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The Holy Roman Empire during the Thirty Years War
Europe 1648
Introduction

On May 23, 1618, upset Protestant members of the recently dissolved Bohemian Estates threw two Catholic representatives of the Holy Roman Emperor and their secretary out of a 70-foot-high window in Prague in an attempt to resolve a difficult, intertwined religious and political situation. Bohemia offered its crown to a German prince, the Palatine Elector Frederick and his wife, and half a world away, the collective heads of the British people turned towards Prague. The defenestrated men survived, due to either the grace of the Virgin Mary or the pile of refuse they landed in, depending on the denomination of the party describing the event. The Protestants of the Estates were angry about the soon-to-be Emperor’s interference with Bohemia’s religious freedoms as granted to them by one of his predecessors, and the Defenestration of Prague, as the event is known, kicked off a full-scale Bohemian rebellion.¹

Frederick’s wife, Elizabeth Stuart, was the daughter of the British monarch King James, and the peoples of England and Scotland felt a duty to support her and her claim to the Bohemian crown.² The rebellion in Bohemia was effectively put down in 1620 and the Palatinate couple was expelled from Prague, but both the war in the Holy Roman Empire and British interest in it continued. As first Denmark, then Sweden and the United Provinces, and eventually France joined the war to fight the Austrian Habsburgs

and their Spanish cousins in Germany, British interest, as evidenced by the abundance of literature printed on the war, ballooned. Why, even after Elizabeth and her husband were exiled from Bohemia and their home province of the Palatinate, was British sentiment still wrapped up in the military happenings in Germany? Given the increasingly tense situation between Parliament and the Stuart monarchs at home, why did a continental war captivate the British imagination for decades?

At its outset, the Thirty Years War was a religious conflict between Catholics and Protestants. The British, as staunch supporters of the Protestant Reformation, had their alliances clearly set out for them. The Holy Roman Emperor, a Habsburg ruler who reigned over vast swaths of Central Europe, primarily in modern-day Germany, was deeply involved in the Counter-Reformation, and had already begun to take privileges away from his Protestant subjects--this was in part why his representatives were thrown out a window by the Bohemian Estates. England and Scotland were both thoroughly Protestant--albeit in different ways--by 1618 when Prague’s Protestant Estates rebelled. King Henry VIII broke England away from Rome in 1534, and Scotland also underwent its more congregationalist Protestant Reformation in the mid-sixteenth century. Despite the back and forth of Henry’s Catholic successor Queen Mary’s reign and the presence of numerous Protestant sects, by the outbreak of the Thirty Years War, both countries had settled comfortably into an anti-Catholic mindset, which was only exacerbated by the Holy Roman Emperor’s attacks on the rights and privileges of German Protestants. The British would support their Stuart cousins and their Protestant brethren through all thirty, bloody years of the war in Europe.
This thesis will investigate the impact the Thirty Years War had on the British populace. I argue that both English and Scottish subjects of the Stuarts felt for their fellow Protestants suffering in the Holy Roman Empire, and out of shared grief, religious passion, and devotion to other “members of one and the same mystical body, whereof Christ is head,” developed a sense of general Protestant community through their near obsession with the European conflict.³ It was this communal religious identity that gave them the foundations to begin imagining themselves as a people united behind their shared religion more than anything else, like a bishop or a royal government or even a monarch. From the study of a number of treatises, sermons, pamphlets, and newsbooks published about the war, I posit that the British understood the Continental religious conflict to be creeping into the British Isles in the guise of King Charles I Stuart’s unpopular Arminian Church policies in the 1630s, and that the common Protestant identity forged in the hearts and minds of the British through the Thirty Years War took on a new, more urgent, British flavor. With their religion threatened, the British people overcame confessional differences and geographical prejudices to stand together as a Protestant community defending their religion. While the need to defend their fellows that began to wash out the threads of English and Scottish religious variance was forged through the violence of the Thirty Years War, it was the specifically British side of the new religious threat that pushed the populace from its lingering religious and political difference into a common British Protestant identity and spurred

them into a place where they could contemplate outright rebellion against a religiously hostile monarch.

Britain at this time, formed as it was by King James I Stuart’s ascension to the thrones of England and Scotland, should be understood in this thesis only as the geographic kingdoms of England and Scotland as connected under direct Stuart rule, not as the united nation forged in 1707. Ireland, though technically under British control when James came to power, maintained its distance from the monarchy in London through religion, politics, and geography. Even within Britain, there was not one homogenous Anglo-Scottish Protestant community. The Catholics in England and Scotland were usually denied a public voice, especially after the Catholic-germinated Gunpowder Plot that tried and failed to assassinate King James, whose rule united all three kingdoms--Wales was incorporated into England under Henry VIII--under one crown, in 1605. The Irish were a conquered people, and non-Irish Catholics were silenced and oppressed. This thesis will not address Catholic or Irish outlooks and identities during the Thirty Years War and the lead-up to the English Civil War, as both were excluded from public dialogue at the time and did not leave much of a paper trail to include in my research.

This thesis will end its consideration of British Protestant identity at the outbreak of the English Civil War, as the war, while intimately connected with the religious wars on the Continent, was very much its own event and must be studied through social, economic, and political lenses that are not pertinent to my argument. The Thirty Years

---

King James I of England was also King James VI of Scotland. He is usually known as King James I, and will be referred to in this thesis with this title.
War itself ended in 1648, but I chose to end my study with the outbreak of the English Civil War, as the 1640s in the British Isles were swept up into local fighting and the people living there turned their focus inward. I will explain how the British people’s investment in the Thirty Years War navigated them to a moment where the English Civil War was feasible, not how other factors incited war or how things played out afterwards.

The English Civil War has rightfully assumed a place of prominence in the study of seventeenth century Britain, sometimes to the exclusion of other events and historical trends, and it is in recognition of this trend that I make my argument connecting the two seemingly disparate conflicts. The civil war, fought between Parliamentary and Royalist forces, lasted from 1642 until 1651--largely while the Thirty Years War continued to rage on the Continent. Parliament and its armies managed to overthrow Britain’s monarchy, execute the king, and institute a relatively functional government before the British populace changed its collective mind and reinstated the monarchy in 1660. The war, its aftermath, and the restoration of the Stuart monarchy are very important within historical study, given their impact on Britain as well as on Europe at large. Given the impact of Continental events on British society and politics, I advocate for a study of the Thirty Years War’s role in Britain, specifically the impacts it had on British religious conception. Studying Britain as part of Europe and European happenings, no matter how distant those happenings seem, offers valuable insight into the context of British-specific events.

---

Historians of the Thirty Years War tend to pay very little attention to Britain, and rightfully so, as the Stuart government was largely uninvolved, generally poorly regarded, and essentially unproductive throughout the conflict.\(^6\) When it comes to works focused on England and Britain, Britain’s interactions with Europe are explored much more fully. The authors that discuss the Thirty Years War in Britain and incorporate the importance of the religious effects of the Thirty Years War on the British public into their arguments--who are few and far between--tend to stop there, without properly acknowledging the essential way that the religious concerns of the Thirty Years War became local ones before the English Civil War. In his book *England’s Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context*, Jonathan Scott beautifully lays out the “protestant anxieties” surrounding European religious conflict that unified British Protestants. He addresses the whole of the seventeenth century in his argument that Continental events had impacts on England’s religious and political situations, which were so deeply intertwined as to be considered one religiously political sphere. Jason White, in his more specific study of militant Protestants, similarly explores the impact of these anxieties on British religious unity and loyalty.\(^7\) These authors, whose works are by far the most closely linked with my topic, lay much of the groundwork for my study but overreach in claiming that the Protestant anxieties

\(^6\) In its direct references to the events of the Thirty Years War, this thesis relies primarily on C. V. Wedgwood’s *The Thirty Years War*, due to its availability to the author. Other accounts of and works regarding the war, such as those by J. V. Polisensky, Peter Wilson, and Tryntje Helfferich that are both referenced in this work and were studied in preparation for it, match Wedgwood in largely ignoring Britain in documenting the conflict.

regarding worshippers on the Continent were enough to cause the tensions of the civil war. I argue it was only when these anxieties became local ones that threatened the English and Scottish churches specifically that they were strong enough to incite war. I have therefore engaged in primary source analysis to properly synthesize the many moving parts of British Protestant identity from 1618-1642. Jayne E. E. Boys’s research into news printing in Thirty Years War-era London provided invaluable information on the structure and functionality of the printing industry and its output for my perusing of printed primary sources. Steve Murdoch’s *Scotland and the Thirty Years War* and Howard Tomlinson’s *Before the English Civil War* also assisted me greatly in gathering background and timelines.⁸

From the number of primary sources that discuss the Thirty Years War, it was clearly a source of impassioned interest, although it can be difficult to tell who exactly was participating in public discussion of the war. While this thesis references only thirty-six documents due to its limited production time, I read dozens more, and had access to hundreds beyond that which address the Thirty Years War, Stuart foreign policy, the Bishops’ Wars and the lead-up to the English Civil War, and the religious troubles both in Britain and abroad. In delving into English language newsbooks, sermons, pamphlets, and treatises published during the war--most of which were printed in London and distributed from there--I found a plethora of impassioned works

---

that provided evidence for my argument. Many of these sources were authored and printed anonymously, which makes it more difficult to pick out which parts of British society were most active in the conversations surrounding the Thirty Years War. The accredited sources come from influential authors and theologians like John Milton as well as from more commonplace doctors and poets who have left a smaller footprint. Newsbooks detailing the events of Europe, primarily translated from Dutch originals, provide a sense of British interest in the war due to their near-constant production when permitted by the king’s censor. Religiously tinged political commentaries, sometimes dedicated to the king and Parliament, make up a large swath of published work from the time. A few sermons, often translated from German or Dutch originals, also made their way through the British publishing circuit. Contemporary commentary on the events of 1618-1642, including British understandings and responses to them, is not hard find, and I have been blessed by the availability of texts from which to draw.

This thesis begins with the establishment of British interest in the Thirty Years War, and how said interest was demonstrated by British subjects. Chapter I explores the military involvements of English and Scots in the war, and the mad rush for news of Europe that caught the British Isles as soon as the war began. Chapter II delves more deeply into the religious lens through which British interest in the war was filtered, and details how Stuart inaction served to fuel the religiously charged British interaction with the conflicts in Europe. Chapter III deconstructs the complicated religious situation of Britain in the early seventeenth century and explores how British religious investment

---

9 Refer to Boys’s book for a study of printing in London addressing the Thirty Years War. The vast majority of my primary sources were accessed via Early English Books Online and its extensive archive of digitized primary sources. A simple search for ‘Thirty Years War’ between 1618 and 1648 on EEBO turns up 177 documents.
in the Thirty Years War helped overcome confessional differences between British subjects to create a larger, more generalized Protestant community in Britain. The final chapter of this thesis outlines the development of this loose Protestant communal understanding into a nationally-focused religious identity as the religious wars of the Continent made their way to the British Isles. Chapter IV seeks to demonstrate that it was the combination of the religious identity forged through generalized Protestant concern regarding the Thirty Years War and the particularly British aspect of the threat to that identity that granted the soon-to-be Parliamentarian forces a base on which to build their protestations.
Chapter I: The Thirty Years War in British Print

After the famous Defenestration of Prague, Bohemia became a site of armed conflict almost overnight. Having ardently opposed the Habsburg imperial heir, Bohemia offered its crown to Frederick V, Elector of the Palatinate, who had married the British princess Elizabeth Stuart, daughter of King James I. In August of 1619, Frederick and Elizabeth assumed their thrones in Prague, but by the end of the next year, the royal family was forced to flee. A decisive battle at White Mountain in November 1620 put the Imperial Habsburg family’s Catholic forces firmly back in charge of Bohemia, and left Frederick unable to return to his home province of the Palatinate, since it was occupied by a Habsburg ally. With the immediate Bohemian concern now settled, the war moved quickly into a struggle for land, power, and religious glory between a rotating cast of Protestant allies and the Catholic Habsburgs.

The fighting spread, and power and advantage oscillated wildly as the years dragged on. For the majority of the war, the conflict was driven by the overarching religious dispute of the time; each convinced their opponent was damned, Catholic and Protestant actors struggled to prove the righteousness of their respective brands of Christianity. The ever-changing cast of characters on the Protestant side, including Denmark, the United Provinces, the king-elect of Hungary, Sweden, and Britain at various times during the three decades of conflict, fought both the Spanish and Austrian

---

10 Boys, 7.
11 Wedgwood, Chapter 2.
Habsburgs and their Catholic allies in the Holy Roman Empire and Italy. The war’s religious themes, which were not entirely ones of conversion to begin with, slid easily into poorly defined attempts to prove the superiority of one denomination over the other through bloody defeat. With the loose Protestant conglomeration ostensibly fighting to restore the Palatinate to its deposed Protestant prince and the Habsburgs seeking full control over the Empire, the defeat of one side did not necessarily signal victory for the other. Since neither side was able to beat down the other enough to get what it wanted, the fighting continued. In 1635, the Catholic nation of France declared war on first the Spanish and then the Austrian Habsburgs, the country’s long-standing political rivals, and firmly signalled the shift of motives away from religion, with success measured by the strength and power of the rulers involved. At the end of 1648, a peace was made between the states, armies, and other actors involved in the war at that point. There were no clear victors, few lasting achievements, and the territory of Germany was left ravaged and broken.\textsuperscript{12}

The Thirty Years War, while limited in direct military action largely to the central European Continent, had far-reaching effects. The complicated religious and political issues that caused the war spread from Germany to Sweden to Britain. While thousands of British men fought in the Thirty Years War, meaningful given the British crown’s lack of military involvement, most British subjects interacted with the war from afar. They demonstrated and maintained a connection with the events of the war through printed literature.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} Wedgwood, with specific references to Chapters 7 and 12.

\textsuperscript{13} J. V. Polisensky, “A Note on Scottish Soldiers in the Bohemian War,” in Murdoch, ed., \textit{Scotland and the Thirty Years’ War, 1618-1648}, 110, 111; Matthew Glozier, “Scots in the French and Dutch Armies During the Thirty Years’ War,” in
While painful, violent, and disastrous for the European continent, the British Isles were never in physical danger of suffering the same horrors that had occurred on the mainland—although many British people were concerned with the possibility of invasion.\(^{14}\) The political connections between Britain and the chaos in Germany were tenuous at best—Stuart foreign policy had been seeking an alliance with Spain and its branch of the Habsburg family for decades—and King James Stuart had firmly refused to act meaningfully on his son-in-law Frederick’s behalf.\(^{15}\) The Stuart monarchy was not in a financial situation to support war, and King James took pride in being a “peace-lover...appalled at the idea of Christians fighting each other.”\(^{16}\) That Britain sent no governmentally-raised forces to Germany is therefore not surprising; however, recruitment for individually and internationally sponsored regiments was relatively successful.

British soldiers, most of whom were Scottish, fought in the Thirty Years War under many national banners and in great numbers. By 1619, there were already Scottish soldiers fighting in the Bohemian war. The Anglo-Dutch Brigade, which was founded during Queen Elizabeth’s rule, was a major employer of Protestant British soldiers in Europe, and given the United Provinces’ continual involvement in the war, guaranteed its British troops opportunities to serve in Germany. Between 1624 and

---


\(^{15}\) Wedgwood, 178, 55, 89.

1642, over 10,000 Scots entered French service; these soldiers, many of whom were against Habsburg hegemony, enlisted en masse after France entered the anti-Habsburg coalition. Over 30,000 British troops served Sweden during its intervention in the war. Again, the majority of those fighting under Sweden’s banner were Scottish. Foreign officers were sometimes permitted to raise troops, and in 1624, the crown funded a recruiting drive that drummed up 12,000 volunteers. Local English and Scottish officers also recruited British soldiers to fight for the Palatinate; Sir Horace Vere levied a body of volunteers in 1620, and Lord Andrew Gray raised a total of 25,000 musketeers in April of the same year. Since all British military action in Germany was paid for by outside parties, the level of British military involvement in a conflict miles away was marked.

The majority of British subjects did not march off to fight in the war, but they by no means ignored it. In the first years after the conflict broke out, information detailing the news from Bohemia was already being printed in London. A pamphlet describing the reasons for the Protestant uprising in Bohemia was published in 1619 from the translation of William Phillip, who was known for translating pamphlets and travel books “from the Dutch.” An anonymous pamphlet promising a “true relation” of the news of the “wars in Bohemia” was printed the same year. In 1620, the poet John Taylor published two pamphlets, one of which professed his love for Bohemia and his

---

17 William Phillip, "Newes from Bohemia. an Apologie..." London, : Printed by George Purslow for Ralph Rounthwaite, and are to bee sold at his shop, at the signe of the Flower de luce and Crowne, in Pauls Church-yard., 1619., , accessed Nov 20, 2018, https://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgthumbs.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=99891963&FILE=../session/1542746057_27036&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=AUTHOR. It is likely that the “Dutch” referenced here and in other primary sources refers to German (Deutsch).

well wishes for his countrymen going to fight for her.\textsuperscript{19} Since he could not “pass the streets” for being “continually stayed by one or other, to know what news” was to be had from Bohemia, Taylor’s second pamphlet served as an account of his travels through Germany. Those he claimed approached him for news were interested in everything from the fighting in the Palatinate--which Taylor did not encounter, as he was miles away in Prague--to the status of English forces on the continent to information about the Emperor’s army.\textsuperscript{20} Even while Frederick and Elizabeth seemed secure in their thrones, the British people cared about the status of their monarch’s daughter’s war.\textsuperscript{21}

In 17th century Britain, the printing and publication of these pamphlets was organized almost entirely in London, meaning that most of their authors were London-based. However, news at this time could have been travelling all over the British Isles, and there was a direct route between London and Scotland, so all subjects of the Stuarts likely had access to the same information and publications. An anonymous diarist in Edinburgh demonstrated reception of news from England as well as Continental ships docking in Scotland.\textsuperscript{22} The publishing process itself was reliant on the saleability of the works submitted for printing, and the largest consideration of publishers was the profit they would gain from printing one pamphlet or news sheet over another. Only private individuals with the means to pay for printing could consider

\textsuperscript{20} John Taylor, “Taylor His Trauels...” last modified -01 (EEBO-TCP Phase 1), 1620, accessed Sep 23, 2018, https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A13508.0001.001?rgn=main;view=fulltext., unfoliated.
\textsuperscript{21} Boys, 7, 17.
\textsuperscript{22} White, 46-47.
losing money to get their messages published; all printers and publishers had profit at the forefront of their minds. Despite the relatively low literacy rate of the 17th century, the presence of pamphlets describing the Bohemian affair signifies that there was enough interest in Frederick and Elizabeth’s situation from literate parties to guarantee a profit in printing about it. Given that the content of available literature influenced those who read it, as more ink was spilled over the Bohemian situation, more people grew interested in the subject that was sweeping through the British news circuit.  

Even after the disastrous Battle of White Mountain in 1620, the press continued to demonstrate British interest in Bohemia and its now-deposed rulers. A 1623 pamphlet attributed to preacher Thomas Scott outlined in great detail the legal background of Frederick’s claim to the Bohemian throne, three years after Frederick and his family had been expelled from the province. In his 1624 treatise on the duties and requirement of British Protestant holy war in Germany, radical Scottish Protestant Alexander Leighton included a letter entreating the Palatine couple “not to faint or fall over till God give the victory,” as well as an appeal to Charles Stuart on behalf of his “only loving...and lovely sister” Elizabeth. In 1636, almost twenty years into the war with no sign of Frederick’s restoration to the Palatinate, much less Bohemia, in sight, a member of a Stuart embassy to the Holy Roman Emperor referred to Frederick and

---

Elizabeth as the king and queen of Bohemia. As late as 1638, the year before Britain’s domestic situation exploded into civil war, Philip Vincent’s “Lamentations of Germany” included a section despairing “above all...the affliction of that Royal Lady” Elizabeth.

Since the Bohemian-centric portion of the war was over relatively quickly, the aforementioned afflictions facing Elizabeth and Frederick were related to the Palatine Electorate. As part of the imperial retaking of Bohemia, Emperor Ferdinand had promised the Palatinate’s electoral title to another German prince, Elector Maximilian of Bavaria. By the time the dust had settled from White Mountain, the emperor’s Spanish Habsburg cousins were holding the Palatinate. From the Protestant perspective, much of rest of the war was fought to restore Frederick to his rightful status and remove foreign players from German affairs. The British press, which had already demonstrated interest in the now-exiled Palatine couple, quickly added news about the expanding war to its publishing, and a notable growth of interest in European affairs swept through Britain. The majority of the printing related to the war came in the form of newsbooks and early broadsheets known as corantos, both of which detailed major battles, important diplomatic events, and, according to a newsbook from a major publishing

---

26 William Crowne, "...The Travels of the Right Honourable Thomas Lord Hovvard..." last modified -03 (EEBO-TCP Phase 1), accessed Sep 23, 2018, https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A19674.0001.001?c=eebo;c=eebo2;cite1=crowne;cite1restrict=author;g=eebogroup;rgn=main;view=fulltext;x=1;q1=ambassador., 1, 12.  
27 Vincent, “The Lamentations of Germany...”, https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A14442.0001.001?rgn=main;view=fulltext., unfoliated (italics from original).  
28 Wedgwood, 99, 133, 135. For more information on the structure and motivations of the war, consult Wedgwood’s book.  
syndicate, “remarkable passages” gathered from all over Europe. Corantos, single-page news sheets translated from Dutch originals, quickly gave way to newsbooks of sixteen or more pages as demand for news of the war increased; many newsbooks were serialized and published new material on a weekly basis. The explosion of print during this time, while notable on its own, is especially marked because of the type of news desired. The contents of these newsbooks came from corantos and letters from the presses of other countries, and often apologized for delays of continental postal systems due to bad weather and fighting. Major publishers often worked together with various printers on iterations of serialized news publications. A newsbook put forth by the prolific publishers William Archer, Nicholas Bourne, William Sheffer, Bartholomew Downes, and Nathaniel Butter went through multiple variations on the theme of Weekly News for its title. The newsbook regularly changed who was accredited on its title page despite maintaining the same printer and publishers, which implies there was enough financial opportunity to be had in printing about the war that all five major publishers maintained an interest. Content from publishers outside this syndicate also reported on the war, demonstrating the demand for news from Europe.

Pamphlets, treatises, plays, ballads, sermons, longer news digests, and over 400 news periodicals have survived from London’s print coverage of the Thirty Years War. Although the Stuart monarchs put out censors on printing in 1620, 1621, 1632, and

---


31 Hobbes and Malcolm, 74; Boys, 89, 40-41. Examples of these publications are available at Early English Books Online.
1634, each of which restricted certain kinds of publishing, the proliferation of content regarding the war continued. Newsbook production in particular continued through lapses in serialization, governmental restrictions, royal inaction, and failed campaigns until the war ended. During the 1620s, the British people were “constantly concerned, and occasionally obsessed,” with the state of affairs in the Palatinate; after Gustavus Adolphus entered the war and began to gain Protestant victories in the 1630s, interest in newsbooks picked up as well. The 1634 printing ban forbade printing of all foreign news, but publishing related to the war continued with pamphlets despairing over the miserable state of Germany and commenting on Britain’s role in the greater conflict. British public opinion was clear: the status of Frederick and Elizabeth, the Palatine restoration, and the war mattered.

---

32 Boys, 9, 1, 68, 8; Hobbes and Malcolm, 61, 74. For access to a relatively full accounting of newsbook publication during the war, consult Early English Books Online. For more information on these bans, consult Boys and Malcolm.
33 An example of this type of pamphlet is “The Lamentations of Germany.” Other similar documents are available at Early English Books Online, many of which are less relevant to this thesis.
Aside from the state of the Stuart relatives now exiled from Prague and the Palatinate, both Britain’s ruler and its people had concerns about the general political situation surrounding the Thirty Years War. These concerns manifested themselves in starkly contrasting manners, to the extent that the Stuart government began to alienate itself from its subjects. Given the Palatine family’s close relation to the Stuart dynasty, there was a real possibility that Britain would look to Frederick and Elizabeth for a successor to the British throne.\(^34\) Therefore, the precarious position of the Palatinate and its now-deposed rulers concerned the British for reasons more pressing than the Habsburg slight of Stuart honor and the restoration of a piece of land half a continent away. The assertion of Habsburg power evident in the movements of even the early days of the war was also concerning to the British, given the country’s long-time rivalry with Spain. The Spanish Habsburgs involved themselves in the affairs of their Austrian cousins from the beginning, deploying troops in the Holy Roman Empire and enhancing British fears of a Catholic hegemony dominating Europe.\(^35\) The nature of this pro-Palatinate sentiment was largely couched not in potential political outcomes, but in religious solidarity. While British authors and printers cared about the fate of Elizabeth,

\(^{34}\text{White, 11.}\)

they spilled much more ink on the subject of religious solidarity with fellow Protestants on the Continent.

While political concerns were enough to grab British attention, they were apparently not concerning enough to drive the Stuart government to decisive action, let alone military involvement. Stuart foreign policy during the war consisted largely of grand diplomatic statements with no real backing power. The “public as well as a large part of the Parliament,” however, were in favor of “extending military aid to Frederick” and made this sentiment clear from the pulpit, in Parliament, and in print. The power of public opinion was enough to apply serious pressure on a regime entirely unable to sustain a war effort, much less one as distant and politically complex as the Thirty Years War.  

The vast array of British publications during the Thirty Years War display a variety of opinions on an assortment of subjects, but a remarkable chunk of published material was devoted to a Protestant religious understanding of the war. Prolific newsbook publishers, along with most others engaged in pamphlet publication in England, promoted the cause of the Palatinate couple and of their true religion in even their nonreligious newsbooks. In the course of reporting on major events from the Continent, pamphlet after pamphlet made sure to check in on the status of Protestants in Europe, bemoaning oppression in Catholic territories and celebrating defeats of “common enemies.” The myriad newsbooks, which reported for the entire thirty-year period of the war, demonstrated a real and continuing investment in both the war and

---

36 Miller, 305-335, 329; White, 2; Boys, 6.
its effects on Protestant populations miles away.\footnote{Hobbes and Malcolm, 70-71; “Decemb. 13. Number 7. Weekly Nevves from Germanie...” London, : Printed by Edw: Alde for Nathaniel Butter and Nicholas Bourne., 1623., , accessed Sep 23, 2018, https://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgthumbs.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=938016506&FILE=/session/1537744085_11920&SEARCHSCREEN=CITATIONS&SEARCHCONFIG=var_spell.cfg&DISPLAY=AUTHOR., 4. For further examples, refer to EEBO; “Aprill 28...,” printed for Nath: Butter and Nicolas Bourne, 9; White, 2; J. Scott, 100.} Government censorship, of course, would not allow for any print too obviously contrary to Stuart policy, so it is unsurprising that newsbooks did not contain Catholic-centric depictions of the war. However, publishers tailored their work to public opinion so as to make as much money as possible from readers, and Protestant unity sold. When even these more secular newsbooks demonstrated a bond between British and Continental Protestants, it is not surprising to find that texts devoted to specifically this connection were published over the course of the war.\footnote{Miller, 13; Green, 22.}

While the subjects and goals of the non-news publications during the Thirty Years War varied from political critiques to policy advice to religious explanations, a common feeling of Protestant sympathy pervaded literature regarding the war. These too were published throughout the war, and while the advice offered and complaints made changed along with the circumstances of the war, the underlying sentiment did not. Thomas Scott’s 1620 pamphlet “Vox Populi,” a fictitious account of Spain’s plots against England, set up a stark Catholic-versus-Protestant dichotomy. While the pamphlet does not concern itself with the wider war in Germany, its aggressive understanding of Catholicism expresses a “need to actively protect international Protestantism” from the nefariously united papists all over Europe.\footnote{T. Scott, “Vox Populi...” [London] imprinted : [s.n.], 1620., , accessed Sep 23, 2018, https://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/full_rec?SOURCE=pgthumbs.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=21503750&VID=176759} A lengthy
pamphlet by Alexander Leighton in 1624 devoted over 300 pages to the reasoning behind, guidelines for, and treatment of a British holy war on behalf of the Palatinate. In the pamphlet’s introductory letter to Charles I, Leighton emphasizes the Protestant duty towards those “as dear and near to [Charles] as Lot was to Abraham,” and later encourages Parliament to strike a covenant with God to ensure success in the war to come. The pamphlet, titled “Speculum belli sacri: Or The looking-glass of the holy war,” compares Leighton’s, and Britain’s, situation to a wide array of Biblical stories and uses them as justification for his rather bellicose understanding of Protestant duty.⁴⁰

Published in 1626, a pamphlet entitled “An Excellent and Necessary Discourse” by an author known as S. B. calls upon Britain to support her Protestant fellows under siege in Europe, emphasizing the urgency of sending aid to various German provinces and the King of Denmark, who was in 1626 a major player fighting against the Habsburg coalition in Saxony. The author spells out the painful consequences awaiting England and France should Denmark fall: economic and political freedoms curbed at the whim of the Emperor, who would immediately begin “removing the true religion” and instead imposing “bondage and superstition,” just as occurred in Bohemia after the fall of Prague.⁴¹


This rhetoric of warning and impending doom appears in other literature as well. Many authors and publishers understood the Thirty Years War as divine punishment rained down on the sinful people of Continental Europe, and viewed the war as a warning to those not yet affected by it. Alexander Leighton begins his treatise on holy war by presenting war as the wage reaped from sin. In chapter 26, Leighton states that while England and the similarly uninvolved Holland may think “the Lord will never come against them,” their rejection “of the Antichristian Hierarchy” of popery did not ensure their rejection of other heresies. Leighton entreats “Princes, States and people” to let the Word dwell within themselves or face the wrath of God.42 A sermon from Norenberge (likely Nuremberg) that arrived, translated into English, in London in 1638 spends 72 pages comparing Germany’s status to the prophecy of destruction for Israel presented in Isaiah 64:11. The version published in London contained an introductory warning that “if not cut off by a timely and unfeigned Repentance,” the kingdoms of Christendom would suffer the same fate as Germany.43 Even newsbook publisher Edward Allde, despite his and other publishers’ devotion to writing news and not religious and political theory, included a 1623 letter from Denmark that understood the war as God’s response to idolatry in his otherwise relatively secular newsbook series.44

43 "Lacrymae Germaniae..." London : Printed by I. Okes, and are to be sold by H. Ouerton, and Iohn Rothwell at the Sunne in Pauls Church-yard, 1638., unfoliated.
Even authors who did not see the war as a warning viewed it in religious terms. A 1638 pamphlet by Philip Vincent speaks of the plague afflicting Germany as “being God’s immediate judgement.” Vincent, a doctor who had already treated plague in London, saw “the divine hand and finger of God” in the horrors of the plague he treated in Germany during the war. The pamphlet’s introduction encourages the British “church and state, and every member of the same...to be cordially affected with the miseries of Germany” as members of the same faith. Vincent mentions the troubles that, through levies on soldiers and money spent on embassies, had already impacted Britain and assures his readers that through prayer and mourning, as presented in the Bible in Nehemiah 1:4, God would restore Germany’s peace and continue Britain’s. Even at the beginning of the war, when the fighting had barely begun and before there had been much religious repression to speak of, John Taylor’s 1620 pamphlet “An English-Man’s Love to Bohemia” spoke of the war as a godly one and sent the soldiers going to fight in Germany off with prayers and affirmations of God’s support.

While it is difficult to assemble any sort of comprehensive picture of the religious backgrounds of these many authors before the outbreak of the war, there is a common trend visible throughout their works. While there are notable differences in the goals and styles of these authors, the way they talk about the Thirty Years War indicates the

---

development of a Protestant public sphere in which authors from different backgrounds and with varied viewpoints could make their thoughts, which were overwhelmingly religious, heard. This sphere of communication, and those writing within it, expressed a sense of solidarity with fellow Protestants being oppressed in Germany and demonstrated a general theme of religious opinion to which these authors, regardless of their backgrounds, gravitated.

Given the fervor of public support for the Palatine cause, many British people—authors and otherwise—were not content to send only their prayers to Germany. Public and Parliamentary pressure in favor of extending military aid to Frederick and the Bohemian Protestants expanded dramatically, and as the war spread to impact Protestants all over the Holy Roman Empire, the push for aid only strengthened. The Palatinate lobby had no success under King James, who had cast himself as a peacemaker dedicated to Christian coexistence in Europe, and spent the last years of his reign hopelessly working towards a royal marriage between his son Charles and the Spanish Infanta. Considering the deep-set British hatred of Spain and its popish ways— even less religiously concerned subjects lived in fear of a Continental Catholic league led by the Spanish—the British public and Parliament hated the Spanish match, and in 1624 Charles himself abandoned the match and pushed for war with Spain.⁴⁷

After James’s death in 1625, Charles assumed the throne and things seemed positive for the Palatinate lobby. While there was no immediate levy for troops to send

---

to Germany, the increasingly bellicose relationship with Spain seemed a promising lead-in to engaging with the Palatinate’s enemies. The new king was able to work harmoniously with the anti-Spanish Parliament, and actually began the war with Spain that his father had declared the year before. Parliament, however, did not fund the war fully, or even properly, and the war achieved effectively nothing while costing Britain money and lives. Public and Parliamentary sentiment towards Charles, and his favorite the Duke of Buckingham, soured. Charles and Buckingham attempted to court favor by going to war with France to relieve the French Protestant Huguenot minority under siege at La Rochelle. Given that Buckingham had previously proposed selling ships to France, which would be used to continue the siege, this embarrassing and fruitless war served only to widen the gap between monarch and people, especially since despite the nation’s Catholicism, France was generally anti-Habsburg. The Palatinate lobby’s efforts to work with Charles had led to five years of war that did nothing to aid German Protestants, or even to distract their enemies, and by the time both wars had ended in 1630, the king and his policies had fallen out of favor.\footnote{White, 58-59, 85, 12; Esmé Cecil Wingfield-Stratford, \textit{Charles, King of England, 1600-1637} (London: Hollis & Carter, 1949), 140, 162, 194. Wedgwood, Chapter 12.}

British perception of the war, couched in religious duty as it was, did not lend itself to patient acceptance of Stuart foreign policy. Drawn largely from John Foxe’s influential \textit{Book of Martyrs}, published almost a century earlier, the English public sphere (and to a lesser extent the Scottish one) had conceptualized the influence of a godly prince figure, leading the country to foster a united national and religious identity under his leadership.\footnote{White, 3; Foxe, John, and Charles A. Goodrich. 1832. \textit{Book of martyrs}. Cincinnati: Roff & Young.} James’s unpopular foreign policy had prevented him from
assuming this role in the minds of his subjects; the king’s religious convictions were loose enough to countenance a Catholic marriage, which was a destination to which his subjects refused to be led. From the beginning of his reign, King James had portrayed himself as a peacemaker, so the more militant strain of British Protestants, operating with the mindset that the Antichristian Catholic church and the true godly Protestants would inevitably clash violently, had turned their hopes towards James’s firstborn son. Prince Henry had been “perceived by the public...as a warrior prince and as a resolver of religious dissensions in Europe by force of arms” before his untimely death in 1612. The British public, especially the more militarily inclined, were used to directing their advocacy towards a Protestant warrior prince figure, and were sorely disappointed by Charles once he assumed the throne. In absence of a domestic champion for their oppressed fellows in Germany, the British Palatinate lobby looked to other Protestant princes as leaders.  

At the beginning of the war, many saw Frederick as the new Protestant warrior prince, given his readiness to fight the Catholic Habsburgs to retain Bohemia and the Palatinate. Frederick’s luck, status, and ability to exact change all declined rather quickly after 1620, and British Protestants once again turned their hopes elsewhere.  

When Sweden entered the war in 1630, its king Gustavus Adolphus fit the bill perfectly. He was “a new conqueror whose first task was to restore the undermined Protestant

The 1563 Book of Martyrs sets up and explains a “Godly Prince” dynamic wherein a connection between said Godly prince, the church, and the people helps organize religious identity. This dynamic flourished England, and while Scotland appreciated it as well, the Presbyterian nature of the Scottish Kirk prevented it from fully embracing it. For more information, see Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of John Foxe’s Book of Martyrs, Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, as well as Foxe’s Book of Martyrs itself.

Miller, 305, 308.

White, 2, 3, 41.
power in Germany,” which was just what the Palatinate lobby in Britain had been advocating for. Adolphus fought alongside his army for his Protestant brethren abroad, and did so with relative success, despite the back-and-forth nature of the war. Early in his involvement in the war, British newsbooks were publishing praise, support, and songs of victory for the “Sweden king;” author Alexander Gill devoted a pamphlet in verse to Adolphus’s “just heroic mind” and valiance on the battlefield. Even after Adolphus died from battle wounds in 1632, the British--and especially Scottish--Palatinate lobby continued to cultivate a close relationship with Sweden for the benefit of Germany’s Protestants.\(^5\)

publishers were comfortable drawing on each other’s religious outlooks from early on in the war.

While British authors, publishers, people, and Parliament made their religious concerns regarding Britain’s place in the Thirty Years War quite clear, not much actually came of their efforts. Despite frequent and consistent lobbying, changes in monarchs and policy approaches, and the status of the war itself, the Stuart government, which was admittedly nowhere near capable of sustaining a serious war effort, did very little for its religiously concerned subjects. To complicate the situation further, many of the Palatinate’s advocates came from different religious and political backgrounds, held different views on the lessons to be taken from the war, and envisioned different plans to meet different goals. It is understandable, then, that nothing substantial was accomplished to assist Protestants and fight Habsburgs in Germany.

Although the Stuart governments did not contribute anything particularly important to the events of the Thirty Years War, Britain and its people were involved in the religious conflicts of the era. The goings-on of Europe are not usually given the attention they deserve in the study of British history of this period, but I argue that an understanding of Britain’s reactions to and involvement in more general European affairs is an important, if as of yet underemphasized, aspect of Britain’s historical journey through the seventeenth century. As evidenced by the mass of printing on the topic, British subjects understood themselves to be part of the European conflict, be it as observers, allies, or even soldiers; the island nation was in no way isolated from the affairs of the Continent, and should not be seen as such. In fact, an understanding of
how international struggles impacted British national ones is necessary to present a clear portrait of the upheavals looming down upon the British horizon.
Chapter III: British Religious Diversity and Its Impacts

As King Charles and his Church policies led Britain towards a path of religious conflict, British Protestants looked to the Thirty Years War to provide context for the tensions generating on their own soil. The religious landscape of Britain during the early Stuart period was relatively diverse; official Church policy was still developing, and had not pulled popular religious practice in line with the policies it had managed to establish. Given the diversity of practice and the lack of policy enforcement, British Protestants understood themselves as members of the general European Protestant community, not just as members of the Church of England. When King Charles began to lead the Church away from mainstream, generally accepted Calvinist doctrine, British Protestants viewed their religious struggle through the lens of the broader wars of religion happening on the Continent.

The English Church officially broke from Rome in 1534, and the Scottish church, known as the Kirk, did so in 1560. However, the English Protestant Reformation predated King Henry VIII, who spurred the nation’s permanent split with Catholicism. After establishing himself as head of the Church of England, Henry VIII enabled and helped develop the Reformation in England. By the time James ascended to the Scottish and English thrones, both Church and Kirk had settled on doctrines and ritual practices. The Church of England carried over a bishop-based episcopal hierarchy from its Catholic days, although it replaced the Pope with the monarch as head of the religion
and was drawn increasingly toward Lutheran theology.\textsuperscript{53} When Queen Mary took the throne in 1553, she dragged the English people, kicking and screaming, back to Catholicism. Many staunch Protestants fled Marian England for Zurich, Geneva, Frankfurt, and other hotbeds of Protestant activity. When Elizabeth began her reign in 1558, these exiles returned, many laden with new and exciting Reformed ideas about religion, and they went on to shift the Anglican Church towards a more Calvinist confessional approach.\textsuperscript{54} The Scottish Kirk was relatively set in its Presbyterian ways, and happily rejected the episcopal authority of its English cousin. The Kirk had developed independently of the crown, and desired to maintain that separation.\textsuperscript{55}

Elizabeth’s church doctrine was designed more to heal the wounds of Mary’s tumultuous five years of Catholic reign than to actually establish what the Church of England looked like, and was therefore at times rather vague. The English Protestant church was a relatively recent creation, and had not yet had the time to solidify its doctrine even before Mary’s rule. The various religious subgroupings within the Church were still “undergoing change and development during this period,” and were not solidified yet either.\textsuperscript{56} Accordingly, the Church of England was rather loose in its description of proper worship.

\textsuperscript{53} Lutheranism, founded by Martin Luther’s break from Rome, emphasizes salvation through faith and relies on Scripture, which was made more accessible to the layperson. Calvinism, another dominant Protestant strain, holds that man can do nothing to save his soul, and that those destined for salvation have already been chosen by God. The particulars of Lutheranism and Calvinism are not important to this thesis, which focuses on the Catholic-Protestant divide.


By the time the Thirty Years War rolled around, James had settled on his religious policy. When James came to power, he did not change much in terms of actual church doctrine (such as it was), and did not go to great lengths to impose the Church’s nebulous policies on every person under his rule. He was, however, decidedly in favor of the episcopal model despite his Scottish upbringing, believing that the monarchy could not exist without its hand ruling over religious policy, and worked to implement universal British episcopacy. James’s main quarrel with the Scottish Kirk was its independence, and he attempted to bring the Scottish and English churches together under a Calvinist Anglican doctrine of which, most importantly, he was head. He tried to impose an English episcopal structure on the staunchly independent Kirk, which was not particularly effective; while the two churches were not terribly different—both were Calvinist, and had grown closer in opposition to Marian reforms—the Scots were not willing to give up their government-free church structure.\(^{57}\)

By the beginning of Stuart rule, religious practice in England was varied. Elizabeth’s policies—and James’s—regarding minority religious opinions were relatively tolerant. Given the recent confusion under Mary and the vagueness of Elizabethan policy, there were multiple religious cultures and understandings of what the Church should look like floating around the minds of the British public. While the Church adhered to a Calvinist-leaning doctrine, non-Calvinists were allowed to make their voices heard, and a modicum of diversity was permitted in religious practice. The Church was not entirely forgiving; some of the more radical practices of the Puritans
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\(^{57}\) White, 3-5; Collinson, 27, 49.
were forbidden under church doctrine, and British Catholics, while not forced to leave
the country, were an unwelcome and oft-abused minority. The religious landscape
under the early Stuarts was colorful enough to build alliances and incite arguments
between subsets of the still somewhat loosely defined British Protestant tradition.58

During the Thirty Years War, one religious group was particularly vocal59 This
outspoken (or argumentative) group was rather more bellicose than official Stuart policy
regarding the Thirty Years War allowed for. The militant Protestants, as named by
historian Jason White, predated the union of the Scottish and English crowns and were
outspoken in print, Parliament, and the pulpit. While not cohesive enough to qualify as
a religious sect—notable militant Protestants did not correspond with each other or
interact in person—the movement was widespread and popular. Its conception of
Britain’s place in the war held sway with Parliament and populace alike, and its
adherents felt no qualms whatsoever in critiquing royal policy.60 According to White,
this group believed that “Protestants everywhere needed to protect one another, to take
up arms in each other’s defense and to attack their common enemies,” and that Britain
had a duty as a sovereign kingdom to aid its fellow worshippers.61 Despite not
attempting to consolidate themselves into a clear denomination, the militant Protestants

58Lockyer, 264, 266-267; Dickens, 313; White, 2, 55; Green, 38; Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland,
C.1650-C.1850, eds. Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (Cambridge, UK; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press,
59 Most of the sources available on EEBO that cover the Thirty Years War are newsbooks. The majority of the non-news,
jointly religious and political texts are of a militant Protestant bent. It is difficult to qualify what exactly a militant
Protestant work looks like, given the lack of group cohesion. I consider works that advocate a military response or speak of
political events and their religious undertones in warlike terms to fall under the umbrella of militant Protestantism. There
is, unfortunately, no easy way to filter an EEBO search for specifically militant Protestant works, but over the course of my
research, I have viewed hundreds of search results and am comfortable describing the militant Protestant opinion as a
widely-expressed and prominent one.
60 White, 52-53, 57, 80.
61 White, 2.
can be understood as a religious group given the startling similarity of their individual members’ convictions. An analysis of militant Protestant writings demonstrates determination to fight for and defend German Protestants during the Thirty Years War, and its adherents were very vocal about that desire as the war dragged on. Alexander Leighton Thomas Scott, the otherwise unidentified S.B., John Taylor, and Alexander Gill all adhere to some part of the militant Protestant message in their writings.

S.B., Taylor, and Gill demonstrate their faith in simple terms: all three advocate, encourage, or celebrate the Protestant cause and fighting in Europe. Taylor commends the “warlike troops assembled bravely” going off “to aid a gracious Prince in a just war” in 1620. “The Church of God while it is in the way of Canaan,” proclaims S.B., “is still militant” in 1626, and should it fall on the Continent, it shall surely do the same in Great Britain. Gill praises Gustavus Adolphus, who “doest God's battles fight, by whom the wronged still regain their right,” for his triumphs in 1632. These authors make their acceptance of direct, violent action more relatable by framing it in Biblical terms; in doing so, they legitimate military intervention to themselves as well as to their general Protestant audience.62 In a pamphlet thematically entitled “The Belgick soldier, Or war was a blessing,” Thomas Scott states that if not for war, “the Church might still be

62 Taylor, “An English-Mans Loue to Bohemia...,”
moyling in the brickhills in Egypt.” Scott lists multiple Biblical instances of war waged at God’s command, under God’s leadership, and to achieve God’s goals. Scott’s numerous other works justify the cause of the Palatinate, rejoice over banishing papists and Jesuits, and encourage the king to “enter into war with the Spaniard” time and time again.\(^6\)

Leighton’s treatise on holy war appears at first glance to be a perfect example of militant Protestant theology, does not actually lay out much of the political or religious ideology behind the movement. After a few introductory letters urging king and Parliament to lead an armed intervention in Germany, Leighton takes for granted that his audience agrees with him and spends the next three hundred-odd pages describing the proper ways to go about such an exercise. The second chapter of “Speculum Belli Sacri” explains why it is not “altogether unlawful for Christians to make war,” when said war is “defending the good and offending the bad.” Leighton’s work is careful to cover as much potential Biblical ground for objection as possible in his impassioned plea for a change in foreign policy. When the Gospel instructs its followers to turn the other cheek, Leighton explains that Christ refers to private wrongs and not public, nationwide ones.

like affronts to religion. While Christians should endeavor to pursue peace, life is full of men with “dragon’s hearts, serpent’s heads,” and the “cruel motto of the wicked,” against which the true faith must be defended. “Speculum Belli Sacri” is dedicated to both Charles and Parliament, demonstrating the typical militant Protestant comfort with petitioning others—including the government—to follow their lead. This central message of militant Protestants was articulated by a multitude of authors and published in London and Edinburgh, as well as on the Continent.

English Protestants, Scottish Presbyterians, militant Protestants, and Puritans may not have agreed with each other, but they all agreed that they were Protestants, and understood the general Catholic threat to be more pressing than the occasional interdenominational squabble. The approaches taken to the Continental Protestant suffering dealt by the Thirty Years War, while stemming from the same underlying sentiment, varied based on the particular beliefs and outlooks of each writer’s religious subgroup. While the British populace as a whole ached for the plight of the Palatinate, not all authors writing on the war advocated for a military response. Authors like Philip Vincent and Sa. Baker, who profess no clear leanings to any one religious sect, devoted their pamphlets to bemoaning Germany’s pitiable situation and calling for heartfelt prayer to resolve it. Militant Protestants encouraged the crown to send material, if not military, aid, and secular news writers restrained themselves to reprinting the more

---


65 Taylor, Scott, and Gill published in London, and Leighton published in Amsterdam. Scott also published in Edinburgh, Holland, Dort, and Utrecht. For examples of Scott’s pamphlets not cited here which were published in the cities listed above, refer to Early English Books Online.
pointed religious tirades of their contemporaries. The early years of the war and James’s relatively hands-off Calvinist policies developed a strong basis of shared sympathy for Protestants in England: since James’s church was largely content to leave religious practice to the practitioner, minority Protestant groups could turn their attentions to the Continent instead of fearing oppression at home. The continued failure of the crown to enact any meaningful popular foreign policy built upon that foundation to pull the British subjects, from Parliament to publisher to pulpit, into a more cohesive, if less well-defined, reformed religious grouping.  

One place where the vast majority of British subjects, militant or otherwise, could write on common religious ground was in their hatred of Catholicism, and of Spanish Catholicism in particular. For some, the Catholic threat was one of a more political nature. The Catholic Spanish-Austrian Habsburg alliance seemed poised to overrun Europe and establish a massive economic hegemony at any moment; France, which lived in fear of this very possibility, was largely given a pass for its Catholicism due to its dislike of Spain. The anonymous author of a pamphlet entitled “The Necessary League” presses for the creation of a league of Habsburg enemies to counter the already established Habsburg alliance. Though this author makes a brief reference to the establishment of true religion under a league of this sort, “The Necessary League” views the Catholic threat as one primarily of state.

---

66 Refer back to Chapter 2 for description of these failings.
Many other authors, especially militant Protestants, did not separate the political threat of Habsburg Catholicism from the religious one. Alexander Leighton credits the Gunpowder Plot, an attempt by English Catholics to blow up Parliament and the king, to an international Spanish-led conspiracy. In “Vox Populi,” Thomas Scott goes as far as to claim that English Catholics were all secretly loyal to the Spanish king. S.B. understands the Catholic hegemony to be chopping down Protestant leaders right and left; the Habsburgs had unseated Frederick, and were “hewing at the second pillar” of the true religion, Denmark. S.B. warns that if Britain does not step into the fray, it will be the next to fall. Others believed that the Catholic Church was under Satan’s thumb; pamphlet author Henry Burton accuses the Pope of carrying millions of souls to Hell, and author Thomas Beard’s treatise spends over 400 pages explaining that the Pope is in fact the Antichrist. Additionally, all Catholics were assumed to be loyal to the Pope above all else, effectively rendering them secret agents of nefarious papal designs.

---


against king and country. Regardless of the specific source of their animus—and considering that the political and religious fears of Catholicism were usually combined—, British Protestants stood in clear opposition to Catholicism and wanted its influence firmly out of their churches, practices, and country.

The Protestant community in Britain saw itself as standing in solidarity with its oppressed Continental cousins, and the finer details of and squabbles between Lutheranism, Calvinism, Puritanism, and Presbyterianism faded away in the face of a threat to Protestantism as a whole. The fear of Catholic—and especially Habsburg—domination was certainly a driving factor in the creation of a general agreement between the many, varied groups of Protestants in Britain, as is evidenced by the diverse authors who espoused this fear. This overarching Protestant community developing in Britain, however, did not just stand in opposition to a common enemy; it stood in allegiance with a common ally. While the Habsburg threat had bloomed with its victories in Germany, it was watered with the blood of Protestants. It was on behalf of these Protestants that the British involved themselves.

This sense of solidarity through religion has already been made clear through analysis of the explosion of British print focused on the plight of German Protestants. In his book on militant Protestants, however, historian Jason White argues that this religiously charged anger produced more than just pamphlets. He claims:

Therefore, this militant Protestant British identity, forged as it was around the conceptualization of the ideal foreign policy and the disputes it engendered, can tell us something very important about the early Stuart era: there was a

---

71 J. Scott, 102.
significant number of English and Scots who saw themselves as British and who had conceptualized opposition to Crown policy in British terms.\(^72\)

White’s argument is a bold one. While his book, and this thesis, focus in large part on British understandings and reactions to the Thirty Years War, there were other things going on in the Stuart kingdoms during the three decades of the Continental war. Charles’s domestic policies impacted his subjects far more intimately than his foreign ones did, and England and Scotland were still divided by cultural prejudices despite the union of the two kingdoms’ crowns under James in 1603.\(^73\) White’s implication that opposition to royal foreign policy was strong enough to forge a communal identity across the Scottish-English border therefore relies on the Thirty Years War being the defining public concern of the era. That a number of English and Scots transcended their national and cultural boundaries to think of themselves as British rather than English or Scottish does make sense, and is clearly visible in the domestic wars that erupted in 1638. White’s theory, however, does not account for the fact that the Suarts had been ignoring militant Protestant foreign policy ideas for years before their subjects turned from political opposition to actual resistance. White does not properly address the immediate cause of the tangible English and Scottish cooperation: the change to local British religious policy. While the connections built surrounding the Thirty Years War and Britain’s place in it were certainly foundational in the creation of a British Protestant identity, White limits himself to the interactions of militant Protestants and
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\(^72\) White, 10.
\(^73\) White, 1, 8-9.
does not adequately address the specifically British nature of the events that pushed Anglo-Scottish cooperation from political agreement to united action.

The breaking point that pushed British Protestants into action on behalf of their faith came under Charles. When Charles assumed the throne in 1625, he moved away from his father’s relatively relaxed, Calvinist-leaning ceremonial observance. Where James had styled himself a protector of European peace, Charles was ready to go to war when he began his reign. Charles’s willingness to jump into the fray on behalf of Bohemia garnered support from his people, but the total failure of his foreign wars with Spain and France quickly washed his initial popularity away.\textsuperscript{74} While Charles inherited his fair share of problems—like the almost decade-old Bohemian war and the poor financial status of crown and country—he was responsible for even more damaging ones. It is possible that Britain could have forgiven Charles his military failings had he remained true to the Protestantism espoused by his people.\textsuperscript{75}

A small group of clergy uncomfortable with the level of Calvinism in the Church of England that had been limited in influence under James gained power under Charles. While this group had arrived at its theological policy by itself, its similarity to the doctrine of Dutchman Jacob Arminius earned it the name Arminianism.\textsuperscript{76} Many viewed the Arminians as leaning towards popery, and Charles’s choice to embrace Arminianism and appoint its supporters to high positions in the Church left the British public worried

\textsuperscript{74} Refer to Wingfield-Stratford’s book, \textit{Charles, King of England, 1600-1637}.
\textsuperscript{75} J. Scott, 104-106, 101.
\textsuperscript{76} Freya Sierhuis, \textit{The Literature of the Arminian Controversy} (Oxford University Press, 2015), 1-5; Arminian theology was anti-Calvinist in its rejection of predestination and embrace of free will. Arminius and his ideas caused a major controversy for the Dutch from 1609-19. Again, the doctrinal details of Arminianism as opposed to Calvinism are not as relevant to this thesis as is the mere fact that they were different religious philosophies. For more information on the Arminian Controversy, see Sierhuis’s book.
that the Church would be “utterly ruined” by the “superstition and idolatry” of Rome.\footnote{White, 59, 63, 77; Collinson, 36; Peter Salt, “Sir Simon D’Ewes and the Levying of Ship Money, 1635-1640,” in J. Scott, 128.}


In turning towards Arminianism, Charles split with Parliament and with the public at large. Both England and Scotland, despite their doctrinal differences, despised Arminianism and the direction in which Charles was taking the Church.

The religious duty fostered by the Thirty Years War was one that could ignore minor confessional disagreements, but the implementation of Arminian practice in the Church of England began pushing those disagreements entirely away. When the threat to Protestantism began to bloom on British soil, it was suddenly much more important
to band together in the defence of Protestantism than it had been when the threat was miles away in Germany. Fear that Britain was suffering from the same attacks on Protestantism as visible in Europe began to bring the wars of religion, as yet confined to Continental Europe, into the British Isles. In disconnecting himself from the religious proclivities of his subjects, Charles inadvertently succeeded in helping the British towards a unified understanding of Protestantism—just not the Arminian one he was hoping for. The Church of England was still relatively new and consequently still settling into its religious opinions, and the “fusion of Calvinism and popularity” that formed the basis for worship across Britain was directly threatened by Charles’s Arminian policies. This threat, which demonstrated what British Protestantism was not, helped define what British Protestantism was. It clarified which doctrines British Protestantism rejected as well as blurred the lines between religious denominations as all sorts of Protestants scrambled to ally themselves against Arminianism. The “cooling of [English] hearts towards their sovereign” was notable even through the muddle of English religious practice, and the allegiance of the Scots to their monarch, given Charles’s aggressive attempts to install Arminian bishops in the Kirk, was “fatally undermined” in both political and religious spheres.  

It seemed clear to the British that their ruler was increasingly drifting towards the ranks of those that threatened their true religion. In order to respond to the threats facing them, be they Catholic Habsburg oppression of Protestant cousins or popery creeping into the domestic Church, British Protestants everywhere needed to join
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79 Bathlazar Gerbier, British Library Add MS 4181, ff. 12, 52., as quoted in J. Scott, 91; J. Scott, 134, 137; Boys, 8.
together. In his impassioned plea to Parliament to save the reformed religion, Prynne states that the time to debate opposing religious doctrines had passed, and that the “only care...is now to defend, to settle them, not dispute them.” Philip Vincent’s call for the church, “in the bonds of Religion,” to “grieve with them that grieve and weep with them that weep” can be viewed as a rallying cry for Protestants across the nation to put their differences aside and band together for the common good. \(^8\) If the British public wanted to rescue Protestantism from its myriad aggressors, they would have to do it alone.

\(^8\) Prynne, “Anti-Arminianisme,”
[https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A14442.0001.001?rgn=main;view=fulltext], unfoliated.]
Chapter 4: A Unifying Call to Arms

The real unifying force that created a British Protestant identity strong enough to withstand, and win, the war brewing on the horizon was that of the Arminian threat to specifically British Protestantism. The Thirty Years War, while complex and impactful enough on its own, was also “part of a more general war of religion” that began the previous century and continued after the Peace of Westphalia.\(^81\) The British religious struggle, despite its localized nature, was another facet of this broader fighting. While the British Isles had long felt invested in the fate of Protestantism in the wider war, it was under--and due to--Charles and his church policies that the wars of religion finally touched down on British soil. Where on the Continent the opposing force to Protestantism was the Catholic Habsburgs, in the British kingdoms it was the Arminian Stuart religious government. It was then, with the threat to their religion localized, that many British Protestants finally jumped into action. The ensuing conflicts between king and country brought about marked changes in British governance, official religious practice, and national-religious identity.

As members of the reformed Christian faith, the British public had long felt a stake in the religious conflicts between Catholics and Protestants taking place on the Continent. Under Queen Elizabeth, England had provided military assistance to Holland against Spain, and British theologians had been exchanging bits of Calvinist theory with French and Dutch Protestants for a long time.\(^82\) The vast majority of Europe--including

---

\(^81\) Murdoch, ed., *Scotland and the Thirty Years’ War, 1618-1648*, 7.

\(^82\) J. Scott, 214, 138.
the British kingdoms, to an extent—had already felt the sting of religious war. The Thirty Years War was therefore just another, albeit longer and bloodier, conflict in a series of battles over true religion. The possibility of the destruction of Protestantism had been looming on the horizon for decades, and while Britain offered words of support and occasional military backing to Protestants struggling on the Continent, the islands had so far avoided any major threats to religion at home. The trend of religious violence did have the Stuart kingdoms worried over the possibility of Catholic invasion, but no such invasion would ever actually occur.83

When the Thirty Years War began, the fight for religion found its footing in Britain again; Elizabeth Stuart’s ousting from her throne and electorship added an element of personal concern to the already established religious one. While Britain itself may not have been threatened, despite its people’s fear of invasion, British Protestantism had been attacked by the actions against Elizabeth. This attack imbued British Protestants, already worrying over wars of religion of the era, with a more personal and therefore more deep-seated concern. Even then, however, the Church and Kirk were still safe. Charles’s foreign policy began to intensify these concerns as he started reforging diplomatic bonds, so loved by his father and hated by his populace, with Spain. During his personal rule, Charles received offers of anti-Habsburg alliances from Sweden, the United Provinces, and France, but chose instead to bargain with Spain in the hopes that the Spanish Habsburgs could restore Frederick’s family to the

Palatinate. He failed on all counts, managing only to further convince his subjects of his coziness with popery. To the Scottish and English publics, the situation was clear: the papists were invading, the “military struggle between reformation and counter-reformation” was moving to British soil, and without a Protestant prince to lead the charge to save their religion, the British people were going to have to do it themselves.\(^8^4\)

Anti-Caroline sentiment, as previously demonstrated, had been brewing for a while. The underfunded, unpopular Stuart government had achieved none of its subjects’ goals, and had in some cases actively worked against them. By the time the domestic situation came to a head in 1638, much of the products of the London-based printing industry had stopped trying to convince Charles to fight for the cause and instead criticized the king for not doing enough. Stuart foreign policy, according to Parliament, was “misguided and mishandled,” and domestic policy was widely protested.\(^8^5\) The straw that broke the camel’s back came about with the publishing of a new prayer book for Scotland in July of 1637. The prayer book adhered to royal, and therefore Arminian, doctrine, which was one step short of popery in the eyes of the Scots. The congregationalist Kirk would not stand for the imposition of religious doctrine, especially not an Arminian one. Rioting ensued in Edinburgh, and unrest continued through the end of the year. In February 1638, representatives from all walks of Scottish life signed the National Covenant, rejecting Charles’s religious innovations and promising to resist their implementation with force if necessary.

---


\(^8^5\) Wedgwood, 20; Boys, 2; J. Scott, 145; Murdoch, ed., Scotland and the Thirty Years’ War, 1618-1648, 32.
The uprising in Scotland was powerful enough that its echoes reached the Continent. Hundreds of Scottish soldiers, employed primarily in the Swedish army, were given leave to return home to fight for their country and their religion. Scottish military service in the Thirty Years War had created experienced and well-organized officers and soldiers who were happy to continue their defence of Protestantism on Scottish, and even English, soil. This migration of well-trained soldiers made the Covenanter army far superior to its hastily gathered Stuart counterpart, and linked the religiously grounded rebellion to the wars of religion being fought on the Continent--the Swedish were apparently just as happy to see Protestantism defended in Scotland as in Germany. By 1640, Charles had suffered a humiliating defeat, and the treaty that ended the war referred the disagreements between king and country to the Scottish Parliament to be resolved. In order to fund the war and the peace with the Scottish, Charles was forced to call a Parliament to petition for funds, giving the English a chance to make their concerns known. Long Parliament, which sat for the course of the English Civil War, was not happy with Charles, and England soon followed Scotland’s lead into civil war.  

The Covenanters’ Rebellion, also known as the Bishops’ Wars, was a Scottish affair; while the Covenanter army made brief forays into northern England, its quarrel was with the king, not with England. Charles’s army, weak though it was, consisted mostly of Englishmen doing their duty to the crown. Given the religious structural differences between Church and Kirk, the history of bad blood between the two
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86 J. Scott, 136-142; Murdoch, ed., Scotland and the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648.
kingdoms, and Scotland’s relative irrelevance in English—and in more general British—politics, it would not be unreasonable to assume that the Scottish problems of the Covenanters’ Rebellion were dealt with by the Scots, and the Scots only. This assumption, while technically true in regards to military engagement, does not apply to public perception of and dialogue surrounding the Bishops’ Wars. Newsbooks explained the events of the conflict, pamphlets from Scotland were re-published in London, and some English pro-Covenanter literature managed to avoid the increasingly restrictive censors. The crisis in Scotland was near and dear to the hearts of the English.

Protestants in both kingdoms were increasingly able to unite in order to face a religious doctrine that threatened them both, ignoring structural and practical differences in their separate churches. Unlike the Presbyterian Kirk, the Church of England had long been led by its monarch and was therefore quite accustomed to the crown shaping religious policy. Nevertheless, many English allied themselves with the rebelling Scots as brothers sharing in the suffering inflicted by Charles’s religious policies. A short poem titled “Scotlands Encouragement” published in 1640, which praises the “Scottish Lamb” for trampling the “Romish wolf,” speaks of England’s passionate solidarity with Scotland. It is not clear where the pamphlet’s anonymous author hailed from, but the poem was likely published in London, as it complains there is “no freedom to be had of speech” in the city. The first stanza proclaims that
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87 J. Scott, 137; Young, 82.
88 Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England* (Boydell Press, 2007), https://books.google.com/books?id=ZmxB5nHEDY4C&pg=PA92&lpg=PA92&dq=charles+1+print+censorship&source=bl&ots=gNBBhSoUl0&sig=ACfU3U1mmUxdEdrX7zvYrYJhDmlSYQ&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjG8r fbi4XgAhUMTN88HQtXCEUQ6AEwCXoECAEFAQ#v=onepage&q&f=false, 184-185; For examples of literature surrounding the Bishops’ War, refer to Early English Books Online.
“ambitious bishops have received their doom,” and the last stanza directly mentions William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, as an impediment to the proper celebration of the worthy Scottish army. The pamphlet believes the “Eagle styled English Parliament” will soon uncover the “hellish plots” that have tyrannically attacked the Church. “Scotlands Encouragement” demonstrates the growing reality of England and Scotland’s unified religious attitude.89

Of course, not everyone sided with the Scottish rebels. Loyalists from both Scotland and England fought for Charles against their rebelling Protestant brethren. In London, many laymen published pamphlets disavowing the “tumults in Scotland” and the “foul acts” of the Covenanters.90 The trend of Scottish-English solidarity, however, was so strong that loyal members of Charles’s government worried that “the beliefs of many English and Scots troops were closer to each other” than to royal Arminian policy. In a 1638 letter to the Earl of Strafford, the Earl of Northumberland worried that as “the People through all England are generally so discontented” that “there is reason to fear that a great Part of them will be readier to join with the Scots, than to draw their swords in the King’s service.” In his personal diary, Archbishop Laud worried over the “great

Concurrence between [the Scottish], and the Puritan Party in England.”91 Even outsiders to the political situation saw the truth of the situation; the Venetian ambassador to the Stuart court wrote as early as August 1637 that many English “were no less discontented and scandalized than the Scots” and that the two kingdoms’ grievances were similar. In May 1638, the ambassador wrote of the hesitance of the English to fight their Scottish brethren when Charles declared his war.92

The steadily growing connection of English and Scottish Protestants demonstrated a shift in identities, with both English and Scottish feeling closer to and more united with each other, and the Protestant cause across Europe, than their king. The language surrounding this increasing unity, however, took a while to coalesce. The concept of a united Scotland and England as one Britain predated any actual union of the two kingdoms, but British language did not immediately permeate Scottish-English unity dialogue. The two crowns of Scotland and England had only been joined in 1603, by the person of James Stuart. At that point, Britain was still composed of “two Privy Councils, two Parliaments, two laws, two churches,” and notable cultural divides. The project of unifying the two distinct kingdoms was James’s, one that would ideally end with James “as the sole ‘British’ institution in existence,” with the Parliaments of each kingdom essentially redundant.93 The first years of James’s reign saw much propaganda “encouraging people to start thinking of themselves as Britons, inhabiting a British
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92 White, 100.
nation” instead of an English or Scottish one with joint custody of a king.\textsuperscript{94} This approach saw some lasting success; in 1624, when the Palatinate lobby felt it could still rely on the king, Leighton named Charles the “Hope of great Britain” and referred to “the union of Britains kingdoms” in his work on holy war.\textsuperscript{95} While England and Scotland were not particularly passionate about James’s idea of union through absolutist monarchy, the king’s propaganda did get the concept of a united Britain reliant on the monarch into the minds of his subjects.

One result of James’s essential role in the conception of a combined English-Scottish identity was that Protestants advocating for inter-kingdom support for Scotland’s armed defence of its Kirk did not immediately couch this request for unity in combined terms. Thomas Scott believed that “England and Scotland should be united” in their religious struggles, and the reality for Scottish militant Protestants “was that the two kingdoms were better off” combatting Catholicism and the illusions thereof together, “despite ecclesiastical or liturgical differences” between the two. Scott was advocating for a united Protestant community in Britain, but did not use British language to describe it; Britain belonged to the king, and the king--first James, and then Charles--was against military intervention on behalf of international Protestants. If


England and Scotland were to work together, they would have to do so via a different uniting vehicle.  

This vehicle was the reformed religion. Protestants across the British isles had shared the hopes and pains of their brethren on the Continent for two decades by the outbreak of the Bishops’ Wars, and given the centrality of religion in politics, uniting as Protestants was just as effective, if not in fact more so, than uniting under some vague monarchical pipe dream of a unified crown. It is therefore not surprising that those fighting Arminianism referenced the general wars of religion, of which the Bishops’ War were considered a part, in their calls for support. A 1641 pamphlet by author John Cragge proclaiming the sins of Britain--much in the same way that earlier pamphlets proclaimed the sins of Germany--pleads for God to end the “dangerous time of contagion” and return peace to “great Britains Land;” it also reminds its readers to “be mindful of sweet river Rhine,” stating that no true peace can envelop Britain until all Protestants are safe. Another 1641 pamphlet by an anonymous author encourages England and Scotland to “march to the Rhine” and to Germany “with courage” after banishing popery from Britain and Ireland. However, associations with international Protestant struggles could only go so far. Unlike the Thirty Years War, which spread across the European continent, Britain had no land borders for the fighting to expand
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96 White, 8, 50, 55; Clayton and McBride, eds., Protestantism and National Identity…, 8.
over, was miles away from the fighting in Germany, and had no real inter-church struggle, only a denominational one. Given these factors, the Protestant overlay of the Anglo-Scottish collaborations during and after the Bishops’ Wars became one specific to Britons, binding them further together through a threat to national religion that, while part of the larger religious conflicts of the time, was disconnected from the international Protestant community.

Although the war was fought against him, after the Bishops’ Wars ended--in part because of the concessions Charles made while restoring peace--British subjects still understood their uniting religious and political figure to be the king. Yet another 1641 pamphlet, this one by a minister named John Thornborough, devotes itself to explaining the “great happiness that hath and still may accrue” through the reunion of England and Scotland under Charles, “to the everlasting peace and welfare of” the Church. While this pamphlet does not concern itself overmuch with the specifics of the Church, it clearly presents Britain as an entity reliant on the king.98 The famous author John Milton, also in the popular pamphlet-writing year of 1641, found great importance in Church specifics; he praises Commons for clipping “the wings of the Clergy” who have “made a bridge unto the Church by the Arminian opinion, to pass over to Popery.” Milton then advocates that the “Kingdoms unite for their own safety,” stating that “the Scot hath an army on foot for this purpose.” Clearly, Milton falls on the Covenanter side of the
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Bishops’ Wars, but later in the same sentence, he ensures Scottish safety since “the King hath promised” the Kirk and General Assembly authority to make religious decisions for themselves. Towards the end of his explanation of the state of affairs in Britain, Milton expresses his humble desire for “God to bless his Majesty,” finding no issue with praising both the rebellious Covenanters’ army and the king whose policies they fought against. Milton, along with many others, placed the blame for Arminianism and popery on Charles’s advisors, despite the fact that Charles had ultimate control over Church appointments, religious policy, and his councillors.99

Being a Protestant in Britain, for many, was increasingly coming to mean opposing the religious policy set forward by the king. Religious opinion throughout the Stuart kingdoms had grown increasingly polarized over the course of the Thirty Years War, and by 1640, it was often viewed as supporting either Geneva or Rome, with no room for denominational specifics. This outlook was understandably espoused by many Scots, and by many English Parliamentary leaders as well. In addition, English Parliament started to overstep its bounds in using its newfound power from the Bishops’ Wars and began to infringe upon constitutional royal powers and privileges. Many members were not entirely comfortable with this new direction of religious opinion and limited royal prerogative, and from this split the Royalist party was born. It was all too easy for absolutists in and out of Parliament to color more moderate thinkers as secret papists trying to tear down the reformed religion, and polarization only increased. As

the public increasingly associated the descent towards popery with Charles’s ambiguous, if not outright hostile, Church doctrine, it drew closer to the Parliamentary cause and drove loyalists further in the other direction.¹⁰⁰

Then, in 1641, Catholic Ireland rebelled. “Speeches and sermons detailing the popish danger in 1641 spoke to the same audience that had scoured” for news of the Palatinate two decades earlier, and fears of popery exploded. Just when Charles appeared to be working his way back into Parliament’s good graces, the rhetoric of secret papist bishops managing a vast Catholic conspiracy spanning Ireland, Spain, Rome, and dead-set on adding Britain to the list, crushed the nascent hopes of cooperation. Bishops, of course, were the king’s lackeys. Scotland had long rejected them, and now England realized the supposed danger it faced for having put up with royal episcopacy for so long. Thusly, it was not safe for the king to lead the army putting down the rebellion; many thought Charles was likely in league with the Irish and was therefore not trustworthy. This fear was realized when Charles attempted to arrest five members of Parliament in early 1642. The king had not only broken with Parliament, he had broken with the mobs in London and the entire governmental system in Scotland.¹⁰¹

No longer could the English people appeal to their king to rid himself of evil papist councillors and still count themselves allied with their Scottish brothers: one was either for British Protestantism or against it, and Charles’s die had been cast.

Not only could British Protestantism not rely on its monarch, it had to conceive of itself as free-standing and strong with the king involved only as an opponent. The

¹⁰⁰J. Scott, 143-145.
¹⁰¹J. Scott, 144-148.
formation of this identity was a part of how, and why, the British arrived at a moment where that self-conception could happen. Since the threat to the religious community was the Stuart monarch himself, being a Protestant in Britain could no longer comfortably coexist with being the loyal subject of an anti-Christian ruler. Gone were the days when the king’s advisors could be blamed for religious policy--they had all been locked up, yet the popish threat remained. The truth was clear: “the King’s design [was] acted by the Popish party,” and the tension between “the King and the Parliament was not about Prerogative, or Privileges, or any such thing, but to subdue the Heretics (meaning Protestants) and to reduce” Britain to its former Catholic state.\(^{102}\) Of course, some common subjects and Members of Parliament continued to back Charles and did not view their king as a tool of Rome. The defense of Protestantism was not a be-all end-all unifying force for every subject in Britain, and many did not subscribe to the increasingly anti-monarchical British Protestant identity that was beginning to boil over. However, it is safe to say that this identity was a powerful enough force to heavily influence the British wars of the era; Parliaments in both England and Scotland rebelled, gathered and united their armies, fought, and succeeded in cutting off Charles’s head.

The success of this understanding of monarch-free British nationality is clearly visible in Parliamentary government during the transition from the Bishops’ Wars into the English Civil War. This period began when Charles called English Parliament to fund his war against the Scots, and found himself almost powerless. Parliament

essentially had the opportunity to hold war funding hostage against the king’s good behavior, but its “collusion with the Scots” and refusal to grant Charles his funding demonstrated the solidarity between the two kingdoms. During the English Civil War, the English and Scottish Parliaments continued to work together to maintain trade and regulate foreign affairs. The 1643 Solemn League and Covenant between England and Scotland swore the two kingdoms to defend the papist-free reformed religion and complete its institution throughout Britain. A Convention of Estates with English Parliament and the Scottish General Assembly furthered a “bipartisan approach” to Continental politics, and in 1644 sent a bipartisan embassy to Holland that was answerable to the Committee of Both Kingdoms.

The British Protestant identity formed and advocated by the end of the Bishops’ Wars cannot--and should not--be considered nationalism as understood in a modern, Western context. The Protestant part of this identity was well-founded and practiced; the specifically British national aspect “had to be created” through the imagining of “a national community where previously there had been only unrelated groups.” I do not wish to argue that the British aspect of this identity was a form of cohesive national self-understanding, or even of Anglo-Scottish geopolitical unity. While closer geographically, linguistically, and religiously to each other than either kingdom was to Ireland, the English and the Scottish had long been unrelated groups. The connected British part of their Protestant identity was born out of a localized religious attack, one that came from within and impacted no others. The two kingdoms created a community
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based on a common Protestant identity and responsibility over the course of the Thirty Years War, and this identity grew increasingly less reliant on one unifying, ruling figure as the Stuarts continued to fail the Protestant communities at home and abroad. When the threat to Protestantism landed on British soil, that sense of Protestant communalism turned specifically British and became strong enough to allow the possibility of a break from the king entirely.

In his book *England’s Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context*, Jonathan Scott demonstrates the essential nature of the Continental wars of religion in the buildup to the English Civil War. He states that:

> The Scots and English protestant anxieties that led subjects into rebellious alliance against their king were stimulated initially by the fate of ‘foreigners of our religion’ in Germany, not Britain. It was the power of confessional identities defined in European terms that made it possible for subjects to put those allegiances ahead of those owed to their own monarch and Archbishop of Canterbury.\(^{105}\)

The power of these confessional identities was certainly strong enough to engender petitioning and criticism of the Stuart government. It was not, I argue, enough on its own to defy the king and the Church. The Thirty Years War began in 1618, and the Stuarts had been failing to intervene on the level their subjects desired for over two decades by the time rebellion began. It was only when the fate of their own domestic religion, not just that of foreigners, was at stake that Charles’s subjects were able to consider changing their allegiances. The specifically British national aspect of the Protestant identity in Britain grown during the Thirty Years War was an essential part of
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\(^{105}\) J. Scott, 93.
the instigation and success of anti-monarchical action in mid-seventeenth century Britain. It was the power of religion and locality combined that allowed the British to teeter towards the edge of rebellion.
Conclusion

Over the course of 1642, tensions between King and Parliament, and Royalists and Parliamentarians, grew into squabbles, then skirmishes, then outright war. The fighting in England, Scotland, and Ireland lasted, with the occasional moment of tenuous peace, for almost ten years. By the end of the war in 1651, Charles was dead and his son was in exile, with the Parliament-funded New Model Army ruling the nation under Oliver Cromwell. While many venerable historians have studied the winding road through this conflict to Cromwell’s rule, the Restoration, and the Glorious Revolution, the Thirty Years War has not been given its due in mapping out the origins of this road in the decades prior. An emerging body of scholarship has begun to address the Thirty Years War in conjunction with the longer-term causes of the English Civil War, and has found many in the religious convictions roused by the fighting on the Continent. It is in this exploration of internationally-based issues on the buildup to the English Civil War that this thesis makes its mark.

The Protestant concerns of the British in the 1620s and 1630s receive their due in this field of study. Here, historians recognize that the British Isles were not encased in glass, impervious to all Continental influences. Although Stuart international clout was weakening, the exchange of goods, ideas, and religious sentiments in no way waned along with Stuart power. The sufferings and triumphs of Continental Protestants loom large in British print, and while no constructive aid ever came to them, their plight caught British attention and held it, dramatically shifting British religious and political
outlooks. The profound reaction to Charles Stuart’s church policy changes, which were based largely around fears of the popery beating down Protestants in Europe, ratcheted tensions up to the brink of war. While this thesis in no way means to discount the valuable study of the detailed and essential socioeconomic and political causes of the English Civil War, it does hope to enrich the portrait of British motivations and actions during the time.

The Protestants of Britain hailed from different kingdoms, worshipped in different denominations, and understood the world around them in different ways. When these differences are properly considered, it is astonishing that anyone, let alone a group strong enough to take on and defeat both Charles Stuart and long-standing loyalty to the crown, formed in the scant few years between the Bishops’ Wars and the English Civil Wars. This thesis shows that the British Protestants of the early Stuart period were forging something new out of the Continental and local religious and political goings-on of the time. As I have argued, the collective identity being formed helped contribute to the increasingly radicalized state in which the British saw fit to execute their king for treason.

This thesis is of course limited in scope, since it addresses only documents that deal with the Thirty Years War directly. Thousands more documents, commenting on subjects from politics to local religion to societal happenings, are sure to offer valuable insights into the minds of the early Stuart British populace, and would expand (and almost certainly complicate) the narrative of British Protestant identity presented here. Additionally, the writings of British nationals serving abroad—as soldiers, ambassadors,
or merchants--can shed light on firsthand British interaction with the war and the ways in which that contact shaped opinions and outlooks. A less easily remedied gap in this thesis is that of class; only those with means could afford to print, and their opinions certainly did not represent the entire breadth of British sentiment. The poorer class of Britons has been thusly rendered voiceless, and this thesis is poorer for it.

This study of the budding British Protestant community has impact beyond the events of the English Civil War as well. When studying the full legal establishment of Britain, both in terms of the titular union of the crowns under James in 1603 as well as the more legitimate legal-political union of 1707, it is important to pay attention to more than just the ruling class politics that brought about these events. While obviously more pertinent to the historiography of the union of 1707--works of 18th century Britain show that religion was a crucial aspect of nation-building--the impacts of unifying religious identity as laid out in this thesis are long-standing, long-lasting ones.\(^{106}\) This thesis offers a look at one of the building blocks of British identity, and the approach taken here can be applied to other subjects as well. The interconnected nature of European and specifically British religious concerns over the course of the Thirty Years War, and the ways in which those concerns helped forge a burgeoning British identity, serve as a reminder of the necessity of contextualizing specific events and trends within the broader stage of historical study.

\(^{106}\) This thesis refers specifically to *Britons* by Linda Colley.
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