the Reformed nature and not any basic religious nature of the revolt. Stoupe closes his arguments by a description of some important events during the revolt, culminating in the Union of Utrecht, which granted the inhabitants liberty of conscience. He exceeds these arguments by remarking that those who stood up against the king of Spain were both of the Catholic and Reformed Religion.

Next, Stoupe contests the sincerity of the conversion of William of Orange to the Reformed religion. He accuses Orange of opportunism in his choice to convert to protestantism during the Dutch revolt. He did not even allow the Reformed religion in his principality of Orange and publicly professed the Roman religion. According to Stoupe, Orange chose a very convenient moment for his conversion. The military expedition to the Low Countries presented a perfect situation to lay his Catholic persuasion aside and side with the Protestants. Doing so would gain him substantial support from the German protestant principalities. Stoupe's style of writing makes it come forward as though William, resembling the mythological Judgement of *Paris*,

19 Giovanni Battista Stoppa, *The religion of the Dutch*,3-4

20 Ibid., 3

was considering every Protestant denomination for the military and political support he could gain for his conversion. According to Stoupe this eventually lead William to choose the Reformed Religion, for that would have opened the way to England, France and the Palatinate.

In the next two letters Stoupe lists the different sects and religions that inhabited the Dutch Republic before condemning the tolerant confessional policy of the Republic in his third letter. However, before embarking on the religious diversity of the republic, Stoupe starts with describing the internal frictions within the Dutch Reformed Church.

'As to the doctors and professors of our Religion, I question not but you know, that they also differ amongst themselves.'²¹ Subsequently the names of Voetius, des Marets and Coccejus, as well as their teachings are brought forward as proof of the internal division within the Dutch Reformed Church. Voetius and des Marets had, with their dispute, created a division of such a rigid nature that if a believer chose one of their confessional opinions, he would have been forced to remain in that camp or face a severe punishment. Voetius, in his aspiration for a strict Reformed lifestyle would abide by the austere rules of the Further Reformation and not even admitted any of 'the most innocent enjoyments of life'.²²

Stoupe estimates that Des Marets, in opposing the teachings of Voetius, would have left the dispute raging, if not for the appearance of Coccejus. His treatment of the dispute betrays a hint of Stoupe's theological preference. The extensive description of Coccejus' opinions that followed in comparison to the small amount of attention paid to those of Voetius supplemented with the complete absence of a description of des Marets teachings testifies of preference and even admiration for Coccejus' doctrine. Stoupe does not only elaborate thoroughly on his teachings, but also extols his discoveries concerning the connection between the Old and the New Testament and the scriptural approach of his theology. Stoupe explains that he felt himself obliged to give a thorough account of his teachings because Coccejus had many followers, but also because he was considered a heretic by his antagonists, which Stoupe apparently deems invalid, because 'they [Voetius and des Marets] affirm, that he is an innovator, and give him the title of *Scripturarius*, as if it were a great crime, to be closely addicted to the Scripture, and to make it the most important of our studies.'²³

21 Ibid., 15

22 Ibid., 15-16

23 Ibid., 17

Stoupe proceeds his second letter with listing the religious denominations that existed within the boundaries of the Dutch Republic and exploring their viewpoints. The Catholics he does not grant more than three lines, for 'it being notorious to all the world, what their sentiments are.'²⁴ The Lutherans are dismissed on similar grounds. He proceeds with an elaborate explanation of the teachings of the Arminians, showing extensive knowledge of their origin and substantial viewpoints. Stoupe's description of the Arminians seems intended to show their inherent errors and failures. They are described by Stoupe as untrue to their own origins by stating that they had adopted many of the Socinian tendencies in their teachings after their formal exclusion at Dordt. Also their strife for toleration of everybody of the Christian religion gives Stoupe reason to conclude that 'if Arminius were to come into the world again, certainly he would not own most of those who bear his name, to be his disciples.'²⁵

Next, the Brownists and Independents are described, but Stoupe judges them as only differing from the Reformed doctrine on the subject of church-government. The Brownists condemned episcopal Church-government, rejected church-marriage and all forms of prayer, while the independents believed that every "congregation" is dependant on itself and that there needed not be any authoritative relationship between so-called "sisterchurches".²⁶

In the third letter Anabaptists, Socinians, Arrians, Borrelists, Enthusiasts, Libertines, Seekers and the ideas of Spinoza are elaborated upon. Especially Spinoza's status is heavily contested. The tolerating of such an overtly heretical philosopher and the observation that there had been no Dutch theologian who had bothered to refute his statement proved how far from Reformed teachings Dutch society and government had drifted. Descriptive and critical, Stoupe again proves himself well-informed about the religious constitution of the Republic. This list of confessions served to proof that the Republic was not of the Reformed religion, merely because of their existence. To conclude his plea, Stoupe classifies Dutch religious life by creating three different categories of Dutch religious sentiment. Each of these, Stoupe estimates, contained one-third of the religious landscape of the Republic. The first group of this 'tripartite division'²⁷ consisted of those of the Reformed religion. He acknowledges that the exact numbers are not known, but from his enquiry Stoupe seems to have found enough

24 Ibid., 18

25 Ibid., 19-20

26 Ibid., 20-21

27 Ibid., 30

evidence to state that 'the number of those who are not of it [the Reformed Religion] is incomparably greater than that of those who do profess it.'²⁸

Stoupe admits his astonishment about the number of Catholics that inhabited the Republic. Catholic worship, according to Stoupe, remained existent amongst a considerable part of the inhabitants of the great cities and the countryside. Stoupe assumes that Catholics were certainly as numerous as the Reformed adherents. The third group consisted of all the sects and denominations that he did not include in the first two groups. After this categorization of the Republic's religious diversity, Stoupe concludes that 'if therefore the Domination, and the Denomination, ought to be deduc'd from the greatest part, those of the Reformed Religion being, at most, but a third part of the people of this country, cannot give the whole state the denomination of being of the Reformed Religion.'²⁹

Stoupe's fourth letter basically concludes that the Dutch Republic's practice of tolerating all these different sects and religions within their boundaries and the proclaiming of a liberty of conscience was contrary to Reformed principles and the Dutch ordinance of 1583, which prohibited the public profession of any religion other than the Reformed. According to Stoupe, the different religions and sects do not merely inhabit Dutch society, but the Dutch government does not even try to persecute them. Stoupe even states that the Estates General promoted and protected heretical sects. The main argument that runs through this letter questions the possibility of two states (The Dutch Republic and the Swiss cantons) both proclaiming to be of the Reformed Faith, while their confessional policy contradicted.

To prove that the Dutch Republic did not profess the same religion as the Swiss Cantons, Stoupe brings up an analogy with the Swiss and their history of religious persecution. He compares the way in which the Dutch Estates treated the Socinians, by allowing them to print their opinions and openly profess their faith, and the death sentence of Michael Servetus and Scipio Gentilis in sixteenth century Geneva who Stoupe believed to held similar opinions concerning the Trinity and the divinity of Christ.

Your canton, and the City of Geneva would have thought themselves guilty of a great Crime against god, if they had not, by death, taken care off these two Hereticks, who hold such strange errors, against the Divinity of Jesus Christ. But the States-General

28 Ibid.

29 Ibid., 31

would think they had committed a great Sin against God, if they should put any of the Socinians to death, whatever their Errours may be.³⁰

Stoupe outright rejects the conviction that the different interests of states could have produced different confessional policies. 'I hope, you will acknowledge that they who do so, have not any [religion] at all'³¹. This conviction is visible in his description of the different treatments of the Anabaptists in Switzerland and the Dutch Republic. The refusal of the Mennonites to take up arms and join the armies of their states lead to rigorous measures taken by the Swiss magistrates, torturing and banishing them, while the Dutch cities were full of Mennonites, where they could profess their faith publicly. Even the willingness to provide the state with the money to pay for soldiers instead was not accepted by the Swiss magistrates. The measure of submission of religious affairs to state-affairs is a point in which, as will be pointed out in the next chapters, Stoupe and Brun disagree. But the way in which they disagree is surprising, for this is one of the arguments in which Stoupe actually comes forward as more strictly confessional than Brun.

Stoupe proceeds his argument by refuting the opinion 'that in things which are indifferent, two states may demean themselves, the one this way and the other that way, and be both in the mean time of the same religion.'³² He defines indifferent things as things that can be done in different ways without offending God and claims that the subjects he speaks about are no indifferent things.

'For I pray, tell me, was it not well done by your magistrate, and by that of Geneva, when they burnt these two ancient hereticks [Servetus and Gentilis]'³³

More comparisons are incorporated, but Stoupe's main point of the impossibility of two states being of the same religion, whilst their practices were completely opposite, remains the same. To underscore the accusations against the Dutch, Stoupe brings forward that the States General of the Republic aligned themselves with the conclusions of the synod of Dort, which propagated that the public exercise of false religions should be obstructed and prohibited, which made their failure to adhere to the right Reformed course more poignant compared with the "true"

30 Ibid., 37

31 Ibid., 34

32 Ibid., 40

33 Ibid.

Reformed practice exercised within the Swiss Cantons.³⁴

Stoupe is also very clear about the imminent cause of the non-Reformed nature of the Dutch. This is described in his fifth letter. According to Stoupe, 'the only design they [the Dutch] seem to have is to grow rich and to heap up money'³⁵ The prevailing of commerce above religion, their ambiguous loyalties in international affairs and their conduct regarding the spread of the Reformed faith in their colonies he deems irreconcilable with Reformed principles. These characteristics he condemns as tokens of idolatry and avarice. Two illustrative examples are brought forward. First, the prevailing of commercial interests in Japan over publicly declaring themselves to be Christian. Stoupe argues that the Dutch denied their Christianity before the Japanese and were therefore given the opportunity to live in those dominions and set up commerce. The Japanese emperor was made to distrust Catholic colonists, for the Dutch told him that they acknowledged the Pope as a second sovereign, which illustrated their promiscuous loyalty. This resulted in the violent persecution and exclusion of the Portuguese from Japan. The second examples of the prevailing of commerce above Christian values was the execution of English ambassadors on the island of *Amboyna* in 1622, after they had confessed that they had intended to overthrow the defensive structure of the island. Other bloody encounters with the English are subsequently described to clarify that the Dutch committed many religious crimes for the sake of their commerce. Apart from the commercial interests prevailing above their confessional identity, Stoupe also elaborates extensively on the failure of the Dutch to impose the Reformed religion in their colonies. According to Stoupe, 'They would rather see all those people perish eternally in their ignorance, than to see their eyes opened, by the illuminations of Heaven, and that they should share with them in the advantages of commerce.'³⁶

In his sixth letter Stoupe brings up a new argumentative strategy to prove that he did not need to be sympathetic with the Dutch. He emphasizes the actual religious nature of the war between the Republic and the French and the real reasons why the war broke out. 'the most Christian Majesty did not intend to wage the war on the matter of religion, but to chastize their ingratitude, to mortifie their violence, and to teach them a new lesson, of paying him the respects that they owe him, and to keep within the bounds of modesty and reason.'³⁷ He clarifies the non-religious nature of the war by

34 Ibid.

35 Ibid., 46

36 Ibid., 47

37 Ibid., 53

arguing that if the war was fought for religious interests, the Austrians, Germans and the Spanish would not have fought on the side of the Dutch. From this consideration follows Stoupe's opinion on the utility of Reformed solidarity in the Dutch war. Stoupe argues that all the Reformed states of Europe together would not be able to keep up an army of ten thousand soldiers if their religious interests were threatened by warfare. He brings forward the argument that the Protestant states in Europe were too scattered and divided amongst themselves to be able to stand against a united Catholic force, which would be more effectively rallied, for the Catholics acknowledged a visible head of the Church in the person of the Pope. Moreover, the Swiss cantons, especially Bern, needed to consider their diplomatic bonds with the French king for they would not want to inspire military measures taken against their states.³⁸

Stoupe apparently justifies his non-solidarity with his Reformed brethren with an argument that might very well have been used in favour of Reformed international solidarity. His non-sympathizing with the Dutch Calvinists was based on the awareness of being outnumbered by the Catholics. Many Reformed would, a century before, probably have used the same argument to justify their allegiance to their Reformed brethren. Political and diplomatic arguments are thus deemed more lucrative and efficient by Stoupe.

The pragmatic-political approach of his sixth letter differs from, if not contradicts, the argumentative strategy used in his first letters. Where Stoupe initially focused on showing the true (pluralistic) religious identity of the Dutch Republic to counter the confessional argument of solidarity, he now starts defending his allegiance to the French crown from a diplomatic point of view. He also accuses Bern of incautiousness by declaring their allegiance to their Reformed brothers in the Low-Countries.

Do you not observe, that by your indiscreet zeal, you deprive yourselves of all the advantages, which you might expect from the alliance there is between you and the most Christian king.³⁹

Stoupe stresses the importance of the Swiss valuing their allegiance with Louis XIV, for they would have been in great trouble without the protection of the French crown. To provide a clear example, he adds that the Dutch were masters of ignoring the interests of their religion in favour their external affairs, as the example of the Dutch

38 Ibid., 53-55

39 Ibid., 58

ambiguous loyalties during the siege of La Rochelle proved. Stoupe argues that the they hired ships to the French, while at the same time proclaiming to be sympathetic to the cause of this Reformed bastion. Additionally, earlier Dutch alliances with Spain are also brought forward as indicators of their opportunistic foreign policy.⁴⁰

Contemporary argumentative analysis of Stoupe's arguments presents a couple of remarkable features in his argumentation. For instance, In the entire fourth letter Stoupe does not seem to be able to construct a thoroughly theoretical or theological foundation for his statements. He keeps comparing the two states and constantly falls back on his own assumption that the Swiss cantons professed the true Reformed religion. The complete absence of a biblical-theological foundation for the argument of the Swiss being of the “true” Reformed religion is remarkable when his intention of showing how the Dutch did not profess the same religion as the Swiss is considered. Besides, being an ex-theologian in military service would probably not have deprived him from any theological knowledge.

Another interesting point concerns the focus of Stoupe on domestic confessional unity. The toleration of different sects and religions within one state he deems irreconcilable with the Reformed faith. This conviction would not raise any questions, were it not for Stoupe's sixth letter. By rejecting religious toleration and thus proclaiming an intolerant and traditional Calvinism his arguments do not seem to stroke with his rejection of international Reformed solidarity. The difference between internal and external solidarity is not elaborated upon by Stoupe, which could have provided Brun and the German author with ammunition to refute these points. Moreover, it once again illustrates the apparent ambiguity between politics and confession in his reasoning.

Stoupe's tract is not completely devoid of any notion of Reformed international solidarity, for he asks the Swiss professor after the exposition of the Dutch crimes in the Indies:

Will you still allow those to be good Reformed Christians, who make no scruple to cut the throats of their Brethren, professing the same Religion as they do?⁴¹

The argument that the Dutch were not of the Reformed faith because they were not sympathetic with their English co-religionists appears quite contradictory considering

40 Ibid., 59-64

41 Ibid., 51

the outset of his tract. It does appear even more inconsistent when we take into account that Stoupe propagated an internally unified Reformed faith in a single state in his fourth letter, while upholding that diplomatic interests should prevail when it came to international affairs. And would Stoupe not be guilty of the same crime, considering his involvement in the massacres of *Bodegraven* and *Zwammerdam*?

Although the main statement of *La Religion* (The Dutch Republic was not of the Reformed religion) consists of a confessional claim, Stoupe did not feel obliged to bring forward any theological arguments. The mere existence of different confessions in one state he perceived as a sin against Reformed theology, but his conclusion is based on evidence brought forward by a pseudo-empirical and practical study, not theological theory. Furthermore, the intention of the first five letters contradicts the political and diplomatic outset of the last letter. The argumentative inconsistencies in his plea and the apparent contradiction between the two different approaches should have provided Brun and the German author with a clear opportunity to question Stoupe's confessional loyalties and to refute his arguments. In the next chapter I will attempt to investigate whether Brun and the German author considered these inconsistencies and contradictions as valuable ammunition to refute Stoupe's effort.

Balancing arguments

If the impact of a pamphlet could be measured by the amount of words used by opponents to prove the contrary, Stoupe's tract must have had a major impact on Jean Brun, a preacher at the Walloon church of Nijmegen. Brun's effort to refute Stoupe's statements consists of nearly four hundred pages, where *La Religion* did not even count half of that amount. Apparently Brun, but also the anonymous German author felt themselves attacked in such a way that it required a thorough refutation.

Brun's tract is a largely linear refutation of the arguments that Stoupe brought forward. Every paragraph starts by recapitulating Stoupe's argument and is followed by a voluminous refutation of that particular point. The German refutation is much shorter, but is embedded in a more voluminous tract concerning the real causes of the Dutch war. Also Brun, besides elaborating extensively on the real true intentions of the French, extends his propaganda with an account of the French conduct in Nijmegen.

The anonymous German refutation was included in a larger tract that defended the Dutch cause and published in 1674, one year before Brun published his. The tract is significantly less voluminous, but similarities in purpose can be distilled between *La Veritable Religion* and *Grondig bericht over de Godsdienst der Hollanders*. For instance, the propagandistic outset compelled both authors to focus mainly on a defence of the Dutch confessional identity. Furthermore, Stoupe's negative judgement of the Dutch confessional identity clearly attacked the authors on more than just the issue of religious policy. The Calvinist identification with the House of Orange and the divinely appointed rule of the Stadthouder is clear, a significant issue promoted by both Brun and the German author.

This analysis of the counter-arguments is subdivided into four different topics. First, the defence of the House of Orange and the religious dimension of the Dutch Revolt will be discussed. This is mainly because it constitutes a specific dimension of the debate on which I will elaborate hereafter. Secondly, the arguments defending the diverse confessional reality of Dutch society and the tolerant policy of the Dutch government will be described and clarified. Thirdly, Brun's last letter and the refutations of Stoupe's diplomatic and political arguments will be discussed. and finally, I will focus on a fourth argumentative strategy. Throughout the refutations, Stoupe's Reformed adherence is repeatedly questioned. Although it appears as a simple strategy

of reducing Stoupe's tract to merely a provocation, they contribute to a more refined understanding of the incentives of Stoupe's opponents. The main focus of this chapter will be on the counter-arguments that Brun brought forward, but these will be supplemented with those emphasized by the German author. The discussion and analysis of the different (counter-) arguments will clarify differences, but also establish similarities between the three polemicists. Eventually the relationship between political and confessional arguments will elucidate if the ambiguity in *La Religion des Hollandois* can be considered as a singular incident or that the duality was also shared by his opponents.

The Dutch Revolt and William of Orange

Following Stoupe's arguments, The two authors found themselves compelled to start out with the defence of the religious origins of the Dutch Republic. Brun tries to establish the context in which the Dutch Revolt commenced and redirects the accusations of Stoupe to the inconceivability of God's will. He argues that Stoupe's rejection of the confessional nature of the Dutch Revolt did not irrevocably prove that the Dutch were not of the Reformed religion. According to Brun, Stoupe implicitly stated that revolt and sedition were exemplifications of a true Reformed church and religion, which he deems ridiculous and incorrect. Maintaining a theological stance, Brun subsequently states that it is not the religion that causes troubles, seditions and uprising, but mankind, who is corrupted by sin.¹

To weaken Stoupe's statement even more, Brun attempts to recreate the religious context out of which the Revolt emerged. He argues that religious tensions already existed in the Dutch Republic for sixty-four years, before the ignition of the Revolt. Ever since 1521 the Reformation had aroused religious tensions in the Low Countries. Regarding the actual causes of the Dutch Revolt, Brun does not contradict Stoupe's story explicitly. Instead he highlights the inconsistency in Stoupe's reasoning derived from Stoupe's concluding paragraph which stated that because of the various motives of a temporal nature, the Netherlanders had not being deprived of their spiritual

¹ Jean Brun, *La véritable religion des Hollandois. : Avec une apologie pour la religion des Etats Generaux des Provinces Unies. Contre le libelle diffamatoire de Stoupe, qui à pour titre La religion des Hollandois ... / Par Jean Brun ... Cy est joint Le conseil d'extorsion ou la volerie des Francois exercée en la ville de Nimegue par le commissaire Methélet & ses supôts* (Amsterdam 1675),79-81

needs, related to the service of God and eternal salvation.²

Brun takes notice of Stoupe's argument that a good part of the alliance that stood up against the Spaniards in 1566 consisted of Catholics and that, followed by the proclamation of toleration regarding Catholics in 1579, it was therefore never the intention of the Dutch to establish a new religion in the Low Countries. Brun refutes this by creating an analogy with the Swiss Federation, who were and had not ceased to be internally divided between Protestant and Catholic cantons, but nonetheless managed to establish political alliances. Brun emphasizes that there were very few differences in conduct between the Dutch Republic and the Swiss cantons. He positions himself in such a way that it remains possible to maintain the (Reformed) religious foundations of the revolt, while at the same time admitting circumstantial factors. The inconsistency in Stoupe's reasoning highlighted by Brun also illustrates that it remained difficult for Stoupe to rule out religion as a pretext entirely.

Brun and the German author display an obvious tendency to counter Stoupe's arguments with appeals to Divine providence. William the Silent and the motives of his conversion provide a clear example of this tendency. The conduct of the Prince regarding his estates in Orange fitted his prudent nature. According to Brun, the Prince was frightened by the horrors of the Inquisition and therefore considered prudence the right way to approach religious issues.³ Moreover, once Orange was converted to the Reformed cause, he proved himself a zealous Calvinist ruler. Both authors emphasize a biblical similarity with St. Paul. Despite the fact that, like Orange, he once adhered to another religion, St. Paul had not been less of an apostle.⁴ Divine providence is thus brought forward as an adequate argument to account for the religious adherence of the Prince. According to the German author, Stoupe should have known that conversion was a miraculous and unpredictable divine phenomenon, because of his former profession.⁵

The claim that William converted to the Reformed Religion for political reasons (support from other Protestant states) is easily dismissed as slander. After an extensive quotation of Stoupe's arguments in this matter, Brun condemns Stoupe's

2 Giovanni Battista Stoppa, *The Religion of the dutch*, 5 ; Brun, *La Veritable Religion des Hollandois*, 86

3 Jean Brun, *La Veritable Religion des Hollandois*, 90-91

4 Ibid. 90

5 *Grondig bericht van de Godsdienst der Hollanders, Strekkende tot wederlegginge van zeker ongenoemt Schryver; die in zes brieven, over enige maanden uit Utrecht aan een professor der Theologie te Bern in Switserland geschreven, en door de druk gemeen gemaakt, de hollanders, wegens hun Godsdienst, gelijk hij die vertoont, tracht gehaat te maken.* (Amsterdam 1674), 30-31

words as vilifying such an illustrious prince, who was so badly treated by the Spaniards and who has proven himself as *'un instrument si miraculeux en le main de Dieu, pour l'établissement de l'évangile, & pour procurer la liberté au corps & a l'ame...'*⁶

Brun deems it unnecessary to refute the political arguments that Stoupe brings forward because of the sanctified personality of the Prince. He points out that Stoupe puts too much emphasis on the Prince as a primary catalyst of the Revolt, but the divine appeal apparently sufficed. Also the claim that the Orange's conversion was the cause that the Reformed Religion established itself in the Low Countries is confessionally refuted by Brun.

C'est a Dieu qu'il faut attribuer la gloire, que la Religion y ait esté plantée, & non pas aux hommes.⁷

The Reformation had affected religious life in the Low Countries ever since the 1520's and therefore Orange could not have played any part in that development. Even less could he be conceived as the cause of the disturbances, because it had been the bloody edict between Charles V and Philip II, the Inquisition, the Council of Trent and the investiture of new bishoprics that sparked them. Brun derives his arguments from Orange's *Apology* and argues how it were the Spaniards who sparked the Revolt with their actions and not William of Orange.⁸

Brun letter is concluded by emphasizing the importance of divine providence and that non-spiritual every-day events could be attributed to it. Subsequently, he lists some early-modern states and circumstantial factors that played a role in the formation of their states. To underpin his arguments concerning the Dutch Republic, Brun quotes William Temple's observations on the religious pluralism of the Republic. Who would have founded the Reformed religion in the Republic if the House of Orange had not put so much effort in it?

The significance and sincerity of Orange's conversion appears central to both Brun and the German refuter. Apparently the role played by the House of Orange in the revolt was not to be questioned and could only be characterized as courageous demeanour. The certainty with which Brun and the German author maintain the confessional arguments as the only adequate arguments illustrates how the House of Orange had not ceased to play an important role in the forming of the Calvinist

6 Jean Brun, *La Veritable Religion*, 93

7 Ibid. 99

8 Ibid. 99-100

confessional identity of the Republic ever since the Revolt. Willem Frijhoff has argued how the Reformed church had been a great centralising and unifying element in the history of the Dutch Republic. During the Revolt, the public church of the Dutch gradually came to associate itself with the liberating battle against Spanish tyranny, thence connecting the state-interest of freedom with the establishment of the Reformed religion. 'The Prince of Orange had become the new Moses, Gideon or David, the enemy being the Spanish Sennacherib (Philip II) or the French Nebuchadnezzar (Louis XIV)'.⁹

The issue of Orange's confessional significance in forming the Republic's confessional identity includes another dimension to the polemic. *La Veritable Religion* and *Grondig Bericht over de Godsdienst der Hollanders* were not solely intended to refute Stoupe's opinion concerning his non-sympathizing with the Dutch. The additional purpose of the refutations was to re-establish the confessional identity of the Dutch Republic after Stoupe's verbal assault and to enforce the confessional alliance between the Dutch war-cause and the House of Orange. The stressing of Orange's significance indicates that Calvinist Dutch collective identity was profoundly derived from the confessional dimension of the Dutch Revolt and the role of the House of Orange in it. The French-Munsterite invasion of 1672 ignited a strong anti-French and anti-Catholic sentiment and it was within the context of this invasion that these emotions of "national" unity and pride under a Reformed ruler thrived.¹⁰ By stressing the confessional dimension of Dutch history collective unity and concord against the French tyrant could be enforced.

Defending confessional policy

Stoupe's justification of the non-Reformed nature of the Dutch religious toleration was based on the ordinance composed by the States General in 1583, which proclaimed the Reformed church as the only public church in the Low Countries. Brun does initially not entirely understand why Stoupe took such issue against this ordinance, for it established the Reformed religion as the dominant church in the Dutch Republic. The argument that it would not have been honest to the Catholics, who had themselves contributed a great effort to the cause of the revolt is dismissed by stating that the Catholics had created the necessity that produced this particular ordinance.

9 Willem Frijhoff, 'Religious toleration in the United Provinces' in; R. Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop, *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age* (Cambridge, 2002), 50-51

10 Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 644-645

Furthermore, Brun praises God for the fact that the number of Catholics and other diverting sects was slowly diminishing. Stoupe's argument that the ordinance of 1583 was established as a selfish act in the interests of the state Brun takes as a piece of evidence of the non-Reformed orientation of Stoupe.¹¹

Brun proceeds by explaining that the existence of heterodox theological opinions in the Dutch Republic were not that different from the every-day practice of other European states. Heterodoxy was a common phenomenon in other disciplines such as medicine, philosophy and law. Why would theology constitute an exception? Brun places the dispute between Voetius, Coccejus and Des Marets into a historical perspective by elaborating extensively on the religious disputes in the history of both philosophy and theology. The biblical histories of Cain, Abel, Noah, Sem, Cham, Jafet, Abraham, Moses and the doctrinal differences that had existed between the Samaritans and the Jews are brought forward as proof of an always apparent pluralistic tendency within biblical Christianity. In the early-modern period the Jews were not uniform in their doctrine either, given the distinction between the Portuguese and German Jews. The Christian church that was established after Christ did not develop differently. St. Paul and Peter had not always agreed on doctrine and ever since the first apostles of Christ sixty different Christian denominations could be distinguished.¹² Moreover, The initial reformers (Calvin, Luther and Zwingli) did not exemplify all-round consensus regarding scripture and sacrament, and neither did the confessional authorities of the late seventeenth-century Swiss Federation:

En Suisse il s'en trouve qui favorisent les sentimens de Monsieur des Marez, d'autres ceux de Monsieur Voetius, Gernierus Professeur de Bales, Suiterus & Heydekerus a Zurick sont de l'opinion de Coccejus.¹³

Brun compares Stoupe's accusations concerning the internal heterodoxy of Dutch Calvinism to the early-modern European practical situation and attempts to clarify the religiously heterodox nature and practice not only of other early-modern states, but of Christian history itself. This approach can be interpreted twofold. First, it can be considered a strong and learned argument against Stoupe, for it created a historical and biblical perspective and thus illustrates how differing religious policy and heterodoxy had been an ever present historical phenomenon and not solely a Dutch

11 Jean Brun, *La Veritable Religion*, 110-119

12 Ibid. 120-150

13 Ibid. 152

characteristic. Secondly it shows that Brun, in order to refute Stoupe's accusations, need to acknowledge the pluralistic reality of confessional history. It suggests an attitude of resignation towards religious diversity. Basically, it can be considered a surprising argument. Especially when the confessional outset of his approach to earlier accusations is considered. Essentially, Brun argues the ambiguity between the Reformed identity of the Republic and diverse reality by considering religious diversity to be an inherent feature of early modern states, and proclaiming the dominant confession decisive in establishing confessional identity.

Stoupe's *Tripartite division* is also questioned. He acknowledges that a considerable part of the population adhered to the Catholic religion but he contests the that they constituted one third of it. Catholics were more numerous than the sects, but they would not even be remotely as numerous as the Reformed adherents. To prove his point Brun includes his own estimation. According to Brun, The Hague counted four thousand Catholics and consisted of six thousand households in 1675. Supposing these households included five or six people would make the total of inhabitants somewhere between the thirty and thirty-six thousand people. Because Brun did not consider the number of sectarian adherents significant, The number of Reformed adherents could be calculated by reducing the total number of inhabitants with the Catholic adherents. The Reformed segment of The Hague thus counted between twenty-six and thirty thousand believers.

In addition Brun points out that Stoupe focused too much on the cities of Holland, which displayed a greater religious diversity than the cities and countryside of other provinces. Relatively many Lutherans resided in Amsterdam and Leiden while Arminian congregations were, according to Brun, exclusively located in Amsterdam and Rotterdam. Anabaptists are dismissed as an insignificant segment of the population and Brun even wonders whether he had ever met somebody from the Socinian denomination in the Dutch Republic. Borrelists, Enthousiasts, Libertines and Spinozists he would not even recognize because of their rarity.¹⁴

In his fourth letter, Brun admits that there were different confessional denominations in the Dutch Republic, but no public temples or churches of them to be found. Even so, no non-Reformed adherent could hold office in the Republic. Moreover, there had been many ordinances that prohibited the public exercise of any other than the

¹⁴ Ibid. 166-169

Reformed Religion and religious services in the houses of foreign ambassadors. Many and severe punishments had been distributed to officers who did not abide by these regulations. Accordingly, Brun concludes that the States General could not be blamed for the religious diversity of Dutch society:

Si tous les inhabitants de ces pais [The Dutch Republic], ne sont pas de la Religion Reformée comme en la Republique de Geneve, & quelques Cantons Suisses, ce n'est pas Messieurs les Estats ayeut manqué de zele & de bonne volonté, plus que les autres; mais il le faut attribuer aux secréts ressors de la Providence de Dieu, qui a voulu faire cette grace aux uns, & non pas aux autres.¹⁵

Furthermore, Brun applies a (Real)political perspective on the confessional unity and proclaimed identity of other contemporary European states. He argues that the Palatinate was also forced to permit Lutheran persuasions in their realm and how the Brandenburg Elector never established Calvinist dominance in his estates. According to Brun, other Protestant states would not be satisfied by such a situation, the Dutch Republic no less. Even the Swiss cantons were not unified in religion as a elaborate description of Bern and Freiburg's confessional plurality point out. Brun concludes that if the States General of the Dutch Republic would not be of the Reformed Religion because of their tolerant confessional policy, Louis XIV would not be of the Catholic creed for his official toleration of Huguenots, and Poland could not be Catholic for the same reason. To a greater or lesser extent religious diversity, according to Brun, was present throughout all early-modern European states.

Brun distinguishes many obstacles to the establishment of a single unified religion in one state. Location, political alliances, humanity's sinful nature, interests of commerce, government and many additional circumstances could influence the expulsion of heresy. However, those circumstances were provided by God, whose plans were inconceivable. Apparently the Swiss enjoyed more favourable circumstances than the Dutch, but according to Brun, God also inspired humanity and prudence in Dutch religious policy.¹⁶

Once again, the argument of divine providence is brought forward as an adequate explanation of the practical religio-political situation. It is made very clear that political circumstances could have an inhibitory effect on the establishment of one single unified religious policy, but God provided the geographic and political

¹⁵ Ibid. 173-174

¹⁶ Ibid. 174-175

environment in which a state needed to establish religious policy. These could not be directly influenced by mankind. It might appear remarkable that such an argument is used in conjunction with his initial historically based, pragmatical approach of justifying the heterodox Reformed segment in the Republic. Remarkable yet not contradictory, because Brun's analysis of the apparent heterodox history of Christianity and the late seventeenth-century European religious configuration does not irrevocably rule out any divine providence as a cause. By considering religious diversity inherent to God's providential plan Brun creates an interesting balance between confessional and pragmatical-political arguments.

Whilst the duality within *La Religion* comes forward as two separate approaches used alongside each other, *La Veritable Religion* displays a similar tendency, but exceeds Stoupe's approach by integrating both approaches into a coherent confessional world-view. Stoupe presented a more staunch and inflexible opinion regarding the relation between state and religion without involving a providential dimension, where Brun's confessio-political approach considered state-policy and God's providence connected and intertwined. However, this conjunction of providential and political factors did not imply that the political government of a state was directly concerned with religious affairs.¹⁷

Stoupe's comparative argument considering the persecution of Servetus and Gentilis in the Geneva of the sixteenth century and the tolerating of Socinianism in the Republic Brun approaches by distinguishing degrees of heresy. He distinguishes heretics who differed openly on matters which were fundamental to Christian faith and those that sinned out of ignorance. The first category Brun considers dangerous for both state and the church, whilst the second category, although sinful, did not deserve a death sentence. Servetus and Gentilis were therefore justly put to death.¹⁸ Brun does not argue that the Socinians were not sinners against the foundations of faith, but that the States General had, for instance in 1589, condemned several Socinians and instituted many prohibitions against them. Moreover, they had continued persecuting this heresy ever since. Besides, Socinian literature was scarcely distributed. These arguments lead Brun to concluding that the States General of the Republic followed the guide of Scripture in establishing their religious policy:

17 Ibid. 154-156

18 Ibid, 206-209

Ils souffrent ceux que la parole de Dieu souffre, & qui sont tolerez en plusieurs estates, qui pechent par ignorance: & non pas qui blasfement, qui sont profession publique d'impieté, ou qui renversent les fondements du salut directement.¹⁹

Concerning Spinoza and his *Tractatus*, Brun doubts whether it was printed in the Republic and not in Hamburg. He acknowledges that Spinoza's work was sold in the Republic, but this was also true of Germany, the Swiss Federation, England and France. If the *Tractatus* was printed in Hamburg then Stoupe should have focused his accusation on the theologians there and not on those in the Low Countries. But if it was printed in Holland, why should the Dutch be the primary refuters of this philosopher?

Tout ce qu'il y a de Chretiens au monde, ne dovoient ils pas accourir pour le refuter, s'il le jugeoient necessaire?²⁰

Brun argues that Spinoza had been refuted by Mansfeldt and doubts the sincerity of Stoupe's own refutation of Spinoza in *La Religion*, for he is convinced of the fact that Stoupe and Spinoza had established a friendly relationship during Spinoza's visit to Utrecht.²¹

Such an approach allowed Brun to maintain a pragmatical opinion on the religious toleration exercised in the Republic. Brun appears to consider contribution to the welfare of the inhabited state a significant and important argument for tolerating a religious denomination. The Jews, for instance, were modest and did not publicly vilify the person of Jesus Christ. Moreover, they were especially concerned with the Dutch State and their interests and proved themselves true patriots. This was also true about the Anabaptists. Similar to the arguments of the German author, Brun describes how the Dutch Mennonites contributed to the welfare of the military and commercial status of the Republic by providing financial means instead of manpower. They therefore enjoyed

19 Ibid, 209

20 Ibid. 162

21 Stoupe's identity has been subject of historical study. Brun's account only emphasized Stoupe's last name, which gave rise to the assumption that Jean Baptiste Stoupe had been the governor of Utrecht during the French occupation who had a friendly encounter with Spinoza. In *Spinoza en zijn kring: Historisch-kritische Studien over Hollandsche Vrijgeesten* ('s-Gravenhage 1896), K.O. Meinsma drew on this assumption. However, In 'Een verlopen predikant in de 17e eeuw' in; *De Gids, jaargang 96* (Amsterdam 1932), 215-231, C.W. Roldanus has clarified that it probably was not Jean Baptiste who Spinoza spoke with, but his brother Pierre, who was the actual governer of Utrecht.

a measure of toleration that the Swiss Anabaptists could not.²²

Finally, Brun severely contests Stoupe's statement that the Republic is of all tolerated religions, for the dominant religion remained the Reformed.

Pour ce que les Juifs sont tolerez a Rome, diriez vous que Rome est de la Religion des Juifs? Pour ce qu'en Angleterre il y a plusieurs Religions, que ce Royaume est de toutes les Religions? Le pais portent le nom de la Religion, qui y est la dominante, & enseignee par autorite publique. La seule Religion Reformee estant donc la Religion publique, confessee & enseignee, par autorite des souverains, en Hollande, l'on ne peut pas dire qu'ils soyent d'autre Religion, que la Reformee.²³

Grondig bericht van de Godsdienst der Hollanders includes similar arguments, only less extensive. However, where Brun focused on the justification of the religiously diverse Dutch practice, the anonymous German pamphleteer tries to make clear that significant characteristics of the true Reformed religion were established in the Republic to show that it's religion would irrevocably be the Reformed. The author points out that the Dutch created academical centres of Reformed learning, produced many Professors of theology, and established charity throughout the Republic. Subsequently the author points out that the Dutch, being of the Reformed Religion, did not evade any effort to assist co-religionist states like England, Brandenburg, the Palatinate, Sweden and Denmark and they would happily be a refuge and shelter for the oppressed.²⁴

Brun and the German author also shared the political approach concerning the tolerant religious policy of the Republic. The author explains that the situation of the Anabaptists in the Republic and in the Swiss federation was completely different.²⁵ Similar to Brun, he also believes a tolerant religious policy to be contributing to the Dutch welfare and political unity. Furthermore, the German author also stresses the effort of the Dutch States-General in persecuting Socinianism and Arianism. An extensive description of the condemnations of Osterod and Voivodius, the placards of 1653 and 1659, directed at Socinian worship and public book burnings serves to elucidate that the Dutch government was not to be blamed for the latent existence of these sentiments.²⁶ Also the historical and international comparative approach comes forward from the German pamphlet. For instance, The Roman Emperor Constantine could not be considered a Christian ruler if he was to be held accountable for the

22 Ibid. 207-225

23 Ibid. 2421-242

24 *Grondig Bericht*, 34

25 Ibid. 35

26 *Grondig bericht*, 36

existence of Arianism in his Empire.²⁷

The subjects of avarice and idolatry which Stoupe derived from the commerce-mindedness of the Dutch, Brun and the German author refute fiercely. It was God that had provided the Republic with the favourable conditions for extensive commerce. The beautiful and navigable rivers combined with the numerous ports and industrious cities were benefices of God for the States General's zealous conduct. Moreover, commerce had always existed. Brun elaborates on this by providing an extensive summary of all the commerce that could be distinguished in European history. The flourishing commerce of the Republic was not to be perceived with the jealousy Stoupe expressed in his tract. The bloody mercenary business that the Swiss maintained, of which Stoupe was an illustrating example Brun deems more detestable and contrary to the Reformed Religion than commerce:

Au lieu que nos gens hazardent leur argent & leur vie, en faisant faire des manufactures, en équipant des vaisseaux, ... sans répandre du sang, ... les Suisses dénaturez tâchent de s'enrichir par la guerre ...²⁸

Brun quotes William Temple, who did not consider the Dutch guilty of idolatry or avarice more than any other nation, to prove that the Dutch were of a modest and sober nature. Subsequently, he embarks on the comparison of the Dutch missionary efforts in their colonies with those of the papists and the English. The Catholic missionary zeal was significant, but the results were not very steadfast. Many of the residents would have themselves baptised for a jar of brandy or professed the Christian Religion by force, without adequate instruction. They would abandon faith the moment an opportunity would present itself.²⁹ Brun acknowledges that the English missionary efforts were great and far more efficient than the Catholic efforts. However, he contests the ignominious statement that the States General instructed the directors of the trading companies to not proclaim the mysteries of the Reformed faith. Brun describes how the Dutch endeavoured on extensive missionary activities in their Colonies.

La Compagnie des Indes Orientales y fait prêcher l'Evangile, non seulement en Flaman, mais aussi en langue Portugaise & Indienne. Ils y ont fait venir des Bibles Portugaises, & plusieurs livres de piété en langue Portugaise & Indienne, & ils catechisent en ces

27 Ibid. 37

28 Jean Brun, *La Veritable Religion*, 250-255

29 Ibid. 256-260

langues, par ce qu'elles sont intelligibles à la plus part des Indiens³⁰

Against Stoupe's statement that if the Dutch would evangelize the inhabitants of their colonies, they would be forced to treat them as equals in commerce Brun argues that it were not the Christians in the world that professed the most perfect trades. The infidels had been better at professing commerce ever since the Phoenicians.³¹

Concerning the incidents in Japan, Brun clarifies that it was because of the Jesuit missionaries who were stationed there. They interfered in the Emperor's policy. It could very well be possible that the Dutch told the Japanese that the Portuguese and the Spaniards adhered to a different religion and were in fact considered enemies in Europe for their tyrannical tendencies, but that would only be the truth. The Dutch conformed themselves to the request of the Japanese government to not spread the Reformed faith in their countries. However, they were allowed to profess their religion. If Stoupe's commercial advice was to only establish commerce with states in which it was allowed to profess and spread the Reformed faith publicly, then it would have been impossible for both the Dutch Republic and the Swiss Cantons to establish commerce with Spain and Portugal.³²

The description of the alleged cruelties against the English in favour of Dutch commerce Brun dismisses as a one-sided account on the actual incidents. The German author explains how the accusations and executions were exercised on a legal basis and therefore to accuse the Dutch of savagery would be untrue. Although the English had contested the legal judgement, both Brun and the German pamphleteer uphold the integrity of law.³³ The English conspiracy was discovered and rightfully brought to justice. Therefore, Stoupe could not claim that there was anything unlawful to the executions.³⁴ In reply to Stoupe's accusation that the Dutch were not sympathetic with the English, who were supposed to be their brethren in faith, Brun elaborates extensively on Stoupe's own sinful nature and the fact that Stoupe did not have any right to speak of cruelties, considering his own involvement in the massacres of Bodegraven and Zwammerdam.

30 Ibid. 268

31 Ibid. 268-272

32 Ibid. 272-281

33 *Grondig Bericht*, 33

34 Jean Brun, *La Veritable Religion*, 293-295 ; *Grondig bericht*, 33

Religious war and diplomacy

The statements brought forward by Stoupe concerning the non-religious nature of the Dutch war and the necessity and utility of Reformed solidarity were not directly refuted by Brun and the German author, although Brun devoted about one hundred pages to a refutation of Stoupe's last letter. The diplomatic arguments with which Stoupe justified his service do not find their confessional opposites in *La Veritable Religion* and *Grondig Bericht*. On the contrary, Brun establishes a political and diplomatic account on the real causes of the Dutch war.

The non-religious nature of the Dutch war Brun, surprisingly acknowledges:

Jamais Monsieur Stoupe n'a mieux dit la verité; ... & que les Balaams, les Caïphes, & tous les plus faux profetes dissent quelquefois, par malheur, la verité. Il n'y a personne qui entende tant fois peu les affaires du monde, & le naturel des princes ambitieux, qui foit dans la opinion, qu'un Prince se porte facilement á une guerre offensive, uniquement pour les interets de la Religion. ... La Religion en est souvent le pretexte, mais rarement la veritable cause.³⁵

Brun admits that, similar to the Dutch Revolt, the Dutch war was not fought over solely religious reasons, but that this non-religious nature was greatly exposed in the French conduct. The history of French military assistance throughout the sixteenth and the seventeenth century illustrated how the French had not acted differently against Protestant states than they did against their Catholic counterparts. However, if religion did constitute a factor in warfare, it was only to impose the French yoke upon the Netherlands.

He subsequently proceeds with a thorough investigation of the real intentions of the French in the war. The “official” reasons of punishing the Dutch for their ingratitude, to chastise their pride and to enforce respect, modesty and reason indicated that the main motives of the French were based on Louis XIV's tyrannical ambitions. Any considerations were obviously subordinated to these ambitions. According to Brun both France and the Republic were free to establish alliances as they saw fit and therefore any accusations of ingratitude or pride were not justified. Brun acknowledges that the Dutch Republic was probably sinful in the eyes of God, given the severe punishment it received in the Dutch war. However, the French, judged upon the same conditions, would at least be equally sinful. Was it therefore justified that the French

35 Jean Brun, *La Veritable Religion*, 302-303

executed God's punishment?³⁶

The extensive investigation of the French intentions appears to serve two purposes. First, it can be regarded as direct propaganda about the unjust cause of the French invasion, without any religious component. Secondly, Brun attempts to clarify that the French did not consider religious solidarity as one of their prevailing motivations in warfare. By highlighting the completely non-confessional and tyrannical intentions of the French he depicts Stoupe's collaboration as even more misplaced, founded on political motivations and not according to the Reformed faith.

Brun's next section concerns Stoupe's estimation European Protestant incompetence of raising ten thousand soldiers in case they were threatened by a Catholic force, based on solely confessional motives. Besides, Lutheran European states would be so hostile against the Reformed, that a Protestant alliance between Reformed and Lutherans would also be unthinkable. Brun heavily contests this by illustrating that the States General had gathered more than thirty thousand men soldiers in earlier conflicts and would be able to raise even more forces if necessity demanded it. Although Brun needed to acknowledge that alliances between Lutherans and Catholics had existed in the past (Antwerp 1567) he explains how Lutheranism had more in common with its Reformed counterpart, than Catholicism did.

Stoupe's warning to the Swiss, that if they remained sympathetic with the Dutch Louis XIV would not be so generous in aiding the Protestant cantons if they were attacked by another Catholic force, is refuted by stating that Louis XIV was not the only protector of the Swiss cantons.

Le Roy d'Angleterre, & les Hollandois ne les abandonneroient pas, ni tant de Princes Reformez en Allemagne. Je m'assure que le Roys de Suede, de Danemarc & autres princes Lutheriens, (quoi que Stoupe en ait dit) & peut-etre les Princes d'Italie même, accouteroient à leur secours.³⁷

Brun adds that the Swiss did not have reason to support the French in this war, because there had been no aggressive action against the French. Louis XIV decided to attack the Republic based on motives Brun deemed detestable. Therefore the Swiss employed in the French army were used solely for French tyrannical ends.

The characteristics of the arguments derived from *La Veritable Religion* and

36 Ibid. 304-341

37 Ibid. 375

the German pamphlet are quite similar. As the descriptions make clear, both authors display a fierce effort to defend the Dutch confessional identity based on a largely similar argumentative basis. Both emphasize the confessional dimension of the Stadtholderate and acknowledge political motives for a tolerant religious policy. These tracts were published shortly after each other and therefore it could be plausible to assume that Brun took notice of the German effort and incorporated some in his own refutation. The main difference however, is Brun's theological outset. The German pamphleteer does not construct a confessional basis for his own views on toleration and confessional politics. Additionally, both authors made the confessional adherence of Stoupe a primary target of their refutations, which is discussed in the next paragraph.

Argumenti ad hominum

As clarified in the first section of these chapters, Brun and the German pamphleteer incorporated a more obvious component of propaganda in their tracts than Stoupe did. The emphasis placed on the significance of the House of Orange and the confessional alliance between Calvinism and Dutch government incorporated a strong “national” sentiment into the debate. Regarding the domestic political situation of the years after 1672, the significance attributed to William III as focal point of the Dutch war efforts was not peculiar. Next to establishing the Reformed character of the Dutch ruler, the constructing of a general (Catholic) enemy contributed greatly to the prestige and justice of the Dutch war-effort. While establishing that the Dutch Republic had enough reason to call itself Reformed, Brun and the German author both endeavoured on questioning Stoupe's own Reformed adherence. These *argumenti ad hominum* make an clear appearance throughout Brun's tract, but the German author, lacking the theological background Brun possessed, comes forward as most explicitly offended by Stoupe's arguments and endeavoured furiously on depicting Stoupe as a non-Reformed lying and diabolical provocateur whose sole intention was to ruin Dutch Calvinism in general.

Throughout *La Veritable Religion*, Brun takes great issue with Stoupe's choice of words. For instance, the word *sedition*, used to refer to the Dutch Revolt, indicated a mutiny without any justification, while Brun maintains that the Dutch stood in their right:

certes les Hollandois n'ont jamais fait de Sediton. Ils ont taché de se maintenir en la liberté de conscience, avec toutes souffrances & toute humilité, sans mutinerie, & sans employer autre force que la patience & la priere, jusques à ce qu'on leur eut fait la guere ouvertement, pour les exterminer.³⁸

By scrutinizing Stoupe's words, Brun attempts to demonstrate that Stoupe's Reformed adherence was questionable.

Furthermore, the term *nouvelle religion*, used to describe the Reformed religion in many of Stoupe's arguments would claim antiquity of Catholicism and therefore indicated Stoupe's Catholic preference.³⁹ It is indeed remarkable that Stoupe choose this term. Early-modern Calvinists were convinced of the fact that they were the justified continuation of the old Church, where Catholic practice deviated from original Christian doctrine. On the other hand, Catholics obviously did not perceive them as such. French Huguenot communities in the seventeenth century were often referred to as *Religion Pretendu Reformee*.⁴⁰ Stoupe's use of the term *nouvelle religion* obviously lead Brun and the German pamphleteer to think that he did not truly adhere to the Reformed religion and not wrongly. However, considering Stoupe never abjured his confessional persuasion, as I have set out in the previous chapter, it might indicate that their might have been some French (Catholic) interference in the editing of his tract.

Apart from the choice of words, Stoupe's former career as a preacher and the fact that he choose to pursue a military career instead provided his opponents with a rich source of inspiration to question his religious considerations. Also, Stoupe's conduct while residing in the Republic, invalidated his accusations concerning Dutch avarice. According to Brun, Stoupe needed to contain himself, for he was not a perfect example of generosity himself. Additionally, he depicts Stoupe as being greedy and running in heavy debts during his time in the Low Countries.

Il ne pourra pas nier qu'il a laisse des dettes à Utrecht. Il scait bien qui sont les marchans, auxquels il devoit encor long-tems aprez son depart, & comment il les a assignez sur un fond, où il n'y avoit point de reveru, je sçai qu'il ne l'a pas encore paye jusques à present.⁴¹

Stoupe's avarice was even more difficult to understand, regarding his former profession. Apparently, Stoupe preferred the sword above the Bible to go to war and

38 Ibid. 83-84

39 Ibid. 85-89

40 Elisabeth Labrousse, 'Calvinism in France 1598-1685', 285

41 Jean Brun, *La Veritable Religion* 247

pillage, steal and massacre:

C'est par une même rendresse de Conscience, & par une même libéralité, qu'il a renoncé à la qualité de ministre de Christ, & au lieu d'estre Serviteur du Roy des armées, il aime mieux estre Officier de l'armée du Roy.⁴²

According to the German pamphleteer Stoupe first needed to consider his own conduct, because it had been going downhill ever since he stopped preaching:

Van een herder van Gods kudde, die gy geweest hebt, zijt gy, beneffens uw medegezel, een bedroever, en een vervolger en bloetzuiger van zo veel vrome onschuldige lieden, die u nooit beledigt hebben, geworden⁴³

Stoupe's involvement in business not of a religious nature contributed to Brun's conviction that he served the Antichrist instead. The abandonment of his preaching, the effort to make the Republic and the Bern each other's antagonists and the hiring of his pen and tongue to the effort of defamation testified of Stoupe's non-Reformed persuasion.⁴⁴ If *La Religion des Hollandois* could be considered as a blow below the belt of the Dutch Calvinist belt, the harsh opinions on Stoupe's motivations and conduct very clearly illustrate their frustration. The German author makes no effort to hide his low esteem of Stoupe's efforts:

Schaam u over uw leugenachtige lichtvaerdigheid: gy spottelijke Chamsgezel van uw vaders ingebeelde naaktheit; gy zult de welverdiende Chams vloek haast op uw kop halen, zo gy u niet bekeert⁴⁵

Analysis of these refutations brings forward the following conclusions. Both authors assigned significant value to the concept of divine providence. However, this confessional argumentation was used in conjunction with political consideration about the political usefulness of a tolerant religious policy. The German tract was incorporated in a more extensive political tract, written to justify the Dutch cause, which contributes to the fact that his refutation appears as a rather volatile attempt to attack Stoupe on a personal level. Despite the evident personal approaches, the duality of political and confessional arguments which are encountered in *La Religion des Hollandois* was countered in a similar fashion by both Brun and the German author. Brun's extensive description of religiously diverse groups in other European territories of great

42 Ibid. 248

43 *Grondig Bericht*, 31

44 Ibid. 248-249

45 Ibid. 32

knowledge, but the mere fact that he brings these arguments forward betray a deconfessionalizing tendency. Apparently the comparison between the practical confessional configuration of the Republic and other European states was considered an adequate argumentative strategy to prove that the Dutch Republic was not that different from other states. By attributing these developments to divine providence Brun even exceeds Stoupe's reasoning by establishing a argumentative balance between both arguments.

What remains remarkable is the fact that *La Veritable Religion* and the German tract do not make a thorough and explicit public effort to justify Reformed solidarity in this particular war. Stoupe's diplomatic arguments are barely discussed with an intention to prove them wrong. The main intention that comes forward in the refutations is the defence of the Dutch war-effort and the enforcement of domestic unity against the French. This indicates how the debate, which was initially sparked by the issue of international Calvinist solidarity, transformed into a propagandistic polemic considering the justification of warfare without explicit incorporation of the international Calvinist component.

Despite the shift in focus, the duality between confessional and political considerations also appears in the refutations. It would even be sufficient to state that Brun's fusion of both tendencies into a confessio-political justification of the Dutch religious policy appears even more elaborate compared to *La Religion des Hollandois* and the German pamphlet. In the next chapter I will attempt to construct a conclusion regarding the implications of this duality for our understanding of the relationship between political and confessional considerations in seventeenth-century European society and attempt to illustrate the significance for the study of early-modern confessional history.

Conclusion

The outset of this research was to investigate how the three pamphleteers, based on a disagreement about the necessity and usefulness of the confessional issue of international Reformed solidarity during the Dutch war, positioned and defended their causes. I have attempted to approach the different tracts by focusing on separate arguments and distinguishing those arguments and viewpoints that came forward. Furthermore, understanding the argumentative dynamics between political and confessional considerations used to accomplish that goal provides us with insight in the argumentative dynamics of the seventeenth-century pamphleteering arena.

The polemic revolved around the confessional issue of Reformed solidarity. However, as the previous chapters have elucidated, the different viewpoints were not solely defended from a confessional point of view. The majority of Stoupe's viewpoints in *La Religion des Hollandois* were founded on arguments of a very practical and political nature. For instance, Stoupe's focus on the tolerant confessional reality of late seventeenth-century Dutch society in order to question the complete religious identity of the Republic combined the confessional intention of justifying his service with practical-political arguments derived from Dutch confessional reality. As discussed, Brun and the German author obviously did not fear to include politically based arguments as well. Especially Brun seemed to have established a coherent integration of both argumentative strategies.

In this last chapter I will bring together all the findings that I set out in the first two chapters and attempt to clarify the apparent duality between political and confessional considerations with regard to the study of late seventeenth century religious history. The incorporation of both tendencies in these pamphlets launched them into the arena of the public opinion. Especially the numerous publications and translations of *La Religion des Hollandois* indicate an intensive spread of the document. Apparently, the tracts found a eager public. By incorporating the existence of the dichotomy between political and confessional considerations into the historiography of seventeenth century confessional developments I want to clarify the significance of this case-study. However, to establish a balanced picture of the arguments and their implications for our understanding of the significance of confessional alliances in late

seventeenth-century diplomacy and conflicts, we need to understand the dynamics of the polemic and the different purposes and intentions of the authors.

Following the sequence of the different tracts and the initial outset of the polemic, one could easily conclude that the polemic could be defined as a debate involving three different participants (four if the Bern theological faculty is included) who discussed the necessity and the naturalness of international solidarity between people and societies of the Reformed religion within the diplomatic and military context of the Dutch war. The thesis was provided by the Swiss academics of Bern and Stoupe's purpose was to defend his opinion that he did not need to be sympathetic with the Dutch in this particular conflict, while Brun and the German author's aim could be considered as defending the contrary.

This blunt definition is misleading regarding when the content of the arguments is taken into account and it obviously does not cover the complete historical context in which the polemic evolved. Besides interpreting this argumentative ambiguity, the polemical military context to which these pamphlets contributed needs to be understood to provide a clear picture of the significance of this debate. As discussed, the different intentions and motives to write their pamphlets caused the responding authors to incorporate another dimension. The emphasis on the confessional dimension of the Dutch authorities in *La Veritable Religion* and *Grondig bericht van de godsdienst der Hollanders* indicates how Brun and the German author were preoccupied with the defence of Dutch confessional identity, while Stoupe essentially attempted to justify his seemingly ambiguous service. Stoupe's strategy of attacking the Reformed identity of the Republic compelled his opponents to justify it. The polemic thus incorporated a polemical dimension of internal religious policy and confessional identity.

Stoupe's dichotomy

The dichotomy in Stoupe's reasoning consist of two seemingly contradictory intentions. On the one hand, Stoupe attempted to establish a non-Reformed picture of the Republic's confessional identity to justify why he, being a Calvinist, was perfectly able to engage the Dutch in battle. On the other hand, he makes a clear cause for the non-religious nature of the Dutch war and the superior role played by political and diplomatic considerations in establishing foreign policy. Against the accusations of the

Swiss professor, he first followed their reasoning on the same confessional ground, only to uphold political considerations as equally significant in his concluding letter.

His description of the religion of the Dutch is based on argumentative appeals to the Dutch history of the Revolt, the Reformed adherence of the House of Orange, the religious diversity constituting the Dutch confessional landscape and the commercial interests that appeared superior to the Christening of their colonies. They were intended to clarify how the Dutch had deviated from the “true” Reformed path of Calvinist religious policy. Despite his attempt to counter the Swiss arguments of solidarity on the same ground, all these arguments betray a political and practical orientation. Basically, Stoupe attempts to underpin a confessional statement (non-solidarity because of the non-Reformed character of Dutch confessional policy) with practical-political arguments.

The confessional base for his arguments appears rooted in the conviction that the Swiss Cantons exercised the “true” fashion of Reformed religious policy. This derives from his staunch opinion on the impossibility of two Reformed states differing on the practical implementation of Reformed values in society and confessional politics, while adhering to the same Reformed principles. The concept of domestic confessional unity is given great priority and appears to have been Stoupe's only real confessional base for deeming the Dutch confessional policy inferior to the Swiss. The omission of a theological viewpoint creates contrasts with Brun's defence of the Reformed character of the Dutch Republic.

Stoupe's arguments to illustrate the unwise consequences of Reformed solidarity were based on political considerations as well. Basically, he gave priority to the diplomatic relationship between the Swiss Cantons and the great and mighty kingdom of France above solidarity with the small and (in his opinion) relatively insignificant protestant states of Europe. The non-confessional nature of the Dutch war is extensively stressed and former bi-confessional alliances of the Republic brought forward as tokens of the Dutch establishing their foreign and religious policy along the same lines.

The intentions of the first five letters and the last one seemingly contradict. Why did Stoupe need to establish a non-Reformed picture of the Republic to justify his French service in the first place, when he considered Reformed solidarity unusable at all and deemed the diplomatic ties with France more important? How to interpret this apparent contradiction within Stoupe's reasoning? Did Stoupe's efforts to justify his

actions based on political and confessional considerations constitute an exception to his otherwise Reformed lifestyle? Did it compose a significant alteration compared to his earlier professions and employment? Investigation into Stoupe's career leads me to conclude that political considerations influenced Stoupe's choices greatly. Burnet's account of Stoupe's conduct at Cromwell's court, combined with his efforts to rally the French Huguenots into revolt against Louis XIV illustrate Stoupe's ability to manoeuvre himself in favour of his own benefits. His efforts to serve Cromwell by providing a thorough account on the atrocities committed against the Waldensians can be considered illustrative for his Reformed adherence and commitment to the international protestant cause. Meanwhile, his courtly conduct and his efforts to provide political arguments displayed in *La Religion des Hollandois* illustrate a political motivation, apart from any Reformed concerns.

The attempts to explain the non-Reformed nature of Stoupe's French employment have met their limits by concluding that his loyalty to a Catholic monarch was a peculiar deviation from Stoupe's otherwise Reformed demeanour.¹ But did international Reformed conduct bear uniform and clearly defined characteristics? Murdock's investigation in Reformed internationalism already demonstrated how international Reformed solidarity in situations of armed conflict and diplomacy was not self-evident and was highly dependent on the various state-interests.² The polemic does not provide an alternative example. On the whole, Stoupe's career bore one very important common feature, which was his political and diplomatic preoccupation. Both his English and French service betrayed a great emphasis on political considerations. Thus considered, his efforts to establish a non-Reformed image of the Republic based on a confessional inspiration stand out more peculiar than his diplomatic approach. Moreover, if Stoupe's duality between confessional and political justification would have been a general example of early-modern confessio-political considerations, the sympathetic call of the Swiss theologians, despite the political and diplomatic limitations, would have seemed hopelessly outdated.

After the Dutch War, Stoupe had to explain why he had given up his profession as a Reformed preacher in order to be permitted to the Holy Supper at the Parisian congregation. As reasons to enter military service he listed unemployment and the necessity to provide for his own life. Stoupe made very clear that his change of

1 Elisabeth Labrousse, *Conscience et Conviction*, 67

2 Graeme Murdock, *Beyond Calvin*, 52-53

profession did not derive from renouncement of his Reformed faith. As far as the sources can confirm, there is no data to support the hypothesis that Stoupe abjured his Reformed faith during his French employment. Therefore, we need to conclude that Stoupe managed to maintain his confessional conviction, but did not consider it the only motivational force in the justification of his actions.

Integrating confession and politics

Stoupe's description of the denominations that were present in the Republic and the derivative accusation that the Dutch were of all religions lead his opponents to counter it using different approaches. Brun's account and the German tract combined bring forward four different yet not mutually exclusive strategies. The first approach consisted of reducing Stoupe's arguments by providing an own account on the situation. For instance, Brun's calculation and description of the diversity is effectively brought forward to create a different and nuanced account on the religious constitution of the Republic and emphasizes Stoupe's focus on the Holland cities. Brun attempted to bring back Stoupe's (in his opinion) exaggerated and subjective statements to the actual confessional constitution and politics of the Republic. The arguments concerning the commercial interests prevailing over Reformed interests were similarly refuted. Brun and the German author also provided their own account on the incidents of Amboyna and Japan and stressed the legal justification. They did not deny the fact that the spread of the Reformed religion was difficult in their colonies, but emphasized the missionary zeal, the never-relenting Calvinism of the colonists and the possibility of professing their religion.

Secondly, a comparative approach leads both authors to conclude that religious diversity was a common feature in almost every European state. Especially Brun established a thorough European perspective intended to invalidate Stoupe's rhetoric by discussing and comparing the religious policies and practices in Brandenburg-Prussia, France, the Swiss Cantons and other European states. Moreover, he argued that heterodoxy was a common feature in every scientific discipline (law, medicine and philosophy) as well as in the history of European Christianity and not specifically Dutch.

The third strategy appealed to God's providence as an adequate explanation of the existence of religiously diverse states. If God wanted the Dutch to establish religious

uniformity in their lands, he would have provided them with the contributing circumstances. God's inconceivable plan apparently included Dutch religious diversity. Fourthly, the involvement of political unity and social stability are common features in both refutations. For instance, both *La Veritable Religion* and the German pamphlet explain why and how the Anabaptists could enjoy a considerable measure of toleration in exchange for political commitment.

The arguments concerning the religious identity of the Republic essentially illustrates a disagreement about government responsibility in establishing confessional dominance of one religion in its realm. Stoupe perceived the mere existence of diversity in the Republic as an indication of failed religious policy and attributes it to the sinful nature of the Dutch who decided to venerate the god of commerce and profit instead. Brun and the German author pointed out that no European state, not even the Swiss Federation, was able to eradicate religious diversity completely and assigns the reason for this failure to God's inconceivable will. Despite this failure, the States General were not to blame considering the ordinances and persecutions they had proclaimed.

The responses to Stoupe's diplomatic arguments illustrate a similar intention. Brun's approach resembles his earlier efforts in focusing on direct refutations of the arguments brought forward, but involved a different purpose. He basically depicts the French as non-religious and opportunistic as Stoupe accused the Dutch of being. He extends his refutation with a comprehensive defence of the unjustness the French justifications of the Dutch war. After a thorough analysis of the truthfulness of Stoupe's accusations, Brun concludes that the French reasons to wage the Dutch war (pride, arrogance and a lack of respect) derived from Louis XIV's megalomaniac aspiration of European hegemony. Hence, Brun's differing intention and political outset of rallying support against the French comes forward. While rejecting Stoupe's arguments about the incompetence of the protestant states to establish an effective alliance, Brun questions the need for the Swiss to aid the French. He does not explicitly claim Reformed solidarity to be directly applicable to the case of the Dutch war, but he upholds the opinion that, despite the fact that it was not a predominantly religious conflict, the Swiss should not align themselves with the French, for the tyrannical intentions of Louis XIV should antagonize any state, regardless of their religion. Essentially, Brun brings in non-confessional reasons for a confessional alliance with the Swiss.

Apart from the duality between confessional and political arguments, one type of argument in the refutations makes an exceptional appearance. All through the tracts of Brun and the German author, arguments questioning the personal religious affiliation of Stoupe are given considerable effort and attention. They, however, served a purpose which was situated in the polemic-propagandistic context of the Dutch war. They presented Stoupe as being subjugated to the French Catholic propaganda-machine and emphasized his own failure to behave as a true Calvinist. By invalidating the Swiss colonel by discrediting his own loyalties, his opponents intended to nullify his arguments reduced them to mere rhetorical provocations, without any confessional basis.

The fact that the refutations published by Brun and the German author both included or were published in propagandistic treatises about the real causes of the Dutch war and the injustice of the French aggression, contributes to the assumption of the propagandistic outset. The Dutch indignation did not focus primarily upon the theological differences, but on the assumption of being a sovereign state next to the French and subjected to merely tyrannical purposes. Futile reasons, like a lack of respect, pride, arrogance and many other justifications that Louis XIV brought forward to justify the invasion, were dismissed as excuses for his tyrannical ambitions.

Furthermore, in response to Stoupe's first letter both Brun and the German author put great emphasis on the sincerity of the conversion of William the Silent and the Divine mandate he exercised in his managing of the Dutch affairs during the Revolt. Stoupe's condemnation of the religious convictions of William the Silent is, without any hesitation, discarded as mere slander by both authors and in return Stoupe's own Reformed adherence is regularly questioned. Any other circumstances that could have influenced Orange in his decision to convert to Calvinism were deemed taboo and God's providence turning William the Silent into the Reformed focal point of the Revolt is elevated high above any human or political considerations. Basically, this is the only one of Stoupe's statements that was refuted by a solely confessional counter-argument. Concerning the Reformed nature of the Dutch Revolt, Brun largely agreed with the description of Stoupe, but kept emphasizing that religious tensions that had existed in the Low Countries ever since the Reformation, had played a considerable part in the start of the Revolt.

The emphasis on the confessional example of the House of Orange in Dutch history and collective identity, based on solely confessional arguments demonstrates

how religion and politics still heavily coincided in the eyes of Dutch Calvinists. Stoupe's assault on the confessional identity of the Dutch state thus did not only attack the Dutch Calvinists on a personal religious level, but on a more institutionalized level of the confessional Dutch state as well. The debate about Reformed solidarity thus expanded itself into a debate concerning the collective identity of the Dutch Republic set against the tyrannical aspirations of the French enemy.

Implications

The co-existence of confessional and political arguments in all tracts without one of the polemicists expressing any significant complaint, illustrates how political and religious considerations were used in conjunction to justify the respective war-causes. It needs to be concluded that Brun and the German pamphleteer did not perceive the apparent contradictory intentions within *La Religion* to be worthy of refuting. On the contrary, they attributed significant value to political and comparative arguments themselves. Especially the comparative and political approach indicate the great value both Stoupe and the German author attributed to political and pragmatic arguments to prove a confessional point. Combined with providential arguments, Brun created a confessio-political equilibrium that he not regarded as contradictory. The basic difference establishes itself between the use of the confessional arguments compared with their purpose. Stoupe's purpose of defending his allegedly contradictory loyalties is based on largely political and diplomatic arguments, while Brun's purpose of defending the confessional policy of the Republic illustrates a balance between confessional arguments based on divine providence, historical and political interests and a comparative European perspective. The German author does not divert basically from the aims of Brun, but his argumentation is less extensive and does not provide the reader with a theological framework similar to Brun's.

Having established that, although in different proportions and with different purposes, the confessio-political dichotomy was a common feature of all three pamphlets, it remains necessary to establish how this must be integrated into the historiography regarding confession and politics in the late seventeenth century. As described in the introduction, early-modern confessional historiography demonstrates various approaches towards the concepts of confessionalism and Enlightenment.

Authors like Kamen and Zagorin described the rise of the concept of toleration as a process which went hand in hand with the deconfessionalization of the state that the Enlightenment produced. Meanwhile, Kaplan's study of the toleration within multi-confessional European communities has led to a more refined insight regarding tolerant conduct in every-day situations on a local scale. These different approaches produce two extremes. On the one hand the traditional modernist discourse which connected the increase of institutionalized toleration with the disappearance of confessional significance in state-affairs. On the other hand the defining of tolerance as non-violent coexistence in every-day situations which clarified how confessional conflicts and persecution transcended the traditional period of confessional Europe.

It is within these paradigms that we must position the apparent dichotomy between confessional and political arguments in the accounts of Stoupe, Brun and the German pamphleteer. The abstract but general assumption of politics and religion, constituting two different and exclusive motivational concepts in early-modern society, needs to be reconsidered in the wake of the results of this study. Apparently, political and confessional considerations could co-exist in order to justify the pamphleteer's intentions. Stoupe's primary reaction to the Swiss accusations was to defend his cause from a confessional perspective. By describing the non-Reformed nature of the Republic he explains why he, as a zealous Calvinist, could engage in battle with them. Supplemented with his secular response, based on diplomatic considerations, *La Religion des Hollandois* illustrates how both political and confessional arguments could be brought forward in conjunction to prove a point. Both Brun and the German author did not perceive this approach as contradictory, for their refutations do not include a response to this seemingly argumentative paradox. The establishment of a similar duality between political and confessional considerations in their own tracts contributes even more to the assumption that politics and confession co-existed as motivational forces. Especially the arguments defending the Republic's tolerant confessional policy demonstrate how confession and politics intertwined heavily. The same can be said about the confessional emphasis placed on the Stadtholder and the House of Orange. Calvinist confessional and collective identity in the Dutch Republic drew largely on the confessional conviction of the political authorities, especially the Stadtholder. Of the three polemicists, Brun appears to have been able to establish the most coherent and inclusive rhetoric by incorporating divine providence into his largely politically based tract.

These findings lead me to conclude that in this particular polemic both political and confessional considerations possessed adequate justifying strength. It needs to be considered that the different purposes and intentions produced different tracts, but the fact that these seemingly contradictory arguments appeared in conjunction without any of the pamphleteers discarding it as a rhetorical paradox, makes clear that both considerations were given an equal valuation. It requires further research to specify how this outcome fit in the larger context of confessional history. In traditional terms, it could be explained as a transition phase between the age of Faith and the age of Enlightenment. A phase in which confession was diminishing as a motivational force and gradually came to be equated with political and diplomatic considerations, before Enlightenment principles established their dominance. This, however, I believe to be an one-sided approach. Stoupe's career already bore signs of diplomatic and political behaviour as early as the 1650's. The seemingly exclusive distinction between confession and reason in the traditional discourse about the prevailing of state-interests over confessional interests, is not applicable to the polemical-propagandistic context of Stoupe, Brun and the German author. The two concepts appear more flexible if not completely integrated. To establish whether the traditional progressive assumption remains valid if the the public opinion would be incorporated in historical studies, it is necessary to investigate the relationship between confessional and political considerations in situations prior to the traditional ending of confessional Europe in 1648. Even so, the appliance of argumentative analysis in an eighteenth-century context could provide insight in the way in which the Enlightenment-values found their way into the public opinion. A focus on polemic pamphleteering, as demonstrated in this research could clarify the dynamics of the debate and thus promote understanding of the argumentative and justifying significance of political and confessional considerations. Considering Reformed internationalism, this research has provided an explicit example of Murdock's thesis that Reformed internationalism in conflict and diplomacy remained ambiguous, because of the political considerations that collided with confessional interests. The approach of this research would however be able to shed light on the notorious upsurge of Reformed internationalism brought about by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, which has never been thoroughly questioned with regard to the deconfessionalization-thesis. My research has attempted to show how politics and confession remained intertwined in the late seventeenth century, both in the justification

of military service, like Stoupe, as well as in the (re-)establishing of the confessional and collective identity of the state, of which Jean Brun and the German author provide clear examples. Apparently, the Dutch war was not a perfect occasion for Reformed international solidarity, due to the prevailing of other concerns over confessional association. If possible, a thorough argumentative analysis of the 1685 European public opinion could clarify why confessional allegiance reappeared so intense. Although it needs to be considered that it lacked an international situation of conflict, a comparative analysis between the two occasions would need to focus on different characteristics, intentions and purposes. However, these could grant us an explanatory insight in the motivations, justifications and dynamics of late seventeenth-century Reformed internationalism.

Bibliography

Primary sources:

Brun Jean, *La veritable religion des Hollandois. : Avec une apologie pour la religion des Etats Generaux des Provinces Unies. Contre le libelle diffamatoire de Stoupe, qui à pour titre La religion des Hollandois ... / Par Jean Brun ... Cy est joint Le conseil d'extorsion ou la volerie des Francois exercée en la ville de Nimegue par le commissaire Methélet & ses supôts* (Amsterdam 1675).

Burnet, Gilbert, *Bishop Burnet's history of his own time: from the restoration of Charles II to the treaty of peace at Utrecht, in the reign of queen Anne* (London 1838).

Stoppa, Giovanni Batista, *The religion of the Dutch, represented in several letters from a Protestant officer in the French army, to a pastor, and professor of divinity, at Berne in Swisserland* (London 1681) *Out of the French*, by J. D. of Kidwelly.

Stoupe, J.B., *A Collection of the Several Papers Sent to his Highness the Lord Protector of the Common-Wealth of England, Scotland, & Ireland, & Concerning The Bloody and Barbarous Massacres, Murthers, and other Cruelties, committed on many thousands of Reformed, or Protestant dwelling in the Vallies of Piedmont, by the Duke of Savoy's Forces, Joined therein with the French Army, and severall Irish Regiments*(St. Paul's churchyard 1655).

Stoupe, Jean Baptiste, *La religion des Hollandois, représentée en plusieurs lettres écrites par un Officier de l'armée du Roy a un pasteur & professeur en theologie de Berne* (Cologne/Amsterdam 1673).

Stoupe, Jean Baptiste, *Advys of bericht aen de heeren staten der Verenigde Nederlanden, waer in sy sullen sien dat het haar lieden seer profijtelijck is, van Spanjen af te scheyden en een goeden Vrede met Vrankrijk op te richten, uyt het Fransch over-geset* (1673).

Grondig bericht van de Godsdienst der Hollanders, Strekkende tot wederlegginge van zeker ongenoemt Schryver, die in zes brieven, over enige maanden uit Utrecht aan een professor der Theologie te Bern in Switserland geschreven, en door de druk gemeen gemaakt, de hollanders, wegens hun Godsdienst, gelijk hij die vertoont, tracht gehaat te maken. Daar voor by gevoegt is: Wat d'eigenlijke oorzaak van de Franse Oorlog tegen Hollant is; Wat Interest andere Vorsten en Staten binnen en buiten deze oorlog hebben, en Wat de Switsers bijzonderlijk daar in hebben t'aanmerken. (Amsterdam 1674).

Secondary sources:

Benedict, Philip, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed, A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven and London 2002).

Brady Jr., Thomas A., Heiko A. Oberman and James D. Tracy ed., *Handbook of European History 1400-1600 Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation Volume II: Visions, Programs and Outcomes* (Leiden, New York and Cologne 1995).

Canziani, *Filosofia e Religione nella letteratura clandestina, secoli XVII e XVIII* (Milan 1994).

Deen, Femke and David Onnekink ed., *Pamphlets and Politics in the Dutch Republic* (Leiden/Boston 2011).

Duke, Alastair, Gillian Lewis and Andrew Pettegree ed., *Calvinism in Europe 1540-1610, A collection of documents* (Manchester/New York 1992)

Elton, G.R., *Reformation Europe* (London 1963).

Grell, Ole Peter and Roy Porter ed., *Toleration in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge 2000).

- Israel, Jonathan, *The Dutch Republic, its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806* (New York 1995).
- Kamen, Henry, *The Rise of Toleration* (London 1967).
- Kaplan, Benjamin, *Divided by Faith, Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (London 2007).
- Labrousse, Elisabeth, *Conscience et Conviction, Etudes sur le XVIIe siècle* (Oxford 1996).
- Lynn, John A., *Giant of the Grand Siecle, The French Army 1610-1715* (Cambridge 1997).
- Meinsma, K.O., *Spinoza en zijn kring: Historisch-kritische Studien over Hollandsche Vrijgeesten* ('s-Gravenhage 1896).
- Murdock, Graeme, *Beyond Calvin, The intellectual, Political and Cultural World of Europe's Reformed Churches* (New York 2004).
- Panhuysen, Luc, *Rampjaar 1672, Hoe de Republiek aan de ondergang ontsnapte* (Amsterdam/Antwerpen 2009), 266-283.
- Pettegree, Andrew, 'Afterword to the second Edition' in G.R. Elton, *Reformation Europe* (London 1999).
- Po-Chia Hsia, R. and Henk van Nierop ed., *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age* (Cambridge 2002).
- Prestwich, Menna ed., *International Calvinism 1541-1715* (Oxford 1985),
- Roldanus, C.W., 'Een verlopen predikant in de 17e eeuw' in; *De Gids, jaargang 96* (Amsterdam 1932).

Venning, Timothy, 'Stoupe, Jean-Baptiste' in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online).

Zagorin, Perez, *How the Idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West* (New Jersey 2003).