

Political Storytelling and Propaganda:  
William Prynne and the English Afterlife of  
Tommaso Campanella

Andrew Manns

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of PhD

The Warburg Institute,  
School of Advanced Study,  
University of London

March 2019

I declare that the work presented in this thesis is my own.

Signed:

Andrew Manns

# Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my gratitude to Tony Grafton, Catherine Charlton and the rest of the staff at The Warburg Institute and Senate House for their continued support and advice. I am also deeply grateful to my advisers, Jill Krave and Guido Giglioni for guiding me on this journey and for their thoroughgoing and keen-eyed insights and input into the present work. Lastly, I am greatly indebted to my long-suffering wife, Marjolaine, who has given me unbounded encouragement and inspiration every step of the way.

# Abstract

## Political Storytelling and Propaganda: William Prynne and the English Afterlife of Tommaso Campanella

Although there has been extensive scholarship on the pamphleteering practices and political activities of the dissident moralist and lawyer William Prynne, scant material exists on the narrative mechanism underlying Prynne's persuasive storytelling. This dissertation argues that Prynne was the source of the literary archetype concerning the 'Jesuit' Tommaso Campanella diffused during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The ideas of the Italian Dominican Campanella (1568-1639) had a certain impact on the philosophical, theological and political panorama of early modern England. The study of this impact is an area that is still largely unexplored. Using Prynne's apocryphal Campanella as an interpretative lens, my dissertation compares and analyses the anti-Catholic myths elaborated by Prynne and proposes that he devised a fictional Campanella in tandem with his exposition of the fictitious plots of Adam Contzen, Cardinal Armand Richelieu, and Robert Parsons. In doing so, it specifically postulates the existence of a narrative continuity in the way in which Prynne articulated his conspiratorial political tales and charts their evolution. Overall, it posits and shows how these figures and their associated plots emerged consecutively out of Prynne's reactionary propagandistic efforts against what he believed were two ideological mentalities: on the one hand, the Arminianism of the English prelature, on the other, the allegedly insurrectionary and sectarian Jesuitism of the New Model Army, the radical Independents party, the anti-royalist proponents of the Good Old Cause, and the Quakers.

# Table of contents

Introduction	6
Chapter 1 Setting the Conspiratorial Scene: Universal Monarchy, the ‘Jesuit’ Campanella and the Good Old Cause	28
Chapter 2 The Enduring Appeal of the Campanella Plot in England	53
Chapter 3 The Arminian Conspiracy and the Emerging of Prynne’s Foundational Myths	65
Chapter 4 The Unholy Mix of Politics and Religion: Prynne’s ‘Machiavillian State-Religion’	92
Chapter 5 Prynne and the Laudian Plot	100
Chapter 6 Prynne’s Anti-Jesuit Stance	117
Chapter 7 Prynne and the Ancient Plot	136
Chapter 8 How the Ancient Plot Metamorphosed during the Interregnum	145
Conclusion: Conspiratorial Likelihood and the Limits of Prynne’s Narrative Inquiry	170
Bibliography	190

## Introduction

In 1964, Richard Hofstadter (then professor of history at Columbia University) published ‘The Paranoid Style in American Politics’ in *Harper’s Magazine*. In the essay, Hofstadter surveyed and critiqued the multifarious expressions of conspiratorial thinking that had shaped and were continuing to affect the language of political discourse in American culture. Among other things, he identified four prejudices that frequently appeared in what he deemed the American ‘paranoid style’: the fear of the Catholics, the fear of the Communists, the fear of the Masons, and the fear of racial and religious minorities.<sup>1</sup> In discussing these primal fears and the effects that they had on United States demagoguery and public policy, Hofstadter highlighted the actions and reputation of Senator Joseph McCarthy (1908–1957).

McCarthy was at that time seen by many to have been the major proponent of anti-Soviet sentiment, chiefly because of his inquisitorial and high-profile investigations into the personal and professional lives of American citizens.<sup>2</sup> McCarthy invoked a fiery rhetoric which cited age-old stereotypes of American exceptionalism and traditionalism to broadcast his moral reform politics. He publicly characterized the Soviets as immoral subversives who were infiltrating the State Department and threatening Christian society.<sup>3</sup> The situation therefore called for extreme measures: the Communists and their sympathizers and abettors needed to be cast down from the high places, disenfranchised, imprisoned, and exiled in order to show the Soviet Union that America had the upper hand. Thus, McCarthy somehow managed to appear as if he was sounding the alarm against the forces of evil. He gave himself the responsibility of standing (to use the words of William F. Buckley) ‘athwart history’, in attempting to ensure the future prosperity and liberty of the American people.<sup>4</sup>

Hofstadter found in McCarthy an exemplar of the ‘paranoid spokesman’. This figure, he wrote, sees:

---

<sup>1</sup> R. Hofstadter, ‘The Paranoid Style in American Politics’, *Harper’s Magazine* (Nov., 1964), pp. 77-86. A recent survey of Hofstadter’s thesis can be found in T. Aistrophe, *Conspiracy Theory and American Foreign Policy*, Manchester 2016, pp. 17-22.

<sup>2</sup> For examinations of the pervasiveness and legacy of McCarthyism see R. Fried, *McCarthyism: The Great American Red Scare: A Documentary History*, Oxford 1997; id., *Nightmare in Red: The McCarthy Era in Perspective*, Oxford 1990.

<sup>3</sup> E. Shrecker and P. Deery, *The Age of McCarthyism: A Brief History With Documents*, 3rd edn, Boston 2017, pp. 184-87.

<sup>4</sup> A. Felzenberg, *A Man and His Presidents: The Political Odyssey of William F. Buckley Jr*, New Haven 2017, p. xvii. Buckley had used the phrase to describe the role of the ideal American conservative, who had a duty to be cautious about progressivism. He notoriously defended McCarthy’s intentions in W. Buckley, *McCarthy and His Enemies: The Record and Its Meaning*, Chicago 1954.

the fate of conspiracy in apocalyptic terms—he traffics in the birth and death of whole worlds, whole political orders, whole systems of human values. He is always manning the barricades of civilization.<sup>5</sup>

The paranoid spokesperson was a product of the zeitgeist. The ‘psychic energies’ to which he was privy and by which he was empowered were facilitated by ‘certain social structures and national inheritances, certain historical catastrophes or frustrations’.<sup>6</sup> McCarthy’s conspiracy theories were indubitably influenced by nuclear age hysterias, as well as by the growing pains of America settling into its newfound rivalry with the Soviet Union, the new superpower in Eastern Europe.<sup>7</sup> They spoke to a people who had still not recovered from the emotional ravages of the World Wars and who were still unsure about their place in the world. Hofstadter concluded his essay with the statement that the paranoiac was a ‘double sufferer’: one who was ‘afflicted not only by the real world’, but also by his ‘fantasies’.<sup>8</sup>

With regard to the term ‘paranoid’, Hofstadter made it clear that he was ‘not speaking in a clinical sense, but borrowing a clinical term for other purposes’. In this way, he employed the adjective to refer to exaggerated ‘modes of expression used by more or less normal people’ who nevertheless see themselves as having larger-than-life roles in the destiny of the world.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, Hofstadter maintained that the paranoid spokesman also sees himself as a mystical ‘renegade’, one who has seen what others can not or would not:

he renegade is the man or woman who has been in the arcanum, and brings forth with him or her the final verification of suspicions which might otherwise have been doubted by a skeptical world.<sup>10</sup>

Furthermore, the spokesman mainly interprets events dualistically; his enemies are either ‘totally evil or totally unappeasable’, and for this reason they have to be eliminated completely or removed from the ‘theatre of operations’ on which he is focused.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Hofstadter, ‘The Paranoid Style’, p. 82.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 86.

<sup>7</sup> J. Byford, *Conspiracy Theories: A Critical Introduction*, Houndsmills 2011, pp. 58-60; K. Olstead, *Real Enemies: Conspiracy Theories and American Democracy, World War I to 9/11*, Oxford 2011, pp. 84-5, 100-9.

<sup>8</sup> Hofstadter, ‘The Paranoid Style’, p. 86.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., p. 77

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., p.85.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 82.

Importantly, the spokesperson also suspects his targets of possessing an ‘effective source of power’, such as brainwashing technology and unlimited wealth. This suspicion contributes to his pedantic manner of narrating historical events.<sup>12</sup>

In many respects, the pre-modern equivalent of McCarthy and a prime example Hofstadter’s paranoid spokesman was the seventeenth-century pamphleteer, lawyer, and parliamentarian William Prynne (1600–1669). This comparison has, in fact, most recently been made by David Lowenstein in his book, *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*. Lowenstein, echoing the opinions of other historians who have also pointed out the similarities between American anti-communism and Caroline anti-popery, likened Prynne’s ‘manipulation of fear and patriot language’ to the fearmongering extremism of McCarthy and the House of Un-American Activities Committee.<sup>13</sup>

Prynne, for his part, claimed to be an avowed patriot and ‘Champion’ against ‘Romish emissaries’.<sup>14</sup> At the beginning of the English Revolution and throughout the Interregnum period, he relentlessly promoted his version of the ‘Popish Plot’.<sup>15</sup> As Prynne saw it, a covert but vast Jesuit conspiracy was threatening the security of the English body politic. Likening the order to the mythological deity Proteus, Prynne claimed that the Jesuits were the *ne plus ultra* of villains operating in the Three Kingdoms. With innumerable disguises and contrivances, they had murdered Charles I, fomented wars and rebellions in Scotland and Ireland, and installed and manipulated the New Model Army. Their goal was simple: the utter subversion of Protestantism.<sup>16</sup> For this reason, Prynne demanded the problem be dealt with

---

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 85

<sup>13</sup> D. Loewenstein, *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*, Oxford 2013, p. 222. For other comparisons of anti-communism to anti-popery see C. H. George and K. George, *Protestant Mind of English Reformation, 1570-1640*, Princeton 1961, pp. 252-3; B. Coward and P. Gaunt, *The Stuart Age: England, 1603–1714*, 5th edn, New York 2017, p. 138.

<sup>14</sup> E. Kirby, *William Prynne: A Study in Puritanism*, New York 1972, p. 190.

<sup>15</sup> The ‘Popish Plot’ has been described as a common literary trope of seventeenth-century England, which features both real and rumoured narratives of violent Catholic subversion against the Protestant Christians. For overviews of the concept see J. Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*, London 1972, pp. 1-11; J. Miller, *Popery and Politics*, Cambridge 1973, pp. 85-6; C. Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot*, Chapel Hill 1983, pp. 1-18; I. Thackray, ‘Zion Undermined: The Protestant Belief in a Popish Plot during the English’, *History Workshop Journal*, 18 (1984), pp. 25-52; A. Marotti, *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England*, Notre Dame 2005, pp. 131-201.

<sup>16</sup> William Prynne, *Substance of a Speech in the House of Commons*, 3rd edn, London 1649, sigs P3r-Q2r, R4r-S1r. The association of the chameleon-like Greek sea god Proteus with the Jesuits was widespread in seventeenth-century England. Protestants often compared Proteus’ abilities to outwit his enemies through metamorphosis with the Jesuits’ infamous powers of equivocation, impersonation, and espionage. See, e.g., the anonymous *Mutatus Polemo. The Horrible Strategems of the Jesuits, Lately Practised in England, during the Civil-Wars, and Now Discovered by a Reclaimed Romanist*, London 1650, p. 10: ‘For our bodies, Proteus is less then a Fiction to us; He that erewhile was a Commander in a ranting equipage, is now slinked into a Cobling Stall, or Weavers Loom, or Tapsters Apron, or Coach-mans Box, or Beggars Weeds, or Horsemans Frock, or

severely and advocated the enforcement of discriminatory legislation that barred papists from employment and deported them *en masse*.<sup>17</sup>

A decade prior to the war, Prynne had solemnly pledged to risk not only his ‘fortunes and Liberty’ but also his ‘very Life and Soule’ to ensure that his country, king, and religion were not ‘secretly undermined, abused, betrayed, trampled’.<sup>18</sup> Prynne repeatedly couched his ultraism in populist statements by referring to his ‘plain-dealing’ ways and pride in his national identity. In addition, he frequently asserted that he stood for all ‘true-bred’ Christians and Englishmen. For him, the papists and Jesuits, not unlike McCarthy’s Soviet impostors (many of whom were accused of ‘un-American’ sexual and moral improprieties), were also treacherously ‘un-english’, ‘womanish’, and ‘un-manly’.<sup>19</sup>

Just as McCarthy felt justified in pontificating about higher ideals, Prynne embraced what he believed was a transcendent mandate, a status which allowed him to wield moral authority over his countrymen by explaining and diagnosing the many political ills plaguing their communities. He emphasized his value to his compatriots by asserting that his works gave an ‘exact account’ of popish plots and influences on the English church and state. As one who was knowledgeable about the ‘Mysteries of State’, he demanded to be heard by his ‘ignorant’ peers, most of whom were easily ‘over-witted by Jesuites and their instruments’.<sup>20</sup>

---

Serving-mans Livery, or Taylors Shop, or a Pulpit-thumping Presbyters Iippo; into what not?’ For a general overview of Proteus in Renaissance symbolism see A. Giamatti, *Exile and Change in Renaissance Literature*, New Haven 1984, pp. 115-50.

<sup>17</sup>In 1656, Prynne proposed legislation that would help English Protestants monitor potential threats and stem the flow of immigration of those who ‘are not of known integrity in our religion’. See William Prynne, *A New Discovery of Some Romish Emissaries*, London 1656, p. 28: ‘I can give no better advice to all our swaying Grandees of all sorts now, than I did then in print in my *Memento* upon that occasion; to tender the Oath of Abjuration to all Officers, Commanders, Souldiers, Mariners, and persons desiring Passeports or Protections, that are not of known Integrity in our Religion, and frequent not the publike Ordinances of God in our Parochial Congregations; which will detect for the present, and prevent for the future, the creeping in, the wandring abroad of such dangerous Romish vermin, and Spanish Factors...’ See also William Prynne, *The Sword of Christian Magistracy Supported*, London 1653, pp. 68-9.

<sup>18</sup> William Prynne, *A Quench-Coale. Or A Briefe Disquisition and Inquirie, in What Place of the Church or Chancell the Lords-Table Ought to Be Situated*, London 1637, sig. c2r.

<sup>19</sup> William Prynne, *True and Perfect Narrative of What Was Done, Spoken by and between Mr. Prynne, the Old and Newly Forcibly Late Secluded Members, the Army Officers, and Those now Sitting, both in the Commons Lobby, House, and Elsewhere on Saturday and Monday Last (the 7 and 9 of This Instant May)*, London 1659, pp. 89, 92. See also William Prynne, *The Unlovelinesse, of Love-Lockes. Or, A Summarie Discourse, Prooving: the Wearing, and Nourishing of a Locke, or Love-Locke, to Be altogether Unseemely, and Unlawfull unto Christians*, London 1628, sigs A3r-v and p. 7. Prynne’s ‘national consciousness’ has been treated in H. Larkin, *The Making of Englishmen: Debates on National Identity 1550-1650*, Leiden 2014, pp. 203-4.

<sup>20</sup> Prynne, *Substance of a Speech*, sigs P3v-P4r. Compare with William Prynne, *Quakers Unmasked*, 2nd edn, London 1655, p. 20: ‘all intelligent English Protestants...for whose information I have made them publick, being unknown to most, who are utterly Ignorant of the stratagemms of these Imps of Satan, to seduce them, to their eternal ruine’.

Generally, what Prynne provided was political knowledge, which he believed was both liberating and salvific.<sup>21</sup>

For decades, Prynne licitly and illicitly trumpeted his discoveries by cultivating innovative and tactical relationships with the press.<sup>22</sup> Operating on the fringes of what has been described as a ‘Caroline Underground’, Prynne and his collaborator Michael Sparke (who has been likened to a ‘publishing terrorist’) led one of one of the most effective publishing partnerships in England. Their strategies helped turn Prynne’s pamphlets into a remote pulpit, enabling him to earn a lasting reputation as among the most infamous and ubiquitous sermonisers of his day.<sup>23</sup> Indeed, one contemporary wrote that Prynne’s books were ‘more prevalent’ than the sermons of preachers. Not only was he ‘beleaved most of any of them’, his books held sway over the minds of ‘many judicious persons’. Indeed, many ‘zealous persons’ had built their ‘conscience’ upon his ‘confidence’. He was, the writer noted, ‘the verie oracle of our times’.<sup>24</sup> This was not, of course, the only way in which Prynne’s reputation was received.<sup>25</sup> As the protégé of the Puritan cleric John Preston

---

<sup>21</sup> William Prynne, *Soveraigne Power of Parliaments and Kingdomes*, 4 vols, London, 1643, II, p. 115: ‘...the people of England, (seduced by these blinde Guides, or over-reached by Jesuitically Policies,) they are destroyed for want of knowledge...of the Parliaments Supream unlimited Authority, and Unquestionable Priviledges; of their owne Haereditary Liberties, and Native Rights: of the Law of God, of Nature, of the Realme in the points now controverted betweene King and Parliament...I have hastily compiled this... which by Gods blessing on it, may prove a likely meanes to comprimise our present Differences; and re-establish our much-desired Peace; together with our Religion, Lawes, Liberties in their Native purity and glory...’

<sup>22</sup> Jason Peacey has shown that Prynne had a knack for placing advertisements and soliciting news writers to review his publications. Interestingly, Peacey has also speculated that Prynne may have operated a system of ‘press releases’. On this point, see J. Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and the Interregnum Period*, Burlington 2004, pp. 224-5, and also Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, Cambridge 2013, p. 262.

<sup>23</sup> Ethyn Kirby described the high-risk world of controversialist pamphleteering as ‘literary buccaneering’. See, Kirby, *William Prynne*, pp. 7-10. On Michael Sparke’s terroristic printing methods see D. Katz, *God’s Last Words: Reading the English Bible from the Reformation to Fundamentalism*, New Haven 2004, p. 42. Sparke, like Prynne, was repeatedly jailed and sanctioned by the High Commission for shirking the legal restrictions on printing. For further corroboration of the subversive actions of Sparke see C. Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 68-70, 89, 108-9. For general details on the subversive efforts of dissident Protestant writers to circumvent licensing restrictions during the reign of Charles I see S. Foster, *Notes from the Caroline Underground*, Springfield 1978; D. Como and P. Lake, ‘Puritans, Antinomians and Laudians in Caroline London: The Strange Case of Peter Shaw and its Contexts’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 50 (1999), pp. 684-715; P. Lake and D. Como, ‘“Orthodoxy” and Its Discontents: Dispute Settlement and the Production of “Consensus” in the London (Puritan) “Underground”’, *Journal of British Studies*, 39 (2000) pp. 34-70 (34, 37, 63, 64); A. Bellany, ‘Libels in Action: Ritual, Subversion and the English Literary Underground 1603-1642’, in *The Politics of the Excluded: c.1500-1850*, ed. Tim Harris, Basingstoke 2001, pp. 99-124. For evidence of Prynne’s success as a communicator see Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, pp. 106, 261-3.

<sup>24</sup> *The Fallacies of Mr. William Prynne, Discovered and Confuted*, London 1644, pp. 1-2. Regarding the public accessibility of Prynne’s works, Peacey has noted that at least two of his writings were read aloud in private and public venues. See Peacey, *Print and Public Politics*, p. 78.

<sup>25</sup> For some examples of accounts of Prynne’s misreporting from contemporaries, see John Goodwin, *Calumny Arraign’d and Cast*, London 1645, p. 41: ‘...Mr Prynne...whose pen I see loves to play at small game in mis-reports...’; the anonymous *The Ear-Mark or Character of Mr William Prynne*, London 1649, p. 4: ‘Certainly no man can be so farr besotted to suppose the offspring of his Invention (produc’d at first probably out of a frolique) to be in good sober sadnesse a truth, a reality, to be adhaered unto, admir’d, ador’d, that a man ought to

(described by the chaplain Peter Heylin as an ‘excellent master in the Art of Insinuation’), Prynne was also criticized for his intractability and doggedness, characteristics which were on display in his relentless hunts for enemies real and imagined.<sup>26</sup> He was also credited with an extraordinary capacity for malice and deceit. One commentator, noting Prynne’s treatment of King Charles and Archbishop William Laud, charged him with ‘anti-Christianism’ and ‘inhumanity’.<sup>27</sup> Another said that his ‘lyes’ were the equivalent of old wives tales.<sup>28</sup> A few also condemned his draconic treatment of his peers.<sup>29</sup>

As for the claim of Prynne’s oracular popularity, the record shows that he knowingly presented himself as both a prophet and a martyr who had been chosen to defend the English Protestant church against Jews, Jesuits, Anabaptists, and all ‘secret Underminers of the true Preachers and Preaching of the Gospell’.<sup>30</sup> He had, he explained, ‘sufficient warrant’ and encouragement to inform the English nation of Jesuit plots from ‘God himself’.<sup>31</sup> Regarding Prynne’s renown and triumphalism, it is well established that he was one of the most erudite and famous public moralists of the Caroline period, both the ‘mouthpiece’ and ‘witch-hunter general’ of Parliament.<sup>32</sup> Prynne’s abilities were most notably commended by Charles II. In a

---

prize it beyond flesh and blood...’; John Lilburne, *Rash Oaths Unwarrantable: And the Breaking of Them as Inexcusable*, London 1647, p. 19: ‘William Prinn, the basest and lyingest of men who in less then eight lines, hath told and printed twelve or thirteene notorious lyes against me...’; T. R., *A Two-Inch Board for M. Prynne to Peep thorow*, London 1647, p. 11: ‘Mr. Prynns... naturall quality is to ly, rayle, scandalize and clamour.’

<sup>26</sup> Peter Heylin, *Cyprianus Anglicus: or, the History of the Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, London 1668, p. 156. See also, id., *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Sufferings of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate, the L. Archbishop of Canterbury*, London 1644, p. 6: ‘...Master Prynne (a man most mischievously industrious to disturbe the publique)’. John Preston (1587-1628) was a master at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. As a minister, he had Puritan leanings and developed a reputation as a gadfly. For more a more detailed analysis of Preston’s life and sermons, see C. Hill, *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century*, London 1997, pp. 216-47.

<sup>27</sup> Edmund Elys, *The Second Epistle to the Truly Religious and Loyal Gentry of the Church of England*, London 1687, p. 4.

<sup>28</sup> Henry Marten, *A Word to Mr Prynne*, London 1649, p. 6: ‘His business is to write lyes in the Name of the Lord, as the Priests of that Sect Preach. To rayl, to jeer at Saints, being a name, in which he is uninterested, and misapply Scripture...I would advise his Readers, to read him as they ‘would read or hear a tale of Oyster women scolding with each other at Billings-Gate.’

<sup>29</sup> John Goodwin likened Prynne’s acerbic prose to a ‘dialect of dragons’. See Goodwin, *Calumny Arraign’d*, p. 12. For a repeated a variation of the expression (i.e., ‘the language of dragons’) to describe Prynne’s writings see Samuel Shaw, *Holy Things for Holy Men*, London 1658, sig. A2v.

<sup>30</sup> William Prynne, *A Gospel Plea (Interwoven with a Rational and Legal) for the Lawfulness and Continuance of the Antient Settled Maintenance and Tenths of the Ministers of the Gospel*, London 1653, sigs a1r-a3v.

<sup>31</sup> William Prynne, *A True and Perfect Narrative*, p. 63. On the subject of Prynne’s status as a Protestant martyr, Mark Kishlansky has pointed a number of remarkable facts, one of which is that Prynne’s portrait and the writings he had inscribed on prison walls were kept as ‘holy relics’. Prynne was also occasionally associated with miraculous occurrences. See M. Kishlansky, ‘Martyrs’ Tales’, *Journal of British Studies*, 53 (2014), pp. 334-55 (335, 352-53).

<sup>32</sup> Kirby, *William Prynne*, p. 185; Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, p. 261. See also Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot*, p. 239. One of the most vivid descriptions of Prynne’s celebrity is in John Vicars, *To His Reverend and Much Respected Good Friend, Mr. John Goodwin: Be These I Pray Presented*, London 1645, p. 3: ‘...him [Prynne] I say, who for his pietie, humilitie, incomparable constancie, fortitude and magnanimitie in

letter dated to 1659, the king praised Prynne's 'undefatigable endeavours' to awaken the people of England and confessed that his skills in uncovering 'dark designs' were facilitating his restoration.<sup>33</sup>

Despite Prynne's well-attested aptitude for influencing public opinion through propaganda, there exists no study to date which expounds his methods of storytelling. Instead, the vast majority of scholarship has generally tended to acknowledge his exceptionality by scrutinising his antagonistic relations with persons and institutions (such as Archbishop William Laud and the Church of England prelature), who opposed his explanations and promotion of English Calvinism, legalism, and parliamentarism. Yet, when it comes to Prynne's creative writing, these studies have mostly presented him as a forceful and effective propagator of tales. The question of why his tales were persuasive enough to have wielded a significant influence over late seventeenth-century anti-Catholic literature, however, has never been sufficiently answered.

Indeed, as William Lamont has pointed out in his *Marginal Prynne* (1963), up to the 1930s, Prynne was often categorized as a 'paranoid personality' (in the clinical sense), one who was maniacal, single-minded and devoid of tact.<sup>34</sup> The Church of England curate and historian Thomas Lathbury, for instance, in this essay 'Laud and Prynne' (1849), suggested—unoriginally—that Prynne was one of Laud's many 'merciless persecutors'.<sup>35</sup> Lathbury, like some of Prynne's contemporaries, focused, not on Prynne's writings, but on his morality. For Lathbury, Prynne's political activities, with respect to Laud, were 'actuated by feelings of the bitterest hostility'.<sup>36</sup> A malicious bigot, Prynne was 'led into extremes by the violence of his

---

suffering for Gospell Truths, was not inferiour to any of his most faithfull fellow-sufferers yea, whose soundnesse and sinceritie, whose profound learning and indefatigable labours in writing upon deepest points of Divinity and controverted Gospell Truths (witnessse his *Perpetuity of the estate of a regenerate man*; his *Antithesis to Arminianisme*, *Unbisboping of Timothy and Titus*, his *Histri-Mastix*; and many other his later, most learned, orthodox and precious peeces) have made his never-dying name and fame most worthily renowned both in England and other parts of the world, beyond the Seas.'

<sup>33</sup> Charles 1, 'The King to William Prynne' in *The Letter Book of John Viscount Mordaunt 1658-1660*, ed. M. Coate, London 1945, p. 126. For another descriptive attestation of Prynne's importance to the cause of the Restoration see Cimelgus Bonde, *Salmasius His Buckler, or, A Royal Apology for King Charles the Martyr*, London 1662, p. 388-89: 'Mr. Prynne hath...got the applause of the people, by writing for the King, and against the Rump, and other sectaries...there is no man in the Nation, hath so much merited as himself, in pulling down the many Tyrannies over us, since the murder of Charles the Martyr. He hath been our Champion, whose pen hath fought against the scriblings, and actings of the Traytors and Rebels; for which I shall ever love and honour him, and without doubt, our Gracious King will sufficiently reward him, if he continueth constant in his loyalty; which God grant he may.'

<sup>34</sup> W. Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, London 1963, p. 8. See also, Lamont, 'The Great Fear', *London Review of Books* (July, 1983), pp. 19-20.

<sup>35</sup> T. Lathbury, 'Laud and Prynne', *The British Magazine* (June, 1849), pp. 601-34 (634).

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 601.

passions'.<sup>37</sup> His anti-Laudian works were merely retributive, formed when his 'feelings of revenge were at the highest pitch'. When it came to the trial of Laud, Prynne's deeds, Lathbury ventured to say, were 'almost satanic':

Prynne revelled in his odious task, not contenting himself with a narration of facts, but inventing slanders, and commenting on acts in the archbishop's life with malice almost satanic...<sup>38</sup>

While Lathbury essentially described Prynne as a villain who lacked any complexity, John Bruce—in a biographical fragment published posthumously by the Camden Society in 1877—took a more objective stance. Bruce began his study by stating that Prynne's works were important, not just in and of themselves, but also for the contextualisation of 'the momentous transactions which occurred between 1625 and 1660'.<sup>39</sup> As valuable historical tools, they enabled readers to 'drink deep into the general spirit of that eventful period'.<sup>40</sup> Bruce then continued his survey of Prynne by looking into his family relations and education. He showed that Prynne's views were molded not merely by his Puritan-leaning family, but also by his experience at Oxford University of the rising conflicts between Calvinists and Arminians.<sup>41</sup> Bruce also encouraged his readers to see Prynne more as a product of a period in which 'Romanism' was seen as a 'temporal power, a power to be feared, a power for which the leading nations of Europe were ready to draw the sword, a power which could command legions although she had ceased to possess them'. Prynne and his colleagues, Bruce stressed, were 'cradled' in the dread of Rome, a kind of atavistic or primal fear from which no English Protestant was immune. For this reason, Bruce maintained, 'they viewed all who did not partake in it [the dread of Rome] to the same extent as themselves with the keenest and most watchful suspicion'.<sup>42</sup>

Building on Bruce's work, Thomas Fitch set out his estimation of Prynne in his 1949 doctoral dissertation, 'Caroline Puritanism as Exemplified in the Life and Work of William Prynne'. Although Fitch conceded that Prynne was a 'fanatic', he nevertheless regarded him as a key figure in England's national affairs who 'wielded an influence the extent of which

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., pp. 611, 634.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., p.601.

<sup>39</sup> J. Bruce, 'Biographical Fragment', in *Documents Relating to the Proceedings Against Willian Prynne in 1634 and 1637*, ed. S. Gardiner, London 1877, pp. i-xxxv (i).

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., pp. ii-xxvii.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., pp. xxviii-xix.

has not been fully recognised, and for which he has not yet received due credit'.<sup>43</sup> Fitch saw Prynne, not as a black-hearted malefactor, but as an impassioned patriot with no 'ulterior motive'; instead, 'where his country was concerned, he was genuinely altruistic'.<sup>44</sup> He was an enemy of popery, and his main foes were its central instruments: the Jesuits.<sup>45</sup> His primary desire, therefore, was to 'maintain the Protestant cause, and he made every endeavour to hold up to view Romanists and their friends in their true character as enemies of the Kingdom and of the Church of England'.<sup>46</sup> Like Lamont, who would later go on to portray Prynne as a conservative who yearned for an idyllic Elizabethan past, Fitch asserted that Prynne pursued an ideal version of the past in his mind.<sup>47</sup> Ethlyn Kirby in her *William Prynne: A Study in Puritanism* (1972), while accepting that Prynne was a 'brilliant pamphleteer', who was 'clever' about handling his research materials, mentioned his key popish plot works (*Romes Master-peece* and *The Popish Royall Favourite*) only in passing.<sup>48</sup> Despite remarking on Prynne's clear and 'strange ability for discovering plots', Kirby did not examine the facets of his storytelling that informed and fuelled his propaganda.<sup>49</sup> Similarly, in his book *Marginal Prynne*, Lamont, while dedicating an entire chapter to Prynne's conspiracy theories, did not attempt to submit these to an extensive literary analysis.<sup>50</sup> To his credit, however, he did articulate several new points about the nature of Prynne's plot theories.

Firstly, he proposed that there was a thematic continuity between Prynne's efforts, on the one hand, to censure Archbishop Laud and the Arminian-aligned bishops in the 1630s and 1640s, and, on the other, his attempts to discredit the leadership of the Interregnum Commonwealth in the 1650s. According to Lamont, the plots that Prynne had exposed in *Romes Masterpeece* and *The Popish Royall Favourite* were, to some degree, expanded on and repurposed in the 1650s to smear anyone who opposed the restoration of Charles II.<sup>51</sup> The initial plot was hinged on the testimony of Andreas von Habernfeld, a courtier, apocalyptic thinker, alchemist, and physician at the court of Charles' sister, Elizabeth, Queen of

---

<sup>43</sup>T. Fitch, 'Caroline Puritanism as exemplified in the life and work of William Prynne', Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh 1949, pp. 185-86.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 179.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 98-9.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 101.

<sup>47</sup> Lamont, 'The Great Fear'; Fitch, 'Caroline Puritanism', p. 183: 'Vision he had, but it was not a resplendent vision hitherto unknown in experience towards the attainment of which he must devote all his energies; rather did he seek a return to that which had existed in the past, and which in a measure had become fixed as an ideal in his mind.'

<sup>48</sup> Kirby, *William Prynne*, p. 63.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 144.

<sup>50</sup> W. Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, London 1963, pp. 119-48.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 138-42.

Bohemia.<sup>52</sup> Habernfeld had purportedly uncovered the details of a clandestine, Catholic cabal seeking to pressure King Charles into military conflicts and force him to adopt policies that were more tolerant of Catholics. He communicated it to Sir William Boswell, a diplomatic attaché at The Hague, and Boswell, in turn, informed Laud. The authenticity of the plot was bolstered by supplementary epistolary evidence obtained by Prynne which suggested that many of Charles' closest advisers (including his consort Henrietta Maria and his Secretary of State Francis Windebank) had facilitated papist intrigue on British soil.<sup>53</sup>

Secondly, Lamont argued that, subsequent to Laud's execution and Charles' deposition, Prynne came to the belief that the Jesuits were manipulating Oliver Cromwell and the New Model Army to destroy the monarchy and the Protestant Church. Lamont termed this the 'second phase' of the Popish Plot.<sup>54</sup> Thirdly, he briefly touched on the individuals whom Prynne accused of laying the foundations of the plot: Robert Parsons (1546–1610) and Tommaso Campanella (1568–1639). Lamont concluded his chapter by noting the enduring legacy of Prynne's reporting on popish plots in the 1670s and 80s, when he was repeatedly cited in the wake of the Titus Oates controversy.<sup>55</sup> Nevertheless, he surmised that Prynne's posthumous popularity 'may only reflect a heightened anti-Papal hysteria'.<sup>56</sup>

Building on the scholarship of Lamont, Caroline Hibbard in *Charles I and the Popish Plot* surveyed the conspiracy theories in Prynne's early corpus. For the first time, she traced the evolution of these and posited that his initial concerns had been confined to the perceived crypto-popery of the Caroline court and Arminian clergymen. These views, she argued, had grown more complex, not only due to Prynne's discovery of the Habernfeld documents and investigation of Laud, but also on account of his reactions to events like the Irish Rebellion and the Scottish Crisis. She finished her survey by claiming that Prynne had 'reinterpreted' his plot theory to address the New Model Army-led regime change. Understandably,

---

<sup>52</sup> Like so many of Prynne's sources (as I will demonstrate) Andreas Haberveschl von Habernfeld operated on the fringes of society and participated in various esoteric and propagandistic activities. There is, however, so far as I can see, no indication that Prynne was aware of Habernfeld's religious sentiments. For information on Habernfeld's life and work see, V. Urbanek, 'The Comet of 1618: Eschatological Expectations and Political Prognostications during the Bohemian Revolt', in *Tycho Brahe and Prague: Crossroads of European Science*, ed. J. R. Christianson et al., Frankfurt am Main 2002, pp. 282-91; and also id., 'Mezi paracelsiánskou medicínou a rosenkruciánskými manifesty: studijní léta Ondřeje Habervešla z Habernfeldu', *Acta Universitatis Carolinae - Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis*, 47 (2007), 1–2, pp. 171–81.

<sup>53</sup> Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, pp. 123, 125.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 138-9.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 143-8. In the late 1670s, Titus Oates (1649-1705), after years of intelligence-gathering in Britain and on the Continent falsely accused a number of prominent Britons of papist allegiances. He actions directly caused the deaths of at least thirty-five people. See T. Oates, *A True Narrative of the Horrid Hellish Popish Plot*, London 1679. For biographical details on Oates, consult Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*, pp. 52-87.

<sup>56</sup> Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, p. 146.

hypotheses as to how Prynne made this narrative persuasive are completely absent from Hibbard's analysis. Unlike the books of Lamont and Kirby, Hibbard's work is a study of court Catholicism in the Caroline era; of 'Catholics and their critics and on foreign policy trends as they interacted with court power groupings'.<sup>57</sup>

## Method of Enquiry

In light of the limitations of the scholarly literature surveyed above, I believe that there is a need for a study on Prynne which puts emphasis on his storytelling. In this dissertation, therefore, I intend to apply specific narratological methodologies to engage critically with Prynne's anti-popery literature. Since the domain of contextualist narratology is, as a number of narrative theorists have insisted, both polyvalent and fluctuating, it is important to clarify my approach.<sup>58</sup> In the first place, this study is not a structuralist analysis; it does not look at Prynne's narratives *qua* narratives, as tales that can be meaningfully interpreted irrespective of their historical context. For Prynne, as with McCarthy and other paranoid spokespersons, politics was a livelihood. In many ways, Prynne wrote with blood: his writings have visceral quality because he believed he was both physically and spiritually affected by malevolent and benevolent forces. These forces (as I shall show) were certainly major causes behind his decision to write. As a result, inasmuch as Prynne's writings can be considered reactions to particular movements within a specific period of time, my evaluation of his tale-telling has a historicist bent.

Furthermore, this study is not concerned with the factual accuracy of the events represented in Prynne's stories. Prynne, of course, did not think of his reporting as a mythographic exercise. Like many early modern pamphleteers, he was sure that he was conveying the truth, neither interpreting nor reproducing fables.<sup>59</sup> Nonetheless, from a critical standpoint, it is hard to deny that his creative and moralizing formulations of events did not

---

<sup>57</sup> Hibbard, pp. 239-42.

<sup>58</sup>In 1990, Seymour Chatman wrote that contextualist narratologists 'argue for the need to inquire into the intentions, motivations, interests, and social circumstances of real authors and audiences. Failure to make this kind of inquiry, they believe, dooms narratology to a treatment of narrative as a "detached and decontextualized" entity'. See S. Chatman, 'What Can We Learn from Contextualist Narratology?', *Poetics Today*, 11, 2, (1990), pp. 309-28 (314). More recently, Ansgar Nünning has said that contextualism as a field is still hard to define; see A. Nünning, 'Surveying Contextualist and Cultural Narratologies: Towards an Outline of Approaches, Concepts and Potentials', in *Narratology in the Age of Cross-Disciplinary Narrative Research*, ed. S. Heinen and R. Sommer, Berlin 2009, pp. 48-70.

<sup>59</sup> On the often-debated issue of truth and reliability in early modern England see F. Dolan, *True Relations: Reading, Literature, and Evidence in Seventeenth-Century England*, Philadelphia 2013.

have a transgenerational influence on the ways Catholics were portrayed in early modern literature. Like the poetic epics attributed to Homer and Hesiod, which have been re-adapted and reinterpreted for millennia, Prynne's tales had a far-reaching impact on English minds. He made these myths, that is, long-lived, culturally edifying stories, by exaggerating the significance of certain political and religious changes. In doing so he created literary titans, monumental narratives able to withstand the test of time. Thus, in order to gain a better understanding of the effects of his tales, I survey the kinds of responses and conversations they elicited in other seventeenth- and eighteenth-century texts.

My method of enquiry therefore resembles in certain respects that employed by Natalie Davis in her *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (1987). Davis set out, not to ascertain the 'real' facts underlying royal letters of pardon and remission, but rather to look at their 'forming, shaping, and molding elements: the craft of a narrative'.<sup>60</sup> Moreover, she attempted to discover how sixteenth-century people, in looking for 'moral truths', used narratives to make 'sense of the unexpected' and build 'coherence into immediate experience'.<sup>61</sup> In addition, she also proceeded to determine the means and settings for producing stories and 'the interests held by both narrator and audience in the storytelling event'.<sup>62</sup> Similarly, in order to evaluate Prynne's storytelling, his primary tool for dispensing moral truths, I shall consider those prevailing social forces and attitudes which helped demarcate the way in which he communicated what he understood as historical facts.<sup>63</sup>

Thus, in this study I am primarily concerned with addressing the missing links, as it were, between Prynne's pre-war and interwar anti-Catholic narratives. Up to this point, as we have seen, the relationship between these narratives has received scant scholarly attention. My contention is that Prynne, in addition to being influenced by the anti-popery literature of his peers and predecessors, also devised and elaborated his own mythology of sorts.<sup>64</sup> This

---

<sup>60</sup> N. Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France*, Stanford 1987, p. 3.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>63</sup> For details on the marvellous or wondrous as a popular genre in English news pamphlets in the first half of the seventeenth-century, see B. Shapiro, *A Culture of Fact: England, 1550-1720*, Ithaca 2003, pp. 87-90. On this subject see also J. Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*, Cambridge 2003, pp. 109-17 and A. Snell, *Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 55-79.

<sup>64</sup> Kenyon has spoken of the popish plot as feature of the 'mythology of ultra-Protestantism'. Similarly, Arthur Marotti has referred to a 'nationalist mythology' which emerged in the popular culture and 'national consciousnesses of England' in relation to 'real and imagined' Catholic plots. It is in this sense that I invoke the word myth. See Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*, p. 15; A. Marotti, 'The Intolerability of English Catholicism', in *Writing and Religion in England, 1558-1689: Studies in Community-Making and Cultural Memory*, ed. A. Johnson and R. D. Sell, Burlington 2009, pp. 47-69 (52-5). For additional instances of scholars likening or

mythology served as the imaginary substrate of his propaganda: it became—I maintain—one of the distinguishing factors of Prynne’s public appeal, and it contributed to his long-lived reputation as an expert on popish plotting. In contrast to previous historians, therefore, I have divided what I understand to be Prynne’s grand conspiracy narrative into two plots: the Laudian Plot and the Ancient Plot.

The thematic origins of the Laudian Plot, which in my estimation is of lesser importance, can be traced to about 1628.<sup>65</sup> The Ancient Plot, however, has its beginnings in 1648. The full details of both plots will be described later; but, for the sake of clarity, I can say here that the Laudian Plot refers to Prynne’s early theory that a confederacy of papists and Arminian prelates led by Archbishop Laud and supported by foreign Catholics had subtly conspired to annihilate Calvinistic Protestantism in England. The Ancient Plot (named after the phrase Prynne used to refer to the evangelising efforts of the Jesuit Robert Parsons) refers to Prynne’s idea that a hegemonic and supranational Jesuit empire had, as mentioned above, orchestrated the deposition of Charles I, taken over the New Model Army, and countenanced (so as to encourage tyranny and anarchy) sectarianism.<sup>66</sup> In articulating the Ancient Plot, Prynne attempted to establish a link between the origin of republicanism in the Interregnum and Robert Parsons’ initial plans for reconverting English Protestants to Catholicism in the 1590s.<sup>67</sup> To show that this continuity was real, Prynne brought in a rogues gallery of real personalities, such as Cardinal Richelieu (1585–1642) and Tommaso Campanella, claiming that each had recycled Parson’s plans to overthrow the Three Kingdoms.<sup>68</sup>

---

equating anti-Catholic beliefs to cultural myths and legends, see R. F. Hardin, ‘The Early Poetry of the Gunpowder Plot: Myth in the Making’, *English Literary Renaissance* 22 (1992), pp. 62–79; G. Cubitt, *The Jesuit Myth: Conspiracy Theory and Politics in Nineteenth-Century France*, Oxford 1993; P. Burke, ‘The Black Legend of the Jesuits: An Essay in the History of Social Stereotypes’, in *Christianity and Communities in the West: Essays for John Bossy*, ed. S. Ditchfield, Aldershot 2001, pp. 165–82; E. Nelson, ‘The Jesuit Legend: Superstition and Myth-Making’, in *Religion and Superstition in Reformation Europe*, Manchester 2002, pp. 94–115.

<sup>65</sup> For Prynne’s retrospective assertion that the Laudian Plot was linked to the Ancient Plot, see Prynne, *Substance of a Speech*, sigs P3v-Q2r. See also William Prynne, *The First and Second Part of a Seasonable, Legal, and Historical Vindication*, 2nd edn, London 1655 sig. E3v-F1r.

<sup>66</sup> William Prynne, *The Second Part of a Seasonable Legal and Historical Vindication*, London 1655, sigs E2r, E3v; id., *A Summary Collection of the Principal Fundamental Rights, Liberties, Proprieties of All English Freemen*, London 1656, p. 47; id., *A Gospel Plea (Interwoven with a Rational and Legal)*, 2nd edn, London 1660, p. 143.

<sup>67</sup> Robert Parsons or Persons (1546–1610) led the first Jesuit mission to England in 1580 and was the author of a number of controversial works, all of which fuelled Protestant fears of a Jesuit conspiracy. See F. Edwards, *Robert Parsons: The Biography of an Elizabethan Jesuit, 1546–1610*, St Louis 1996.

<sup>68</sup> William Prynne, *The Re-publicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause, Briefly and Truly Anatomized*, London 1659, p. 5; id., *Jus Patronatus or A Briefe Legal and Rational Plea*, London 1654, sigs A2v, A3v; id., *Some Popish Errors, Unadvisedly Embraced and Pursued by Our Anticommunion Ministers*, London 1658, p. 6.

This dissertation diverges from the work of earlier scholars of Prynne insofar as it proposes to analyse the previously unexamined narrative connection between these two plots. In order to demonstrate this connection adequately, I have chosen to highlight Prynne's re-imagining and usage of Campanella.<sup>69</sup> As we shall see, Campanella appeared in the Ancient Plot as one of a handful of Catholic malefactors who were responsible for contriving the entryist and *divide et impera* strategies Prynne alleged were used by Cromwell and the New Model Army to overthrow Charles and Parliament. Labelling Campanella the 'Second Machiavel', Prynne attributed to him virtually all the evils for which he had originally blamed Laud and the Arminians.<sup>70</sup> Like Laud, who, in Prynne's mind, had vied for autocratic power, the republicans, antimonarchists, and army-officers were pursuing a similar agenda, 'trampling all Laws of God, and the Realm' by pursuing Campanella's ideas:

...all Republicans & Antimonarchists...and our new Junctoes, and General Council of Army-Officers, seduced and acted by Campanella, Spanish and Romish Emissaries, to promote our ruine...are now become our Sovereign Lords and Legifers...by trampling all Laws of God, and the Realm, and their spiritual as well as temporal King, and Monarchy under their feet.<sup>71</sup>

Prynne's Campanella had Machiavellian aspirations: he had striven to weaken England's security with 'intestine' (that is, internecine) conflicts; he had aimed to 'usher in popery by insensible degrees'.<sup>72</sup> These are all accusations which Prynne originally made against Laud and the prelacy in the 1640s.<sup>73</sup> While the historical Campanella could certainly be described as having—at times—insurrectionary and nonconformist opinions, he was not, as Prynne

---

<sup>69</sup>In the period between 1649 and 1670, Campanella appeared in at least fifteen of Prynne's writings, always as a Rome-allied agent bent on England's destruction. To the best of my knowledge, no single author in England wrote so prolifically on Campanella during this period.

<sup>70</sup> William Prynne, 'His Premonitory Epistle Concerning Campanella's Discourse of the Spanish Monarchy', in Tommaso Campanella, *An Italian friar and Second Machiavel, Advice to the King of Spain for Attaining the Universal Monarchy of the World. Particularly concerning England, Scotland and Ireland, How to Raise Division between King and Parliament, to Alter the Government from a Kingdome to a Commonwealth. Thereby Embroiling England in Civil War to Divert the English from Disturbing the Spaniard in Bringing the Indian Treasure into Spain. Also for Reducing Holland by Procuring War betwixt England, Holland, and Other Sea-Faring Countries, Affirming as Most Certain, that If the King of Spain become Master of England and the Low Countries, He Will Quickly Be Sole Monarch of All Europe, and the Greatest Part of the New World*, tr. Edmund Chilmead, London 1660, sig. A2r (the pagination is erroneous).

<sup>71</sup> William Prynne, *The First Part of the Signal Loyalty and Devotion of Gods True Saints and Pious Christians (as also of Some Idolatrous Pagans) towards Their Kings*, London 1660, p. 94.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, sigs A2r-A3v. See also Prynne, *Jus patronatus*, sigs A1v-A2v.

<sup>73</sup> William Prynne, *Canterburies Doome, or, The First Part of a Compleat History of the Commitment, Charge, Tryall, Condemnation, Execution of William Laud, Late Arch-bishop of Canterbury*, London 1646, pp. 15, 154-55, 177-78.

claimed, a Jesuit, nor was he a Machiavellian (that is, an endorser of the teachings of Machiavelli).<sup>74</sup> Obviously, Campanella—like many of his peers who were brought up in the Counter-Reformation milieu—hoped that England would ultimately forsake Protestantism and return to the Church of Rome. In fact, Campanella actively lobbied prominent European royals (such as Charles’s consort, Henrietta Maria) and English ambassadors for this outcome.<sup>75</sup> Prynne, however, appears not to have been privy to this knowledge. We can be sure that what Prynne wrote about Campanella was obtained from *De monarchia Hispanica*, a document which, while containing elements of Campanella’s genuine political thought, contained interpolations from his contemporary, Giovanni Botero (c. 1544–1617).<sup>76</sup>

Despite Prynne’s suggestions to the contrary, *De monarchia Hispanica* offers no evidence that Campanella prioritized the destruction of the kingdoms of the British Isles. It is clear that he modelled this work on the mirror of princes literature, and it offers specific astrological, prophetic, and philosophical insights into the nature of good rulership. As for the historical context, the treatise, despite the interpolations from Botero, is completely focused on proposing methods to ensure Spain’s continued success as a global empire. As such, it is one of a number of works produced during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries which repeated the hope for a universal monarchy under Spain.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Like Prynne, Campanella despised Machiavelli and went so far as to call the political theorist a forerunner of the Antichrist. For example, see Tommaso Campanella, *Lettere*, ed. G. Ernst, Florence 2010, pp. 116-23. See also G. Barbuto, *Il principe e l'Anticristo: Gesuiti e ideologie politiche*, Napoli 1994, p. 269. For modern scholarship on Campanella’s anti-Machiavellian views see G. Ernst, *Religione, ragione e natura: Ricerche su Tommaso Campanella e il tardo Rinascimento*, Milan 1991, pp. 73-104; J. Headley, *Tommaso Campanella and the Transformation of the World*, Princeton 1997, pp. 180-196; V. Frajese, *Profezia e machiavellismo: Il giovane Campanella*, Rome 2002, L. Addante, ‘Campanella e Machiavelli: Indagine su un caso di dissimulazione’, *Studi storici*, 45, 2004, pp. 727–750; id., *Tommaso Campanella: Il filosofo immaginato, interpretato, falsato*, Rome and Bari 2018.

<sup>75</sup> Campanella, *Lettere*, pp. 490-92, 525-27.

<sup>76</sup> R. Mattei, *La politica di Campanella*, Rome 1928, pp. 18-69. For Botero as a source for early modern writers on geopolitics see X. Gill, ‘The Forces of the King: The Generation that Read Botero in Spain’, in *The Early Modern Hispanic World*, ed. K. Lynn and E. Rowe, Cambridge 2017, pp. 268-91. For a recent study of Botero see Giovanni Botero, *Reason of the State*, ed. R. Bireley, Cambridge 2017, pp. xiv-xxxvi. Also useful is J. Headley, ‘Geography and Empire in the Late Renaissance: Botero’s Assignment, Western Universalism, and the Civilizing Process’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 53, 2000, pp. 1119-1155.

<sup>77</sup> On early modern ideas of Spain’s divinely sanctioned imperialism see, e.g., L. F. Lima, ‘Between the New and the Old World: Iberian Prophecies and Imperial Projects in the Colonisation of the Early Modern Spanish and Portuguese Americas’, in *Prophecy and Eschatology in the Transatlantic World, 1550–1800*, ed. A. Crome, London 2016, pp. 33-64; H. Braun, ‘Conscience, Counsel and Theocracy at the Spanish Hapsburg Court’, in *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*, ed. H. Braun and E. Vallance, Houndsmills 2004, pp. 56-66; J. J. Ibanez, ‘The Baroque and the Influence of the Spanish Monarchy in Europe (1580-1648)’, in *The Transatlantic Hispanic Baroque: Complex Identities in the Atlantic World*, London 2014, pp. 113-23; J. Headley, ‘The Habsburg World Empire and the Revival of Ghibellinism’, *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 7, 1978, pp. 93-127; A. Pagden, *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800*, New Haven 1995, pp. 11-62; J. H. Elliott, ‘Monarquía compuesta y monarquía universal en la época de Carlos V’, in *Carlos V, europeísmo y universalidad*, ed. F. Montes-Gonzalez and J. L. Castellano, 5 vols, Madrid 2001, V, pp. 699-710; X. Gil, ‘Vision europea de la Monarquía Espanola como monarquía compuesta’,

Although Prynne infamously narrated the particulars of Campanella's project in the epistle to the second edition of Edmund Chilmead's translation of *De monarchia Hispanica*, I have discovered that he first painted Campanella in a malefic light over a decade earlier, in the margins of his *Brief Memento* (1649). In this context, Prynne invoked Campanella to support his claim that Parliament, by intending to execute the king, was carrying out the 'Popes and Jesuits designs'.<sup>78</sup> In resurrecting Campanella for this purpose, Prynne may have been the first person to create the literary stereotype of the friar as a Jesuit evildoer and plotter against England. Further, judging from the numerous amount of times he was cited by his contemporaries and by posterity as an exegete of popery, it is incontestable that Prynne played a dominant role in the popularisation of this version of Campanella. This is attested by the prevalence of overt references and implicit allusions to his thesis in multiple texts published from 1662 through the second half of the seventeenth century.<sup>79</sup>

Campanella is of particular importance to this study for two reasons. First, I contend that Campanella (like Adam Contzen, Richelieu, and Parsons) is a representative antagonist of Prynne's late stage popish myth (that is, the Ancient Plot).<sup>80</sup> These antagonists were not created *ex nihilo*; they were built on and contain many of the characteristics of Prynne's early political ideas. As such, they should not be studied as isolated creations but instead as constructions inextricably linked to Prynne's experiences with and explanations of Arminianism, Jesuitism, and Machiavellianism.<sup>81</sup> Studying Prynne's interactions with these

---

in *Las monarquias del Antiguo Regimen, monarquias compuestas?*, ed. C. Russell and Jose Andres-Gallego, Madrid 1996, pp. 65-95 (76-83).

<sup>78</sup> William Prynne, *A Brief Memento to the Present Unparliamentary Juncto*, London 1649, p. 5. Prynne's marginal reference reads: 'See Watsons Quodlibets. Th. Campanela de Monarchia Hisp.c.25.'

<sup>79</sup> See for example, Richard Baxter, *Fair-Warning, or, XXV Reasons against Toleration and Indulgence of Popery*, London 1663, p. 18; Edward Waterhouse, *A Short Narrative of the Late Dreadful Fire in London*, London 1667; *Pyrotechnica Loyolana, Ignatian Fire-Works, or, The Fiery Jesuits Temper and Behaviour*, London 1667, p. 106; John Pettus, 'To the Right Honourable James Earle of Suffolk, Lord Lietuenant of That Country', in *England's Independency upon the Papal Power Historically and Judicially Stated*, London 1674, sig. A4r-v; Edward Pelling, *A Sermon Preached on the Anniversary of That Most Execrable Murder of K. Charles the First Royal Martyr*, London 1682, pp. 26-7; John Shaw, *No Reformation of the Established Reformation*, London 1685, p. 244; Thomas Bennett, *An Answer to the Dissenters Pleas for Separation, or, An Abridgment of the London Cases*, London 1700, p. 11; *The Ax Laid to the Root of the Tree: or, a Discourse Wherein the Anabaptists Mission and Ministry Are Examin'd and Disprov'd*, London 1705, pp. xv-xviii; *Undone Again; or, the Plot Discover'd. Being a Detection of the Practices of Paptists with Sectaries, for Overthrowing the Government*, London 1710, p. 21; *The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England, from the Earliest Times to the Restoration of King Charles II*, 24 vols, London 1763, XXII, p. 329.

<sup>80</sup> Adam Contzen, a Jesuit and confessor to Maximilian of Bavaria, was an avowed critic of Machiavelli and the author of *Politicorum libri decem*. For a detailed analysis of Contzen's political philosophy and anti-Machiavellianism see R. Bireley, *The Counter-Reformation Prince: Anti-Machiavellianism or Catholic Statecraft in Early Modern Europe*, Chapel Hill 1990, pp. 136-61.

<sup>81</sup> For background on the cultural significance of Arminianism in seventeenth-century England see N. Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism 1530-1700*, Manchester 2001, pp. 132-70, 222-40. Succinct overviews of the negative responses to Machiavelli in England, as well as his eventual association with Jesuitism, can be found in S. Anglo, *Machiavelli, The First Century: Studies in Enthusiasm, Hostility, and Irrelevance*, Oxford 2005, pp.

movements and mentalities will, therefore, allow us to gain a deeper understanding of his overarching mythology and the entwined nature of the two plots.

My second reason for centring my study on Campanella is that he, unlike the other Antichrist-like figures of the Ancient and Laudian Plots, had not been targeted by Prynne predecessors.<sup>82</sup> For example, Richelieu had been associated with international intrigue from at least 1641.<sup>83</sup> Likewise, at the time Prynne began delineating his Ancient Plot in 1649, tales about Parsons and his cabals had already been circulating for fifty years.<sup>84</sup> By contrast, the apocryphal ‘Jesuit Campanella’ was Prynne’s *sui generis* fabrication, and his appearance in subsequent texts is taken as supporting evidence for the exceptionality of the myth created and promoted by Prynne.

In this dissertation, therefore, I attempt to assess the ‘narrativity’ of Prynne’s propaganda by mapping the evolution of his Laudian and Ancient plot theses, and, in particular, the creative processes by which these theses launched the conspiratorial dimension of Tommaso Campanella’s English reception.<sup>85</sup> My aim is not to provide a comprehensive account of Campanella’s reception history in England. Campanella was often praised in the works of English authors, many of whom preceded Prynne (such as Francis Bacon) or were his contemporaries (George Wharton, Joseph Glanvill, Robert Boyle).<sup>86</sup> Instead, I seek to

---

396-401, and A. Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*, Burlington 2014, pp. 314-38. For examples of Prynne’s anti-Machiavellian rhetoric see his *The Petition of Right of the Free-Holders and Free-Men of the Kingdom of England*, London 1648, p. 10; id., *The Machavilian Cromwellist and Hypocritical Perfidious New Statist, Discovering the Most Detestable Falshood, Dissimulation and Machavilian Practices of L. G. Cromwel and His Confederates*, London, 1648; id., *The Substance of a Speech*, p. 307; Prynne, *New Discovery of Free-State Tyranny*, London 1655, p. 26.

<sup>82</sup> One work published in 1641, while sardonically poking fun at Campanella’s theories on sensation and interactions with spirits, offers some insight into his non-philosophical early English reception. The author, Edward Kellet, shows a knowledge of a number of theses expounded in Campanella’s *De sensu rerum et magia*, which at that time existed in three editions. There is no mention of the *De monarchia Hispanica* nor any declaration of Campanella’s supposed Jesuitism. Kellet explicitly refers to Campanella as a ‘Frier’. See Edward Kellet, *Tricoenivm Christi in nocte proditiōnis suae*, London 1641, pp. 556-57, 565.

<sup>83</sup> See, e.g., *The Impeachment and Articles of Complaint against Father Philips the Queenes Confessor*, London 1641, sigs A2v, A3v; *A Dreame, or Newes from Hell*, London 1641, p. 4; *The Confession of John Browne, a Jesuite, in the Gate-House Twice Examined by a Committee from the Honourable House of Commons*, London 1641, sig. A3r.

<sup>84</sup> For recent studies detailing the formation and propagation of the ‘myth’ of Parsons in Elizabethan and Jacobean popular culture see M. Carrafiello, *Robert Parsons and English Catholicism, 1580-1610*, Cranbury 1998, pp. 88-142; V. Houlston, *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Persons’s Jesuit Polemic, 1580-1610*, Aldershot 2013, pp. 9-18, 123-5; Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*, pp. 317-38.

<sup>85</sup> By narrativity, I mean the extent to which events are artificially homogenised and represented as coherent narratives. By today’s standards, Prynne does not narrate, that is, report, current affairs. Instead, he ‘narrativises’: he—to use the words of Hayden White—‘feigns to make the world speak itself and speak itself as a story’. For a fuller description of narrativity as a form of exegesis and to see how it differs from narration see H. White, ‘The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality’, *Critical Inquiry*, 7, 1980, pp. 5-27.

<sup>86</sup> For Campanella as an inspiration to and source of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century natural philosophers see A. Maggi, ‘Tommaso Campanella’s Philosophy and the Birth of Modern Science’, *Modern Philology*, 107 (2010), pp. 475-92.

gauge the ways in which Prynne progressively manufactured and adapted his persuasive stories and, in doing so, to establish the origin of the widespread literary topos of Campanella as a Jesuitical colluder against the English people.

My investigation begins, in Chapter 1, with a brief review of the provenance and transmission history of the *De monarchia Hispanica*. I then summarize the arguments of chapter twenty-five of the treatise (which specifically deals with England), highlighting Campanella's debt to Machiavelli and Botero. I conclude this section by establishing that Prynne's source text is completely devoid of any references to Jesuits or Jesuitism. Since *De monarchia Hispanica* is of singular importance to Prynne's Ancient Plot as a source document, surveying and contextualizing it will serve, later on, to show the extent to which the Jesuit Campanella differs from the historical Campanella.

In the next section of Chapter 1, I make note of the various appearances of the 'Jesuit Campanella' in seventeenth- and eighteen-century publications and trace the root of the archetype to Prynne's propagandistic efforts. In order to pinpoint the origin of the Jesuit Campanella in Prynne and differentiate all print references to Campanella (many of which, as I have stated, present him in a positive or impartial light), I first propose that Prynne's Campanella can be distinguished by the epithet Jesuit and by the fact that he is usually mentioned together with Contzen, Richelieu, and Parsons, figures who appear in the 1653 pamphlet *Plots of Jesuites*. I then provide textual evidence proving, not only that Prynne's use of these figures preceded their appearance in *Plots of Jesuits*, but also that the pamphlet was specifically produced as a précis of Prynne's claims.

To support my thesis about the provenance of the Jesuit Campanella, I emphasize that Edmund Chilmead (who brought out the main English translation of Campanella's *De monarchia Hispanica* in 1654) regarded him in a neutral light and sought to portray his instructions without embellishment. In concluding this chapter, I summarize the tentative evidence for the origins of Prynne's characterization of Campanella and survey his presentation of the Laudian and Ancient Plots, in which Contzen, Richelieu, and Parsons are featured as co-conspirators. Lastly, I maintain that Prynne's communication of this myth was coloured and formed by his perceptions of and reactions to Arminianism, Machiavellianism, and Jesuitism.

Continuing the arguments set out in Chapter 1, in Chapter 2 I assess Prynne's relationship to Arminianism. I examine the impact of certain events and published testimonies on his thinking; and I dissect his avowed anti-Arminianism as displayed in his works published between 1628 and 1637. These include: *A Brief Survey and Censure*

of Cozens His Cozening Devotions (1628), the first and second editions of *The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme* (1629-1630), *Newes from Ipswich* (1636), *A Quench-Coale. Or a Briefe Disquisition and Inquirie* (1637), and *Canterburies Doome*. The reason for limiting my study to this selection is that these texts, in my view, contain Prynne's most concise descriptions of the origins and dangers of Arminianism, both as a state of mind and as a system of practices.

I argue that Prynne in his clashes with Arminian doctrine and ritualism was principally concerned with the defence of Calvinistic orthodoxy in the English Church. His early conspiracy theories emerged in reaction to the introduction or proposal of new ecclesiastical procedures (which he called 'innovations') and his criticisms frequently included insinuations that alterations to the traditions set down by Elizabeth and James originated with papist intriguers. In my analysis, I show that Prynne explicitly based his dogma on a number of theological precedents, such as The Thirty Nine Articles, King James' pronouncements against Arminians, and the Lambeth Articles.<sup>87</sup> In addition, I identify what appear to be Prynne's earliest instances of fashioning and spreading anecdotes. I suggest that a particular tale (which originated with Thomas Challoner, one of Prynne's witnesses against Laud) served as a structural precursor to Prynne's Ancient Plot.

Lastly, I provide evidence showing that Prynne came to believe Arminianism was promoted by the papists in order to facilitate the gradual suppression of Protestant liberties. In other words, he argued that the proponents of popery were playing a long-game, choosing to weaken and redirect the faith of their opponents through incrementalist, somewhat asymmetrical, techniques. I show that Prynne traced the origin of this Fabian strategy to sections of Adam Contzen's *Politicorum libri decem*. I stress the point that Contzen's ideas preceded and informed the *formulae* of the antagonistic triad who communicated the Ancient Plot (Parsons, Richelieu, and Campanella). Overall, this chapter, in evaluating Prynne's understanding of Arminianism and use of Contzen, unpacks the theological and literary foundations for his initial conspiratorial mindset.

Chapter 3 deals with Prynne's interpretation of Machiavellianism. The purpose of this chapter is chiefly to demonstrate how Prynne's anti-Machiavellianism (like his anti-Arminianism) helped to drive his political narratives. Thus, I specifically survey Prynne's

---

<sup>87</sup> First passed by Elizabeth I in 1563, the Thirty-Nine Articles outlined Protestant doctrine. The Lambeth Articles were developed in 1595 by the Archbishop of Canterbury John Whitgift (c.1530–1604) in collaboration with preceptors at the University of Cambridge. They upheld traditional Calvinist doctrines such as predestination and irresistible Grace. I will discuss both the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Lambeth Articles in my examination of Prynne's Anti-Arminianism.

conception of Machiavelli and his teachings and find that Prynne's allusions to the thinker date back to as early as 1629. My primary sources, in addition to the *Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, also include: *A Looking-Glasse for All Lordly Prelates* (1636), *The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie* (1641), and *A Pleasant Purge for a Roman Catholike to Evacuate His Evill Humours* (1642). By critically engaging with these texts, I demonstrate that Prynne, in his early invectives against Arminian or Laudian bishops, often compared them to Machiavellian politicians—tyrants who arbitrarily persecuted their anti-Arminian detractors and rewarded other Arminians. Additionally, I show how Prynne's conflation of Arminianism and Machiavellianism laid the grounds for his invoking of Machiavelli in his polemics against Cromwell, the New Model Army, and Campanella (all of whom he associated with Jesuits and Machiavellians).

In Chapter 4, I expand on my explanation of Prynne's anti-Machiavellianism and anti-Arminianism by delving into his first announcement and explanation of the Laudian Plot in which—as I have indicated—the Jesuits play a primary role. To present the Laudian Plot as clearly and concisely as possible, I divide the chapter into several sections. In the first part, I review the entire background to the Habernfeld narrative in *Romes Masterpeece*, drawing attention to Prynne's assertions that a conclave of Jesuits based in London was (pursuant to the *Congregatio de propaganda fide*) inciting upheavals across the Three Kingdoms.<sup>88</sup> In the second section, I focus on Prynne's manifold accusations as outlined in *The Popish Royall Favourite*. I show how he attempted to discredit Charles I's government by documenting controversial events from the past as well as current affairs.

In essence, Prynne's belief that the government was compromised hinged partially on his understanding of the proceedings of the (ultimately abortive) Spanish Match between Charles and the Infanta of Spain. Moreover, his supplementary evidence (epistolary materials obtained during his investigative researches) showed that Francis Windebank, Henrietta

---

<sup>88</sup> First established with the bull 'Inscrutabili' by Pope Gregory XV in 1622, the *Congregatio de propaganda fide* was an organisation whose agenda involved both the rapid evangelisation of people in the New World and the reconversion of Protestants. For an overview of its founding and activities, see M. Prendergast and T. Prendergast, 'The Invention of Propaganda: A Critical Commentary on and Translation of *Inscrutabili Divinae Providentiae Arcano*', in *The Oxford Handbook of Propaganda Studies*, ed. J. Auerbach and R. Castronovo, Oxford 2013, pp. 19-26. Reports about the evils of the organisation were circulating in England from at least 1624. See, e.g., Paolo Sarpi, *The Free Schoole of Warre, or, A treatise, Whether It Be Lawfull to Beare Armes for the Service of a Prince That Is of a Diuers Religion*, London 1624, sigs C4v-D1r; Thomas Abernathy, *Abjuration of Popery*, London 1638, pp. 40: 'Papists ly in wait to deceave you by two meanes, seminaries, and pensions; yet it is first to be remarked that the ground of both is that Councell in Rome, called, Congregatio de propaganda, or rather extirpanda fide, a congregation of propagating (or rather) extirpating of Faith. This Congregation hath a most sumptuous Palace in Rome, and extreme rich...the end of their meetings is to finde out meanes to bring all people and Nations under the popes dominion...'

Maria, and Charles had, on many occasions, circumvented the law to assist wealthy and influential English Catholics. Given that, as Prynne saw it, Charles's government cared less for Protestants than it did for Catholics, he concluded that the conspiracy to eradicate Protestants was an undeniable reality. Thus, I stress that Prynne in 1643 was certain that the Jesuits were an entrenched and well-connected society in the English polity which exerted considerable and tangible pressure on the royal household. This was, I argue, the conspiratorial zenith of Prynne's Laudian Plot: his conviction that Charles, either through cowardice or carelessness, was virtually powerless, unable or unwilling to make decisions that could benefit his own people, the Protestants. To conclude the chapter, I show how Prynne in *Canterburies Doome* summarized the Laudian Plot by insisting that Arminianism was explicitly a Jesuit ploy in the same vein as Contzen's advice, contrived to confuse and divide righteous Protestants. This claim of Prynne provides strong evidence of the thematic bridge between the Laudian and Ancient Plots.

In Chapter 5, I draw attention to key texts that directly influenced (as shown by Prynne's numerous citations of them in *Romes Masterpeece*, *Popish Royall Favourite* and *Canterburies Doome*) the way in which he framed and narrated the dangers of Jesuitism. I focus specifically on the works of three English spies: Lewis Owen (c.1532–1594), John Gee (c.1596–1639) and James Wadsworth (1572?–1623). The texts I cover include: *Foote out of the Snare* (1624), *The Running Register* (1626), *The Unmasking of All Popish Monks* (1628), and *The English Spanish Pilgrime* (1629). In surveying these works, I argue that Prynne in his later writings (such as *Jus Patronatus* and *A Seasonable and Historical Vindication*) appealed to the authority of Gee, Owen, and Wadsworth in order to corroborate his claims about the antiquity of the Ancient Plot and its continuity with the Laudian Plot.

Following Hofstadter, who argued that the paranoid spokesperson is partially forged by the religious, political, and social environment in which he is immersed, I make an excursus in Chapter 6 in order to review Prynne's interpretation of the actions of the New Model Army and the Independent party. I maintain that the apparently hostile behaviour of these groups towards the moderate Presbyterians and the king had an incubatory effect on Prynne's storytelling, stimulating him to develop the Ancient Plot. In doing so, I also show how he used contemporary sources (specifically, a section from the third part of Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato's *Dell'istorie*[1648]and a mysterious letter from a Cromwellian spy) as evidence of the Jesuits' and Richelieu's personal involvement in the abolition of the monarchy.

In Chapter 7, in order to further map the beginnings of the Ancient Plot, I examine Prynne's use of Parsons in *Substance of a Speech*. To understand why Prynne was attracted to Parsons and how his presence serves as a conceptual bridge between the Laudian and Ancient Plots, I review Parsons' role in the Appellant Controversy and his subsequent demonisation in the press by the secular priest William Watson. In conclusion, I argue that Prynne, by building on Parsons' already infamous reputation, gave his own plot further plausibility and relevance in light of the English revolution.

In Chapter 8 I rely on my freshly established and comprehensive understanding of Contzen, Richelieu, Parsons, and Campanella to demonstrate how Prynne used the Ancient Plot to criticize the Interregnum governments and the anti-royalist supporters of the 'Good Old Cause'. I also show how Prynne, in the second half of the 1650s, drew on additional mythical anecdotes about the Quakers and the circumstances of Charles' execution to reinforce his Ancient Plot. In concluding this chapter, I also document examples of the subsequent appearances in multiple works of Prynne's popish plot theories in order to further demonstrate their durability and contagiousness.

In the final section of Chapter 8, I conclude the dissertation by reiterating that Prynne's storytelling and method of articulating propaganda was indisputably defined by his in-depth analyses and critiques of Arminianism, Machiavellianism, and Jesuitism. I further conclude that this is proven through the examples of his semi-fictionalized antagonists, who serve as evidence of both the development and consistency of Prynne's decades-long campaign of anti-Catholic propaganda.

## Chapter 1

### Setting the Conspiratorial Scene: Universal Monarchy, the Jesuit Campanella and the Good Old Cause

In 1670, about forty years after his death in Paris, and nearly seventy-one years after his failed Spanish insurrection in Calabria, the Italian philosopher Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639) was implicated in yet another plot. This time his accuser, Henry Stubbe (1632-1676), was a thirty-eight-year-old Puritan radical who was convinced that the newfound Royal Society (which had been established in 1660) was a front for a secret programme of ‘Popish’ subversion.<sup>89</sup> Stubbe’s theories hinged on his interpretation of passages from a bestselling English translation of Campanella’s *De monarchia Hispanica discursus* (‘A Discourse on the Monarchy of Spain’), originally published in Amsterdam in 1640 by Elzevir.<sup>90</sup> He was convinced that the famous society was an institution of learned vanity which was accelerating the destabilization of England. Stubbe believed that it would have made Campanella clap ‘his hands for joy’.<sup>91</sup> The ‘papist’ plan was simple enough: distract the vacillating intellectuals with fruitless research and experiments, and watch them gradually lose their religious zeal and return to the Catholic fold. The English ‘nation’, Stubbe writes, would be led to the slaughter by subtlety just as the children and rats were tricked by the ‘Pyed Piper’.<sup>92</sup>

The responses to Stubbe’s biting attack were equally acerbic. The physician Christopher Merret (1614/15-1695), one of the founding fellows of the Royal Society, in his *A Short Reply to the Postscript, &c. of H. S. Shewing His Many Falsities in Matters of Fact*, wrote that Stubbe’s theory of the Royal Society’s link to Campanella was so ‘absurd’ that ‘no fresh man of the University would own to fear of being ridiculous’.<sup>93</sup> The clergyman and philosopher Joseph Glanvill (1636-1680) went further in 1671, setting the tone for his defence in his title: *A Præfatory Answer to Mr. Henry Stubbe, the Doctor of Warwick Wherein the Malignity, Hypocrisie, Falshood of his Temper, Pretences, Reports, and the*

---

<sup>89</sup>For detailed information on Henry Stubbe’s ‘radical Protestantism’ and republicanism, see J. R. Jacob, *Henry Stubbe, Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment*, Cambridge, 2002, pp. 8-40, 139-43; N. H. Steneck, ‘Greatrakes the Stroker: The Interpretations of Historians’, *Isis*, 73, 1982, pp. 161-77. See also C. B. Estabrook, ‘Stubbes, Henry’, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 60 vols, Oxford, 2004, LIV, pp. 203-4. Stubbe decries The Royal Society’s ‘Popish Machinations’ in Henry Stubbe, *Campanella Revived, or, An Enquiry into the History of the Royal Society, Whether the Virtuosi There Do Not Pursue the Projects of Campanella for the Reducing England unto Popery*, London 1670, p. 8.

<sup>90</sup> Tommaso Campanella, *De monarchia Hispanica discursus*, Amsterdam, 1640.

<sup>91</sup>Stubbe, *Campanella Revived*, p. 3: ‘You see what applauds Mr. Sprat would have gained from that Jesuit for this History: but how would Campanella have clapped his hands for joy to see this happy establishment which he so long ago projected, in order to the converting of England, Holland, and other heretical countreys? It was his darling design, and which that fryer (one of the most politick that ever was) so often inculcates in his book of the Spanish Monarchy.’

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>93</sup>Christopher Merret, *A Short Reply to the Postscript, &c. of H.S. Shewing His Many Falsities in Matters of Fact; the Impertinencies of His Promised Answers to Some Physicians that have Written against the Apothecaries: His Conspiracy with Apothecaries to Defame Them, the R.S. and Many Learned Men of Our Nation*, London 1670 p. 25. On Merret, see D. E. Allen, ‘Merret, Christopher, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, XXXVII, pp. 900-901.

*Impertinency of his Arguings & Quotations in his Animadversions on Plus ultra are Discovered.* Glanvill sardonically mused that he could not decide which to admire most, ‘his impudence, or his impertinence’.<sup>94</sup> He concluded by saying that Stubbe was ‘over-heated in his head’. This ‘thought’, remarked Glanvill, was ‘the most charitable thought can be entertain’d of him’.<sup>95</sup>

Needless to say, Stubbe’s accusations caused an uproar, but they did not stick. The controversy over Campanella’s infiltration of the Royal Society was, however, significant enough to be re-examined in the nineteenth century by the English literary critic Isaac D’Israeli (1766-1848) in his *Calamities and Quarrels of Authors* (1812). D’Israeli, who called Campanella a ‘fervid’ and ‘wild’ genius, nonetheless pointed out that his radicalism was due to Stubbe’s characterization.<sup>96</sup> He labelled Campanella’s proposed Spanish monarchy a ‘chimera’, but still noted his unscrupulousness in devising a scheme that would ‘first make men great in science having first made them slaves in politics’.<sup>97</sup> Similarly, an entry in *The Supplement to the Penny Cyclopaedia*, mentions Campanella’s controversial reception in England and his link to the political thinker Niccolò Machiavelli.<sup>98</sup>

The origin of the Campanella controversy becomes clearer when we consider the history of the primary source at its centre. An English translation of *De monarchia Hispanica* was published in 1654 by Edmund Chilmead (1610-1654) with the title *A Discourse Touching the Spanish Monarchy*. A student of Magdalen College, Oxford, where he obtained his Master of Arts in 1631, Chilmead translated a variety of Latin, French and Italian works into English, including Jacques Ferrand’s treatise on ‘erotic melancholy’ (*Erotomania, or A Treatise Discoursing of the Essence, Causes, Symptomes, Prognosticks and Cure of Love or Erotic Melancholy*, 1640), Jacques Gaffarel’s *Curiositez* and Leone of Modena’s *Historia de’ riti hebraici* (*The History of the Rites, Customes, and Manner of Life, of the Present Jews*,

---

<sup>94</sup> Glanvill, Joseph, *A Praefatory Answer to Mr. Henry Stubbe, the Doctor of Warwick Wherein the Malignity, Hypocrisie, Falshood of His Temper, Pretences, Reports, and the Impertinency of his Arguings & Quotations in His Animadversions on Plus Ultra Are Discovered*, London 1671, pp. 193.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 203.

<sup>96</sup> Isaac D’Israeli, *The Calamities and Quarrels of Authors: With Some Inquiries Respecting Their Moral and Literary Characters, and Memoirs for Our Literary History*, 3 vols, London 1814, II, p. 50.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54.

<sup>98</sup> George Long, ed. *The Supplement to The Penny Cyclopaedia of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge*, 3 vols, London 1845, I, p. 274. The editor notes that Campanella’s *De monarchia Hispanica* made ‘great noise’ at the time of its publishing and was ‘reprinted several times’ during Oliver Cromwell’s Protectorate. For information on the popularity of the Chilmead English translation (and its inclusion on England’s list of bestsellers) see William London, *A Catalogue of the Most Vendible Books in England Orderly and Alphabetically Digested under the Heads of Divinity, History, Physick and Chyrurgery, Law, Arithmetick, Geometry, Astrology ... : with Hebrew, Greek and Latine for Schools and Scholars: the Like Work Never Yet Performed by Any: Also, All Sorts of Globes, Mapps of the World or in Parts ... : All to be Sold by the Author at his Shop in New-Castle*, London 1657-8.

throughout the World, 1650). In the preface to his translation of *De monarchia Hispanica*, Chilmead attempted to give a level-headed summary of Campanella's life and a conspectus of the treatise. Without criticizing Campanella's motives or linking him to Catholic conspiracies, he wrote that, even though Campanella's political advice had been designed for the king of Spain, it could nevertheless be useful for any other ruler.<sup>99</sup> Chilmead's Campanella, however, is not the conniving figure described by Stubbe, who was reacting to a phantom revenant dredged up and re-animated by William Prynne. In the perfect storm brought about by England's wartime state of affairs and Prynne's commandeering of Campanella's persona through his pamphleteering and theatrics, a new creature came to life. So influential was Prynne's refashioning of Campanella that even the American founding father Benjamin Franklin would use him as a trope for crafty statecraft.<sup>100</sup>

Prynne first branded Campanella with the powerfully derogatory slur 'Machiavel', in his 1660 edition of *De monarchia Hispanica*.<sup>101</sup> Using this rhetorical language, Prynne gave Campanella the distinction of being Machiavelli's spiritual heir. Hence, Campanella took on a new life and became a figurehead and mastermind for 'papist', Machiavellian and 'Jesuitical' plots against the English people. Prynne appropriated Campanella's private advice to the king of Spain and turned it into a fear-mongering campaign. His exaggerated claims were amplified during the Commonwealth and Restoration periods, fanning the flames of the anti-Catholic sentiments of the day. In an ironic sequence of events, Campanella, who

---

<sup>99</sup>Tommaso Campanella, *A Discourse Touching the Spanish Monarchy: Wherein We Have a Political Glasse, Representing Each Particular Country, Province, Kingdome, and Empire of the World, with Wayes of Government by which They May be Kept in Obedience. As Also the Causes of the Rise and Fall of Each Kingdom and Empire*, transl. Edmund Chilmead, London 1654, sig. A3r: 'For, if it be good counsel for the King of Spain to take, To procure and maintain a perfect Union among his own subjects at home; but on the Contrary, To sow the seeds of Division among his Enemies abroad: the same must be as good Counsel for the King of France also to take, or any other Prince, or Potentate what ever. If it be good Counsel to the Spaniard, Never to trust so much to any peace made with an Enemy, as thereupon quite to lay aside his Armes: it is altogether as good Counsel for any other Prince.' This edition will hereafter be referred to as SM. On Chilmead, see M. Feingold, 'Chilmead, Edmund', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, XI, pp. 460-461; M. Feingold and P. Gouk, 'An Early Critic of Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum*: Edmund Chilmead's Treatise on Sound', *Annals of Science*, 40, 1983, pp. 139-57.

<sup>100</sup> Benjamin Franklin, *Papers*, ed. L. Labaree, 39 vols to date, New Haven 1959-, IX (1966), pp. 342-7.

<sup>101</sup>Campanella, *Advice to the King of Spain for Attaining the Universal Monarchy of the World*. In his preface to the re-issued work, Prynne argued that Campanella had laid the groundwork for the spread of 'anti-parliamentary' and schismatic ideas. These ideas, Prynne maintained, were used by various groups, such as the Jesuits and members of the New Model Army, to destroy England's monarchy. The 'Machiavel' trope was a popular negative stereotype of Machiavelli. For recent studies on the history of the early modern Machiavel and its theatrical and polemical prominence, see V. Kahn, *Machiavellian Rhetoric: From the Counter-Reformation to Milton*, Princeton 1994; Anglo, *Machiavelli*; A. Petrina, *Machiavelli in the British Isles: Two Early Modern Translations of The Prince*, London 2016 [2009]; M. Barducci, 'Order, Conflict and Liberty: Machiavellianism in English Political Thought, 1649-1660', in *Machiavellian Encounters in Tudor and Stuart England: Literary and Political Influences from the Reformation to the Restoration*, ed. A. Arienzo, New York 2016, pp. 157-72.

had died a staunch anti-Machiavellian, rose again to become Machiavelli's arch-strategist and emissary, a spectral tool of Prynne's extreme rhetoric.<sup>102</sup>

To uncover the posthumous evolution of Campanella's political impact in England, it will first be necessary to trace the history of his *De monarchia Hispanica*. In presenting his 1654 translation, Chilmead says that he worked from the 'third edition' of a Latin text published by 'Ludwick Elizivir' in Amsterdam.<sup>103</sup> The treatise, which was probably first written in Italian in the late 1590s, was rewritten by Campanella from memory in the 1600s and then translated into German in 1620 (the original Italian text was published only in 1854).<sup>104</sup> It appeared in Latin a few decades later. *De monarchia Hispanica* probably would not have seen the light of day had it not been spirited away from Campanella's jail cell by some of his friends. Still, it is difficult to piece together its original content, and various scholars have noted that nearly all extant texts are plagued by philological difficulties.<sup>105</sup> In fact, it was the nineteenth-century historian Rodolfo De Mattei who first discovered that the treatise had been interspersed with passages from the popular political writings of the ex-Jesuit Giovanni Botero (1544-1617).<sup>106</sup> Thus, for over two hundred years (before the recovery of Campanella's 'youthful draft', which was published in 1989), all writers

---

<sup>102</sup>William Prynne, 'Mr. William Prynne, his premonitory Epistle concerning Campanella's discourse of the Spanish Monarchy', in *Campanella, An Italian Friar and Second Machiavel*, sig. A1r: 'Campanella laying for his ground, made it his Master-piece to set down stratagems to divide us and other Kingdoms and Nations against and between themselves, to bring them first to desolation by themselves, that so the Spaniard and Pope might without much difficulty seise upon them whiles in that condition, which imminent danger and approaching ruine we have no probable means left to prevent, but by a speedy cordial Christian union between our lawful KING long exiled Head and members; and happy restitution of our Hereditary King, Peers, and English Parliaments to their ancient just Rights and Priviledges according to our sacred Oathes, Protestations, Vow, League, Cove[nant], and an avowed future renunciation of all Campanella's Jesuitical, Popish, Spanish Counsels, Plots, Innovations, dividings, which I leave thee to contemplate.'

<sup>103</sup> Edmund Chilmead, 'The Translator to the Reader', in Campanella, *A Discourse Touching the Spanish Monarchy*, sig. A2v. Chilmead is referring to T. Campanella, *De monarchia Hispanica discursus. Editio novissima, aucta et emendata ut praefatio ad lectorem indicat*, Amsterdam, 1653. The second edition had come out in 1641, always with Elzevir. From now on, I shall refer to the 1653 edition as MH. On the publishing history of the *Monarchia di Spagna* and *De monarchia Hispanica*, see R. De Mattei, 'Le edizioni della *Monarchia di Spagna*', in *Studi campanelliani*, Florence 1934, pp. 57-69; id., 'Le edizioni inglesi della *Monarchia di Spagna* di Tommaso Campanella', *Giornale Critico della Filosofia Italiana*, 48, 1969, pp. 194-205; L. Firpo, *Bibliografia degli scritti di Tommaso Campanella*, Turin 1940, pp. 63-66.

<sup>104</sup> Tommaso Campanella, *Opere*, ed. A. D'Ancona, 2 vols, Turin 1854, II, pp. 85-229.

<sup>105</sup> The critical edition of the Italian *Monarchia di Spagna* is by Germana Ernst. See Tommaso Campanella, *Monarchie d'Espagne et Monarchie de France*, ed. by G. Ernst, French translations by S. Waldbaum and N. Fabry, Paris 1997. See also her 'Introduction' and 'Note philologique', in *ibid.*, pp. VII-XLVIII; 607-12. Ernst has discussed the textual difficulties in the Latin edition of Campanella's *Monarchia di Spagna* in her work *Tommaso Campanella: The Book and the Body of Nature*, transl. D. Marshall, Dordrecht 2010, pp. 57-9. See also R. De Mattei, 'La *Monarchia di Spagna* di Campanella e la *Ragion di Stato* di Botero', *Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* (classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche), 3, 1927, pp. 432-85, republished in *La politica di Campanella*, Rome 1927, pp. 18-79; J. Headley, *Tommaso Campanella and the Transformation of the World*, Princeton 1997, pp. 204-8.

<sup>106</sup>De Mattei, *La politica di Campanella*, pp. 22-69.

commenting on *De monarchia Hispanica* were responding to a hybrid work into which various elements had been inserted without Campanella's permission or knowledge.<sup>107</sup>

In this chapter, I shall therefore start with an overview of the content and context of *De monarchia Hispanica* ('On the Monarchy of Spain'), which, contrary to Prynne's suggestions, set out a utopian vision rather than a devious political plot. It is my contention that it is a work of rhetoric, prophetic speculation and political idealism meant to convince the then king of Spain, Philip II, of his responsibility to establish a global theocracy.<sup>108</sup> I shall then explore its nebulous afterlife and see how its redactors inserted certain passages from Botero's *Della ragion di Stato libri dieci* ('Ten Books on the Reason of State') into Campanella's text. My inquiry will lead up to a discussion of Campanella's complicated relationship with Machiavelli. Ironically, and in contrast to his English critics Prynne and Stubbe, Campanella thought of himself as a staunch anti-Machiavellian. In his treatises he frequently linked Machiavelli to Protestant heretics, tyrants and atheists.<sup>109</sup> Nevertheless, while denouncing Machiavelli, Campanella argued that the king should employ draconian and surreptitious methods to unite the kingdoms of Europe, Africa, Asia and the New World. For example, in Chapter 27, he advised using the arts of Cadmus and Jason to conquer Lower Germany and Flanders. He stated that the Spanish should use the sexual appeal of Southern men to Northern women, innovation, learning and bribery of the nobility to sow internal discord and seduce the people.<sup>110</sup> For Campanella, these techniques which manipulatively exploited the emotions and cultural differences of people were nothing more than the proper exercise of prudence. Since I am trying to gain a better understanding of Campanella's reception in England, I shall devote most of my attention to the passages which were frequently cited by Campanella's English readers. This will serve to fulfil one of the aims of this dissertation, which is to show how Campanella's pro-imperial rhetoric, urgently

---

<sup>107</sup> G. Ernst, 'Introduzione', in Tommaso Campanella, *La Monarchia di Spagna: Prima stesura giovanile*, ed. G. Ernst, Naples 1989, pp. 7-17, 79-82.

<sup>108</sup> For a thorough analysis of Campanella's ideal of a Hapsburgian Spanish universal monarchy, see A. Pagden, *Spanish Imperialism and the Political Imagination: Studies in European and Spanish-American Social and Political Theory, 1513-1830*, New Haven 1990, pp. 37-63. See also Headley, *Tommaso Campanella*, pp. 212-26.

<sup>109</sup> Headley, *Tommaso Campanella*, pp. 180-96. See also F. Meinecke, *Machiavellism: The Doctrine of Raison d'État and its Place in Modern History*, tr. D. Scott, New Haven 1962, pp. 90-115. For details on the 'antimachiavellian Machiavellianism' of some early modern thinkers, see I. D. Evigrenis, 'Wrestling with Machiavelli', *History of European Ideas*, 37, 2011, pp. 85-93; M. Viroli, *From Politics to Reason of State*, Cambridge 1992, pp. 131, 253. On Campanella's characteristic tangle of anti-Aristotelianism, attacks on Machiavelli and rejection of Protestant reformation, see G. Giglioni, 'L'anticristo e i suoi emissari: Cosmologia, escatologia e storia nel *De gentilismo non retinendo* di Campanella', *Bruniana et Campanelliana*, 23, 2017, pp. 635-642.

<sup>110</sup> MH, pp. 215, 228-30; id., *A Discourse Touching the Spanish Monarchy*, tr. by E. Chilmead, London 1654 (henceforth abbreviated as SM), pp. 166, 177-8.

expressed in reference to what he saw as the *kairos*, the opportune moment, was resurrected in the 1650s by Prynne as imaginative propaganda to incriminate the Catholic Church for fomenting acts of sedition against England.

### The World of *De Monarchia Hispanica*

Campanella's treatise is, without question, a period piece. He had originally composed his work to survey Spain's imperial achievements and forecast the problems it might encounter on its way to world domination from 1600 onwards. In Chapter 2 of *Monarchia di Spagna*, he notes four causes which prove Spain's legitimacy as a superior empire. First, in 1492, Spanish rulers expelled the Moors from the Iberian Peninsula, thereby ending an 800-year period of Islamic rule. With the completion of this task, King Ferdinand II of Aragon, acquired the title of 'Catholic king' (*il re Cattolico*) for his dedication to the universal church. Second, the innate prudence and astuteness of the Spanish people helped the country to take advantage of the latest achievements in technological innovation such as the printing press and firearms. Third, the marriage of the house of Asturias and Castile unified various provinces and provided the basis for a centralization of power. Fourth, Spain's monarch had supported Christopher Columbus, who went on to discover the New World.<sup>111</sup> Next, in Chapter 3, Campanella invokes the testimony of divine providence, as revealed in astrological and numerological correspondences and natural disasters.<sup>112</sup> Because the present time is the age of the 'end of monarchies' ('the end of Monarchies is now come'), only the Spanish king, primed by his valiant deeds, has the potential to be a liberator (as Cyrus the Great liberated the Hebrews) and unite the church under one pastor.<sup>113</sup> Once this task has been accomplished, 'shall Christ come to judge the World. And then shall the end be'.<sup>114</sup>

At first glance, Campanella's interpretation of biblical eschatology and his analysis of historical events seems strained; but, in reality, these two ideas—the unification of Christendom under one hegemon and the fulfilment of the prophecy of the end of time—represented two convergent political-religious visions which had developed from medieval thought and which would have a significant impact in England during the Revolution and the

---

<sup>111</sup> MH, pp. 6-7; SM, pp. 4-5.

<sup>112</sup> MH, p. 9; SM, pp. 6.

<sup>113</sup> MH, pp. 16-21; SM, pp. 11-13.

<sup>114</sup> MH, p. 23; SM, p. 14.

Interregnum.<sup>115</sup> In the Middle Ages, the idea of a temporal universal monarchy was seriously considered by Dante in his treatise *De monarchia* (written in 1314).<sup>116</sup> The idea of a universal empire centred on the real accomplishments of a contemporary sovereign did not, however, gain noticeable traction until the reign of Charles V, ruler of both the Spanish and Holy Roman Empires.<sup>117</sup> In the course of his reign, Charles acquired the ‘largest collection of kingdoms and territories that any European monarch had ruled over since the time of Charlemagne’.<sup>118</sup> For historians like Francesco Guicciardini (1483-1540), Charles’s ascendancy and geopolitical indomitability proved that he could be regarded as the restorer of a true Roman Empire, akin to that of the Caesars.<sup>119</sup> Mercurino di Gattinara (1465-1530), Charles’s advisor and confidante who served him as imperial Grand Chancellor from 1518 to 1530, further promoted this idea.<sup>120</sup> Building on the theses of Dante’s *De monarchia*, and linking Charles to Constantine the Great, Gattinara believed that the king was a type of the chosen one, born to unite the Church and all temporal monarchies. This type of idealistic thinking, which considered Spain’s monarchy on an epic scale—as the apex of a Christian hegemony—continued with Charles’s successors Philip II (1527-1598) and Philip III (1576-1621). By 1595, the alleged year of the composition of Campanella’s *Monarchia di Spagna*, Philip II had expanded his father’s realm even further, seizing lands in the Philippines and in Portugal.

The other important notion which supported the idea of the exceptionalism of the Spanish empire was the concept of an impending *eschaton*.<sup>121</sup> Campanella’s mystical interpretation of prophecy was both the spiritual and intellectual basis for his infamous insurrection against the Spanish Empire in the first place.<sup>122</sup> In his analysis of the portents of

---

<sup>115</sup>O. Niccoli, *Prophecy and People in Renaissance Italy*, Princeton 1990, pp. 3-4, 19-23, 172-5, 190-3.

<sup>116</sup>For an overview of Dante’s approach to the concept of universal monarchy see C. T. Davis, ‘Dante and the Empire’ in *The Cambridge Companion to Dante*, ed. by R. Jacoff, Cambridge 1993, pp. 67-80. See also E. Gilson, *Dante the Philosopher*, London 1948, pp. 162-224.

<sup>117</sup>On Charles V’s place in the sixteenth-century dialogue about world empire, see J. Headley, ‘The Habsburg World Empire and the Revival of Ghibellinism’, *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 7, 1978, pp. 93-127; F. A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*, London 1975.

<sup>118</sup>T. J. Dandeleit, ‘The Imperial Renaissance’, in *The Renaissance World*, ed. J. J. Martin, New York 2007, p. 312. At its largest extent, Charles’s dominion included: Aragon, Navarre, Naples, Milan, Sardinia, Sicily, parts of Burgundy and the Netherlands, parts of the New World, and the Aztec and Incan empires.

<sup>119</sup>Francesco Guicciardini, ‘Discorsi politici’, in *Opere inedite di Francesco Guicciardini*, ed. P. and L. Guicciardini, Florence 1857, pp. 384, 388.

<sup>120</sup>For a recent overview of Gattinara’s influential role in shaping Charles’s international policies, see R. A. Boone, *Mercurino di Gattinara and the Creation of the Spanish Empire*, New York 2016, pp. 7-36.

<sup>121</sup>Tommaso Campanella, *Lettere: 1595-1638*, ed. G. Ernst, Pisa, 2000, p. 50.

<sup>122</sup>Tommaso Campanella, *Lettere*, ed. G. Ernst, L. Salvetti Firpo and M. Salvetti, Florence 2015, pp. 37-8: ‘Le cogitazioni mie, Sacra Maestà, da fanciullo furon sopra questa rinovazione di secolo; e mi mossi dalle parole di san Vincenzo, di santa Brigida, di santa Caterina, di san Gregorio, dell’abbate Gioachimo e d’altri astrologi e filosofi d’ogni nazione; e perché parlai di questo tempo che fũro in Calabria le inondazioni, terremoti e comete,

a cosmic mutation, he began to see himself as personally destined to fulfil the oracles of wise pagans and Christian prophets. In his *Dichiarazione di Castelvete* (written after his imprisonment in Castelvete near Benevento in September 1599), he identified himself as a well-informed prophet and maintained that all men had the power to prophesy.<sup>123</sup> His later works also prove that he remained fascinated by the idea of a resurgent Golden Age, which would be ruled by one priestly ruler.<sup>124</sup> He equated this sacred era with the millennium, a period during which Christ and the departed saints would return and rule as discarnate presences, directing the sanctified leaders of the earth.<sup>125</sup> Campanella generally fused this narrative with the eschatological ideas of Joachim of Fiore, an influential thirteenth-century Dominican abbot from Calabria, the same region as Campanella.<sup>126</sup>

Joachim had posited his own apocalyptic time-scale and divided human history according to overlapping epochs, characterized by providential dispensations and symbolized by the persons of the Holy Trinity. The first epoch, which he called the Age of the Father, began during the time of Adam and ended with the rise of John the Baptist, the herald of the saviour of the new age. The general theme of this age was servility to the ‘elements’ of the world and obedience to the strict laws of the Old Testament. The next epoch, the Age of the Sun, extended from the time of King Josiah (641/640-610/609 BC) to 1260. This stage represented the freedom bestowed by the liberating Gospel of Christ. Although people in this age were freer than they used to be in the prior era, they had yet to be fully liberated from the bonds of suffering.

In the next stage however, spiritual men (*virī spirituales*) would lead the masses to cultivate everlasting righteousness. This era would begin with the rule of St Benedict (the founder of Western Monasticism) and end with the consummation, that is, fulfilment of cosmic history. This stage, and its corresponding sovereignty, the ‘Kingdom of the Spirit’,

---

e tanti ufficiali scomunicati, fui preso per sospetto.’ See also, Tommaso Campanella. ‘Prima delineatio defensionum’, in *Il Supplizio di Tommaso Campanella: Narrazioni, documenti, verbali delle torture*, ed. L. Firpo, Rome 1985, pp. 85, 161, 178-9. Prophecy was not the only reason for Campanella’s attempted coup d’etat of course. For his own description of the corruption and social ills of southern Italy, see Tommaso Campanella, *La città del sole*, ed. G. Ernst, Rome 2006, pp. 23-5.

<sup>123</sup> Tommaso Campanella, *Dichiarazione di Castelvete*, in L. Firpo, *I processi di Tommaso Campanella*, ne ed. by E. Canone, Rome 1998, p. 102: ‘...ho atteso a diverse professioni de scienza, e in particolare alla profezia, tanto raccomandata da santo Paulo alli Corinti: “potestis omnes prophetare”’.

<sup>124</sup> Tommaso Campanella, *Monarchia del Messia*, ed. V. Frajese, Rome 1995, p. 61: ‘Se il mondo fusse governato da un solo huomo, prencipe etsacerdote, si viveria felice secolo, perché tutti i guai del mondonascono o dalla guerra, o dalla peste, o dalla fame, o dall’openionecontraria alla nativa religione.’

<sup>125</sup> Ernst, *The Book and the Body of Nature*, pp. 84-9.

<sup>126</sup> On Joachim and Joachimist thought, see M. Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages*, Oxford 1969; ead., *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future*, New York 1977.

has striking similarities to Campanella's end of times utopia. Like Campanella, who anticipated the formation of unprecedented missionary efforts to convert as many people as possible, Joachim expected a renovation and complete restructuring of the entire world—Joachimism, it is worth noting, also had a profound and lasting effect on New World explorer Christopher Columbus, one of Campanella's heroes.<sup>127</sup> Like Campanella, Joachim speculated about *kairos* and messianism, reasoning that expansions into the New World were confirmations of the foretold golden age.<sup>128</sup> These were all themes which an English reader during the 1650s and 1660s would find in Chilmead's *Discourse Touching the Spanish Monarchy* and which captured the attention of Prynne. Yet, his failure to see—or his lack of interest in seeing—the nuances in Campanella's thought might partially account for the superficial way that he judged the philosopher's political instructions.

John Headley has provided a general summary of Campanella's *Monarchia di Spagna* in his *Tommaso Campanella and the Transformation of the World* (1997). For this reason, I shall concentrate on the chapters mentioned by Prynne and examine Campanella's advice using the themes of universal monarchy and apocalyptic prophecy as frames of reference. The purpose of this exercise is to penetrate, as precisely as possible, the vein of Campanella's rhetoric in light of his original concerns and ambitions.

The resulting portrait of the real Campanella will then be contrasted with the hybrid, refashioned Campanellas: the personas deriving from Botero and from the association of Campanella with Machiavelli which Prynne encountered in the interpolated Latin *Monarchia*. In this section of my analysis, I shall quote from the English translation, giving references both to it and to the Latin version in the footnotes. *De monarchia Hispanica* is divided into thirty-two chapters, twelve of which are individual treatments of nations, peoples, countries and kingdoms. The treatments survey the 'actions of particular things' which show the weakening of foreign monarchies and the strengthening of Spain's monarchy.<sup>129</sup> Each has a diagnostic and aphoristic structure and generally follows the same formula: a problem is posed and an ideal solution (which seems clear-cut) is given. First, Campanella provides evidence of a country's strengths and weaknesses. He spends a short time contrasting these with Spain before moving on to propose a series of tactics which he believes would work best with that particular country. For example, in his chapter on Poland, Muscovy and

---

<sup>127</sup> See Ernst, *The Book and Body of Nature*, p. 56. For Campanella's opinion of Columbus as the premier natural philosopher and navigator, see Tommaso Campanella, *Del senso delle cose e della magia*, ed. G. Ernst, Bari 2007, pp.107-8; Tommaso Campanella, *Selected Philosophical Poems*, ed. S. Roush, Chicago 2011, pp. 112-15; Campanella, *La città del sole*, p. 54.

<sup>128</sup> J. L. Phelan, *The Millennial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World*, Berkeley 1970, pp. 19-23.

<sup>129</sup> MH, pp. 7-8; SM, p. 5.

Transylvania, Campanella first describes the conditions:

The Kingdom of *Poland* today is in Our time the most Potent of all the Northern Kingdomes; insomuch that, if it were not so divided in it self, about Points of Religion, as it is; and were withal an *Hereditary Kingdome*, and had a Prince that were a Native, and were not Elected out of some Forraign Nation, as their custome is; it would prove a sufficient Terrour to the *Great Turk*.<sup>130</sup>

To exploit this situation, Campanella advises the Spanish king to seize influence in the region and establish Catholic dominance through a diplomatic marriage, allowing his son to gain a foothold in the government. The king's son would then wisely assimilate himself into the culture and work as a policy insider, using his position as a platform to embolden his Polish compatriots against the Turks and push for alliances with Transylvania and Muscovy.<sup>131</sup> Campanella offers another equally straightforward means for the annexation of Germany. Using religion and matrimony to unite Catholic citizens, the king should also induce jealousy and discord among Germany's small republics. He should, in addition, confer titles and fiefdoms on those officials and soldiers who remain loyal to his empire.<sup>132</sup>

Overall, Campanella's arguments about the stratification and expansion of Spanish imperial power are based on his stance that one should maintain unity with allies and provoke disunity among enemies. In Chapter 19 he writes that the king must always try to divide those who are unfaithful or disobedient to the church by exploiting matters related to religion, customs, sciences, states, trades and everything else that is necessary to them.<sup>133</sup> Allies, on the other hand, must be dominated using the assumption that 'God himself [is] the Author of all

Polity'.<sup>134</sup> The first and strongest type of union is of souls. This is achieved through religion. The second type of union is of bodies, rites and customs. These unions are facilitated in practice through a process of Hispanization. The third union is through proximity. In effect, this means that the king, as a superior power in the region, can influence inferior neighbouring kingdoms, as, for instance, the Turk exercises power over the Republic of

---

<sup>130</sup>MH, p. 210; SM, p. 162.

<sup>131</sup>MH, p. 211; SM, p. 163.

<sup>132</sup>MH, p. 182; SM, p. 139.

<sup>133</sup>MH, p. 162; SM, p. 124.

<sup>134</sup>MH, p. 158; SM, p. 121.

Ragusa.<sup>135</sup> This is consistent with Campanella's understanding of what constitutes prudent governance: a three-part bond of religion, arms and material prosperity.

In the first chapter of *De monarchia Hispanica*, Campanella writes that God, opportunity and prudence are the three causes of all human principalities. God is the prime mover, the independent cause of the interior and exterior world on which occasion and prudence depend. Occasion consists of hidden things and extraordinary events, while prudence is defined as the ability to comprehend these events through wisdom and uncover their significance with respect to the global setting of international politics.<sup>136</sup> Prudence is the knowledge and execution of good rulership. As the utmost skill of any wise ruler, it combines situational awareness, worldly erudition and divine mandate:

For as much as *Prudence* is required in the managing of all Humane things, (which is a Cause adjoined to Fate, consisting of an infinite number of *Joynt Causes*, acting by virtue of the *Prime Cause*), so especially it is necessary in the managing of an Empire: by it the whole World is governed; and it is disseminated by God through all the Universe. For *Nature* is an *Intrinsecal, Divine Art*: and whosoever shall follow *Nature* as his guide, he is wise; which appears evidently in Plants, Ants, Bees, Cranes, and the very Fishes themselves.<sup>137</sup>

Prudence, as opposed to cunning, is also Campanella's criterion for moral virtue. It has an element of magnanimity, clemency and truthfulness, demonstrated by a liberal and pragmatic understanding of the differences between people, as well as a genuine care for their well-being.<sup>138</sup> Cunning, however, is the defining characteristic of selfish and villainous rulers such as Cesare Borgia, a model of political action in Machiavelli's *Il principe*.<sup>139</sup> In *De monarchia Hispanica*, Campanella links cunning (*astutia*) to reason of the state: 'Whence we are to understand that Prudence is a different thing from Craft (*astutia*); which is called by some, *Ratio Statuum regendorum*, the Reason, or Rule of State-Government.'<sup>140</sup> For Campanella, prudence is something that can be both possessed and exercised. Prudent rule necessarily entails an understanding of *kairos*, because history is made up of leaders who interpreted prophecy and instigated change whenever an occasion presented itself. In the

---

<sup>135</sup> MH, pp. 160-62; SM, pp. 122-3.

<sup>136</sup> MH, pp. 42-3; SM, p. 30.

<sup>137</sup> MH, p. 23; SM, pp. 15-16.

<sup>138</sup> MH, p. 24; SM, p. 16.

<sup>139</sup> MH, p. 25; SM, p. 17.

<sup>140</sup> MH, pp. 23-4; SM, p. 16.

same way, the future monarchy of the Spanish king will come about if he subscribes to Campanella's recommendations. Since prudence dictates that the first and strongest bond is religion, the king must be the 'commissary' of God and protect the Pope and his Church, sending out his 'gods of the Earth' to govern the Low Countries and the New World. He must also augment his spiritual and temporal authority by convening supreme councils of Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuits and by gaining the good will of other ecclesiastics. During wars, each military leader should have a religious adviser who has a visible presence. Soldiers, revering the adviser's precepts and receiving their wages from him, subsequently become more loyal.<sup>141</sup>

Although ecclesiastical authority is the core of Campanella's description of prudent rule, it is not the only factor which requires oversight. In Chapter 8, he outlines all the general causes that can extend Spanish dominance:

The *Occasions*, by which the *Spanish Monarchy* may be kept up, or perhaps be enlarged also, are these: First of all, the *Virtue of the King*; secondly, the *Goodnesse of the Lawes*; thirdly, the *Wisdom of the Council*; fourthly, the *Justice of the Officers of State*; fifthly, the *Obedience of the Barons*; sixthly, the *Multitude, and good Discipline of Soldiers and Commanders*; seventhly, a *Full Treasury*; eighthly, the *Mutual Love of the People among themselves, and toward their King*; Ninthly, *Good Preachers, in their Sermons speaking for subjection to Kings*; Tenthly, the *Good Agreement betwixt his Neighbours*.<sup>142</sup>

One could call this list a chain of prudence which emanates from the king and his officials. The king is a master of more than one type of knowledge, combining cross-cultural intelligence and political finesse. He rules in a peaceable, pastoral manner, imitating Moses and Charlemagne. Again, Campanella's formula for dissension and unity is apparent. At home, in domestic politics, the king must enact laws to promote uniformity and religiosity. The days of the heathens should be renamed and the months 'reformed' to reflect the apostles and the holy sacraments.<sup>143</sup> In the New World, information should be selectively disseminated to place the reign of the Spanish king in a good light. Mathematical schools should be erected because they turn the people away from evils; and skilful astrologers

---

<sup>141</sup> MH, pp. 23-4; SM, pp. 23-5.

<sup>142</sup> MH, pp. 43-4; SM, p. 31.

<sup>143</sup> MH, pp. 44-5, 62-5; SM, p. 32-4, 45-8.

should be sent abroad to show how the stars attest to the legendary illustriousness of the Hapsburgian empire.<sup>144</sup>

The next part of Campanella's strategy concerns the nexus of law and culture. Like other early modern thinkers, he assumes *a priori* that the behaviour of citizens can be predicted with a degree of certainty through the use of ethnic generalizations. His basic sense of the relations between different peoples mainly derives from the 'Table of Nations' passage in the Book of Genesis and classical geo-humoralism.<sup>145</sup> Both systems were widely accepted sources of knowledge at the time. In this context, Campanella's profiling, like the ethnographic sketches of his contemporaries, utilizes stereotypes and geographical origins as legitimate indicators of social preferences and actions. Thus, it is natural that the prudent king, a consummate intellectual and skilled observer of social relations, would incorporate these profiles in government policy.<sup>146</sup>

At the same time, however, the king can further efforts at Hispanization by deploying religious emissaries and stationing them in areas which were previously non-Catholic. He can also effect gradual change by developing new laws. The other method which Campanella suggests is much more dynamic and points to his vigorous lifetime commitment to international evangelism.<sup>147</sup> In Chapter 18, he declares that 'the First Instrument of Raigning well, and quietly, is the *Tongue*'.<sup>148</sup> Its chief promulgators are preachers, powerful figures who have historically had the potential to topple regimes and unite divided peoples. The following passage is worth quoting in full, for the light it sheds on Prynne's special interest in *De monarchia Hispanica* and Campanella's strategies:

Now it is manifest again that the Causes of the Public peace and quietnesse, do derive their Original from the Wisedome of the Preachers, and others of the Clergy, to whom the people give an ear; and that so much the rather, because These promise unto them Eternal Blessings, which, if they do but despise their Temporal, they may attain unto: perswading them withal, that it is agreeable to the Will of God, that Obedience should be yeilded to the King; and, that by suffering Afflictions, they shall be rewarded by God himself; withal often inculcating into their minds Humility, and other the like Vertues; but grievously threatning all Theeves, Murderers, Whoremongers, and

---

<sup>144</sup> MH, pp. 66-7; SM, pp. 46-8.

<sup>145</sup> Genesis 9:18-27, 10: 1-32. For early modern theories of geo-humoralism, see S. Davies, *Renaissance Ethnography and the Invention of the Human*, Cambridge 2016, pp. 23-46.

<sup>146</sup> MH, pp. 67-70; SM, pp. 50-52.

<sup>147</sup> Headley, *Tommaso Campanella*, pp. 318-38.

<sup>148</sup> MH, p. 137: 'Ergo primum instrumentum bene imperandi lingua est.' See SM, p. 106.

Seditious persons, declaring what punishments, both from Men, and God himself, continually hang over their heads: on the contrary, comforting and encouraging the Good, and promising them all manner of Happiness. And so by this meanes, the words of these men being greedily harkned unto by their Auditors, overcome, and captivate their Minds and Affections: and then again, all Wicked, Irreligious persons are cast out of doors, with their Perfidious designs; being unable to infect any, either Magistrate, or Souldier, with their corrupt, malicious Perswasions, or by any means to incite them to a Rebellion.<sup>149</sup>

Campanella's recommendation is twofold: erect religious colleges which teach grammar in every province, and dispatch an élite Hapsburg Order of young 'preachers of the king' to countries like Germany and England.<sup>150</sup> Campanella's strategy of religious proselytization on the frontlines and indoctrination in schools may stem from the tradition of Jesuit missionary initiatives. In *De politica*, he describes the order as made up of industrious Catholics who understand the principles of evangelization:

Language is the instrument of religion and prudence, that is, of the goods of the soul... So the prophets and many holy preachers in the reigns of the infidels and today the Jesuits in the province of Japan capture souls with language, from where it will be easy to founda temporal empire, once their rulers have been converted to the faith.<sup>151</sup>

As he also argues in his *Discorsi ai principi di Italia*, religion is the force behind the expansion of empires: 'wherever religion turns, the empire, too, turns; for the former moves the souls, and the souls move bodies, and the bodies move armies and riches according to religion's directions. This is the reason why Elijah, Elisha, and Samuel and others changed reigns in their own ways.'<sup>152</sup> The same point is reiterated in *Del senso delle cose e della*

---

<sup>149</sup> MH, p. 136; SM, p. 105.

<sup>150</sup> MH, p. 147; SM, p. 113.

<sup>151</sup> Tommaso Campanella, *De politica*, ed. A. Cesaro, Naples 2001, p. 102: 'lingua instrumentum est religionis ac prudentiae, idest bonorum animi ... . Sic Prophetae, pluresque Praedicatores sancti infidelium in regnis, et hodiernis temporibus Iesuitae in Iaponis provincia lingua animos capiunt; de hinc facile erit imperium etiam temporale, principibus eorum ad Fidem conversis, condere'.

<sup>152</sup> Tommaso Campanella, *Discorsi ai principi di Italia*, ed. L. Firpo, Turin 1945, p. 154: 'E sempre dove inchina la religione inchina l'imperio, perché quella move l'animi, e l'animi li corpi, e li corpi l'arme e le fortune al suo cenno; onde Elia, Eliseo e Samuele ed altri mutaro li regni a modo loro. Tasche per assicurarsi dal Re di Spagna devono gl'Italiani solo attender ad autorizzare il Papato con fatti e scritti e parole, perché in questo sta la sicurtà loro.'

*magia* ('On the Sense of Things and Magic'), written in 1604 (a work which had a certain diffusion in England).<sup>153</sup>

In Chapter 15 of *De monarchia Hispanica*, Campanella states that religious '*Seminaries of the Faith*' have always existed. Their 'Apostolic Souldiers' have no need for weapons and conquer the world with only their language ('their Tongue only'). They are the 'very Nerves of the Ecclesiastical Monarchy'.<sup>154</sup> This martial statement, coupled with Campanella's other promises of tight-lipped secrets, alarmed English readers like Prynne. Campanella supplements his proposition for religious educators with a similar method of re-education for the Spanish army. He recommends that the Spanish king should follow the example of the Ottoman Empire and train an élite army like the janissaries by recruiting poor children, bastards and 'Moors'. In these institutions, the children would be wards of the state, loyal to their one and only father, the king. Other colleges would be built for the second sons of the nobility, who would be trained in various military arts and sciences. In the colonies, the soldiers would also have licence to rape and forcibly marry natives. This policy, reinforced with other methods of resource redistribution and forced disenfranchisement, would serve as an entrenched system to manage and shape distinct cultures into a uniform Spanish Empire.<sup>155</sup>

The final part of Campanella's method for strengthening the Spanish empire concerns the king's use of councils and his control of nobles, who represent an obvious challenge to his authority because of their personal wealth, weapons and ability to launch revolts. Thus, the king should endeavour to restrict their revenues, titles and physical ability to mount insurrections. He should also provide their children with Spanish teachers to condition them to respect the regime. Moreover, on the pretence of goodwill, he should send nobles away to faraway posts whenever they gain too much power. In this way, the establishment remains in control, and threats from aristocrats are prudently circumvented. The king should also convene diplomatic councils to tackle potential opposition head-on. In practice, the king's 'council of the state' would include qualified nobles from any race who are prudent and knowledgeable about the 'Customes, Religions, Rites, Situation, and the Policy, both Domestic and Military of the several Nations'.<sup>156</sup> In addition, the king should arrange a convocation every seven or nine years. Those in attendance would be 'all the Nobility of each

---

<sup>153</sup> Tommaso Campanella, *Del senso delle cose e della magia*, ed. G. Ernst, Bari 2007, p. 201. See G. Giglioli, 'Campanella e Glisson: Motivi ilozoistici nella medicina inglese della seconda metà del Seicento', *Bruniana & Campanelliana*, 2, 1996, pp. 237-45.

<sup>154</sup> MH, pp. 96-7; SM, p. 74.

<sup>155</sup> MH, pp. 94-5; SM, pp. 68-71.

<sup>156</sup> MH, p. 73; SM, p. 54.

of his several Kingdomes' and all the wisest men in 'the affaires and Secrets of State'. They would discuss and analyse procedural or governmental failings and successes, in order to reduce the chances of oversights in the future and help the king to learn 'New Secrets, and Mysteries of State'.<sup>157</sup>

### Campanella on England

Campanella's initial instructions on prudent politics (from Chapter 1 to Chapter 19) can be seen as the blueprint for his study of England. Certainly this was how Prynne saw it. Working from the assumption that Spain is the nation prophesied to attain global dominion, Campanella made the case for the justifiable destabilization and annexation of England. He claimed that England was a country very skilled in navigation and abundant in ships and soldiers. As such, it represented 'a very great Hinderance to the King of Spains designs'. Yet, if the king of Spain takes control over England and Flanders, he would 'quickly get to be sole Monarch of all Europe, and of the greatest part of the New World'.<sup>158</sup> Thus, Campanella declares that Spain's 'chiefest businesse' should be 'to weaken the Power of the English'. The king can accomplish this by locating his ships in opportune places (such as Lisbon and Galicia) and by establishing relationships (through matrimony) with people who are so fierce that they can overcome the strength of the English at sea (such as the Scandinavians). These proxies would then be bribed to cause trouble for the English fleet with the 'promise of 'a Million of mony' or with the hope of seizing English goods'.<sup>159</sup>

Next, Campanella surveys England's problematic domestic relations: 'as concerning the weakning of the *English*, there can no better way possibly be found out, then by causing Divisions and Dissentions among themselves, and by continually keeping up the same'.<sup>160</sup> Divisions, Campanella continues, are of two kinds, religious and political:

as for the Religion of that People, it is that of *Calvin*; though very much moderated, and not so rigid, and austere as it is at *Geneva*: which yet cannot so easily be extinguished and rooted out there, unlesse there were some certain Schooles set up in Flanders, (with which People the *English* have very great commerce) by meanes of

---

<sup>157</sup> MH, p. 74; SM, pp. 54-5.

<sup>158</sup> MH, p. 201; SM, p. 155.

<sup>159</sup> MH, pp. 202-3; SM, pp. 156-7.

<sup>160</sup> MH, p. 204; SM, p. 157.

which there should be scattered abroad the Seeds of Schisme and Divisions in the Natural Sciences; as namely, betwixt the *Stoicks*, *Paripateticks*, and *Telesians*; by which the Errours of the Calvinists may be made manifest. For, the truth of it is, That Sect is diametrically contrary to the Rules of Policy: for, they teach, that whether a Man do well, or ill, he doth all by divine Impulsion; which *Plato* demonstrates, against *Homer*, to be opposite to all Sounder Policy; which sayes, that every Man hath *Free Liberty of Will*, either to do Well or Ill; so that it is in our own Power, either to observe, or not observe what is commanded us.<sup>161</sup>

From a political point of view, England is constantly in conflict with the rulers of Ireland and Scotland, and Parliament desires to transform the monarchy into a republic as in Holland. The ability to recognize and take advantage of this potentially chaotic situation (he refers to it as an ‘occasion’) corresponds to what Campanella has already defined as prudence. The tactic that he proposes mirrors his views about councils in Chapter 9. It also incorporates his understanding of national cultures and dispositions. First, the king should contract outside agitators (‘some certain Merchant of *Florence*, that are wise and subtle persons, and that traffick at *Antwerp*’) and have them stir up the anger of nobles who have hereditary claims to the English throne. The spies should promise that the entire Spanish empire would support the claims of the pretenders and assist the rebellion. Afterwards, the leaders of Parliament could then be controlled by provoking their ancestral fear of wars between the English and the Scots. The result of this two-pronged dissimulation campaign would weaken England’s national security and make it easier for Spain to invade.<sup>162</sup> Religious hysteria, finally, should also be incited by spreading fear and suspicions among the Anglican dioceses and awakening the spirit of the Catholics in England and Ireland.<sup>163</sup>

Chapter 27, a treatment of the subjugation of Flanders and the Low Countries, is the last one I shall examine, as it contains arguably the most notorious scheming in the entire book. It was cited in several of Prynne’s works, a few of which precede his preface to the 1660 edition of Chilmead’s translation of *De monarchia Hispanica*. In his *Campanella Revived*, Stubbe explicitly cited this chapter as a proof of the author’s ill will.<sup>164</sup> Campanella’s strategy in Chapter 27 should be read as a counterpart to the chapter on England, since the acquisition of both regions (in Campanella’s mind) was a guaranteed route

---

<sup>161</sup> MH, pp. 204-5; SM, pp. 157-8.

<sup>162</sup> MH, pp. 205-7; SM, pp. 159-60.

<sup>163</sup> MH, pp. 208-10; SM, pp. 160-1.

<sup>164</sup> Stubbe, *Campanella Revived*, p. 3.

to global dominance. He starts off by stating that he will describe how the countries can be ‘subtly’ subdued. Campanella then goes on to invoke ethnic stereotypes as cautionary and tactical guideposts for policy. The Northerners are strong-willed, licentious, thick-set and fond of freedom and of alcoholic drinks. They are exactly the opposite of the Spaniards, who are ‘full of Craft, and subtlety’.<sup>165</sup> Because of their stout natures and the impracticality of waging a protracted war on foreign soil, the Northerners would probably defeat the Spanish by wearing them out. Thus, Campanella advises the use of artifice. The Northerners must be divided among themselves and hunted outside of their own country.<sup>166</sup>

In sum, Campanella’s treatise is perhaps best defined as guidebook of ‘destiny-changing’.<sup>167</sup> It was originally intended for the Hapsburg king, a ruler who—if prudent—would already have been aware of his eschatological mandate and would be inclined towards political endeavours aimed at escalating international conflicts and turning events in his favour. In this respect, Campanella’s advice that the king should use militarism, propaganda and diplomacy to achieve these ends was theologically justified, because the breaking up and ousting of sects, factions and misguided countries would help Spain to unite all Christendom against the Ottoman Empire, paving the way for the return of Christ. While it is true that Campanella’s methods are far from altruistic, it would be unjustified to conclude, as did Prynne and Stubbe, that they are connivances crafted by a malevolent cryptocracy.

It is highly unlikely that Prynne and Stubbe were more than superficially aware of the content of Campanella’s other treatises, many of which decried Machiavelli and were critical of the Jesuits. The very fact that Prynne and Stubbe assumed that Campanella was both a Jesuit (ignoring his membership of the Dominican order) and Machiavellian suggests that their perspective was coloured and limited by the anti-Catholic sentiments of their day.<sup>168</sup> In addition, the version of Campanella’s text that was available to Prynne and Stubbe had been modified with passages from Giovanni Botero’s *Ragion di Stato*. Botero was a Jesuit, but it is unlikely that this fact was known by Prynne or Stubbe. Botero had also written the *Ragion di Stato* as a moral, spiritually valid response to what he saw as Machiavelli’s blatant immoralism. Through the efforts of Christopher Besold (1577-1638), Kaspar Schoppe (1576-1649) and others, elements of Botero’s *Della Ragion di Stato* were inserted into

---

<sup>165</sup> MH, pp. 214-5; SM, pp. 166.

<sup>166</sup> MH, pp. 214-5; SM, pp. 166.

<sup>167</sup> For Campanella, one of the aims of rhetoric is the modification of the destinies of nations. See Campanella, *Rhetorica*, in *Tutte le opere*, ed. L. Firpo, Milan 1954, p. 760.

<sup>168</sup> Chilmead, on the other hand, does not label Campanella as a Jesuit or Machiavellian. See Chilmead, ‘The Translator to the Reader’, sig. A2r: ‘...he was a Roman Catholick, nay a Frier, and withal so eager and hearty an Asserter, and Maintainer of the Roman Catholick Sea, and Its Interests...’

Campanella's treatise on Spain's monarchy, without Campanella's knowledge. In the next section, I shall argue that minor interpolations from Botero in the published *De monarchia Hispanica* had a significant impact on Prynne and Stubbe's presentation of Campanella as a political schemer.

### Campanella and Botero

Botero was born in 1544 in Piedmont. From 1572 he was employed in various governmental and advisory roles, first as an assistant (and later secretary) to Archbishop Carlo Borromeo, then as an attaché of the Duke of Savoy in Paris. He also served as a personal counsellor of Federico Borromeo (a cousin of the archbishop), who later went on to become a cardinal. Although Botero was educated in Jesuit schools and remained a postulant for several years, he was never admitted into the order because of his reputation for intrigue. Yet, unlike Campanella, who spent the greater part of his life in prison, Botero enjoyed popular acclaim and patronage throughout his career. In the introduction to his *Della Ragion di Stato*, published in 1589, Botero declared that he aimed to refute and rectify Machiavelli's improper politics.<sup>169</sup> The rest of the book is a survey of methods to preserve and fortify states, which touches on military science, agriculture, strategic communication, public administration and religion. His advice is not directed towards any particular ruler or regime; rather, it is generalized counsel which can be used by any prudent ruler who wants to maintain a prosperous state through the meticulous use of management skills.

*Della Ragion di Stato* quickly became one of the most widely read political treatises of the time.<sup>170</sup> It has therefore been suggested that Campanella had copies of Botero's works with him during his post-insurrection imprisonment. There are traces of Botero's thought in Campanella's original draft, the most obvious of which are Botero's conceptions of demography and the ideal ruler.<sup>171</sup> The later word-for-word additions to Campanella's text,

---

<sup>169</sup>Giovanni Botero, *Reason of the State*, tr. P. J. and D. P. Waley, New Haven 1956, pp. xiii-xiv.

<sup>170</sup> On the influence of Botero's ideas on Elizabethan and Jacobean England, see now J. Trace, *Giovanni Botero and English Political Thought*, PhD Dissertation, Cambridge University, Cambridge 2018.

<sup>171</sup>De Mattei, *La politica di Campanella*, p. 23. On Botero, see L. Firpo, 'Botero, Giovanni', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, Rome 1964-, XIII, pp. 352-362. For Botero's *Relazioni universali* as the main source of Campanella's geographical information, see L. Firpo's edition of *Scritti scelti di Giordano Bruno e Tommaso Campanella*, Turin 1945, p. 407. For an accurate analysis of the relationships between Botero's *Della Ragione di Stato* and Campanella's *Monarchia di Spagna*, see De Mattei, 'La *Monarchia di Spagna* di Campanella', pp. 18-79.

however, were deliberately interpolated by some redactor, and this greatly affected the cast of the English version.

Botero's emphasis on geo-humoralism, for instance, is an integral part of his chapters on the 'situation of countries'. The wise ruler must be able to analyse these differences between peoples and adjust his policies accordingly.<sup>172</sup> Botero writes:

Those who live in northern countries but not in the extreme north, are bold but lack cunning; southerners on the other hand are cunning but not bold. The spiritual qualities of the northerners are matched by their physique, for they are tall, broad, full-blooded and vigorous, whereas those of the south are thin and dry and more ready to evade than to oppose. The former are simple and straightforward, the latter sly and artful in their ways; they are as the lion and the fox; whereas the northerner is slow and consistent in his actions, cheerful and subject to Bacchus, the southerner is impetuous and volatile, melancholy and subject to Venus.<sup>173</sup>

A similar passage occurs in Chilmead's version of the *De monarchia Hispanica* in the chapter on Flanders and Lower Germany:

For, those that are born in such cold Countries, have their Natural Heat shut up close within them, neither doth it in them Evaporate in small, minute parts; whence it is, that they are full of Blood, Corpulent, and are full of spirits, and valiant; being also Lovers of *Bacchus*, rather than of *Venus*: and they are, by reason of the Natural Fuliginousnesse, and Mistinesse that is within them, full of unsettled, tumultuous Thoughts; and, by reason of their abundance of spirits, are very prone to all Licentiousnesse; being withall very suspicious, and, by reason of their Drunkennesse, shewing little or no Gravity in their behaviour. These Northern People (I do not here speak of those Nations that inhabit the utmost Borders of the North) are moreover full of Courage, and without any Craft: whereas the Southern are, on the contrary, full of Craft and subtlety; but very fearful withal... those former are of a Plain, Open Soul; these other are Wily and Subtle, and withal very Malicious; those weare a Lions Skin; These a Foxes.<sup>174</sup>

---

<sup>172</sup>Botero, *Reason of the State*, p. 38.

<sup>173</sup>Ibid.

<sup>174</sup>SM, p. 166.

In both passages, Southern peoples are likened to foxes and stereotyped as wily and artful, the exact opposite of Northerners, who are dull ‘lovers’ of Venus and Bacchus. It is implied that Southerners are better at secrecy, while Northerners, like wild lions, have nothing to hide. The image is a variant of Machiavelli’s concept of the prince as a centaur-like realist who has both vulpine and leonine qualities, exemplifying cunning and ferocity.<sup>175</sup> In the original Italian *Monarchia di Spagna*, the lion and fox comparison is absent. This may seem like a minor addition; but the metaphor would not have been innocuous to Prynne, who was doubtless familiar with Innocent Gentillet’s disparaging rendering of it in *Against Machiavel*.<sup>176</sup> Gentillet’s treatise, which had been published in England in 1602, went on to become a popular and important text of English anti-Machiavellianism.

In addition to his theories of medical and climatic humoralism, Botero’s tactics of subterfuge and espionage appear in both the Italian *Monarchia* and its Latin translation. Campanella’s suggestions that the king should use teams of informants and *agents provocateurs* seem to derive from Botero’s counsel on secrecy. To Botero, a monarch’s ability to keep and act on secrets makes him akin to God.<sup>177</sup> Since he cares more about the monitoring, management and preservation of the state than its expansion, he recommends the use of spies, secret magistracies and dissimulators to identify dangerous persons covertly, quell rebellions and gather intelligence on the activities of potential foreign enemies:

There are two aspects to the task of preventing unity among such subjects: they must be deprived both of the desire to league together and of the power to achieve agreement. Their will can be sapped by fomenting mutual distrust and suspicion among them, so that none of them dares to trust another; secret agents and spies are most useful for this purpose. This reminds me of the means employed by Charlemagne to hold down the people of Westphalia who, although they had received baptism, lived most dissolutely and were strongly suspected of being infidels. He instituted a special secret judgeship in addition to the ordinary offices, and selected for this post men who were outstanding for their loyalty, honesty, prudence and benevolence ... . This secret magistracy was wonderfully effective in checking the

---

<sup>175</sup> Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ed. Q. Skinner and R. Price, Cambridge 1988, p. 61.

<sup>176</sup> Innocent Gentillet, *A Discourse Upon the Means of Well Governing and Maintaining in Good Peace a Kingdom or Other Principalities*, tr. Simon Patrick, London 1602, pp. 143, 224, 227, 315.

<sup>177</sup> Botero, *Reason of the State*, p. 56.

waywardness of that people; it was carried out with so much secrecy and severity that no one dared to confide even in his friends.<sup>178</sup>

This advice is essentially reproduced in the chapter of *De monarchia Hispanica* devoted to the analysis of Germany:

But there is an Admirable way of causing a separation betwixt them [the German people], which pleaseth me very much; and it is done two waies: the first is, if all desire and willingnesse of meeting one another, and laying their heads together to plot or design any thing be quite dasht in them: and this is to be done by fomenting what disgusts, and Jealousies there are amongst them, so that one of them shall not dare to tell his minde to another, or to trust any man with any of his secrets. And this was an Art that Charles the Great made use of; who also, besides His Ordinary Tribunals, set up a Secret Court of Justice in Westphalia, for the keeping of the Westphalians in Order.<sup>179</sup>

Chilmead's translation of *De monarchia Hispanica* closes the chapter with a sentence that is typically Boteran. For Prynne and Stubbe, it would have surely struck a nerve: 'let him be sure to place in all their Councels, Colledges, and about all Magistrates, some of His Creatures, to serve him for Spies, and Informers'.<sup>180</sup>

In *Della Ragion di Stato*, Botero writes that 'secrecy is of capital importance to the government of states'.<sup>181</sup> He recommends that taciturn spies should be assigned to report furtively on the private deeds of public officials as well as foreign politicians. Botero specifically advises this policy for countries like England:

---

<sup>178</sup>Ibid., p. 108.

<sup>179</sup> SM, p. 143.

<sup>180</sup> Ibid. For Prynne's fear of secret colleges, see William Prynne, *The Second Part of A Seasonable Legal and Historical Vindication, and Chronological Collection of the Good Old Fundamental Liberties, Franchises, Rights, Lawes, Government of All English Freemen*, London, 1655, sigs E4<sup>v</sup>-E5<sup>f</sup>: 'Their number being so infinite, and the Pope and Spaniard too, having long since (by Campanella's advice) erected many Colledges in Rome, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, and elsewhere, for English, Scottish, Irish Jesuites, (as well as for such secular Priests, Friars, Nuns) of purpose to promote their designs against the Protestant Princes, Realms, Churches, Parliaments of England, Scotland, Ireland, and to reduce them under their long prosecuted UNIVERSAL MONARCHY over them.' For Botero's recommendation of the types of information-gathers, see Botero, *Reason of the State*, p. 37: '...for ambassadors and spies, merchants and soldiers, and suchlike, who in the way of pleasure or business or for other motives have been in many lands and encountered many different circumstances, are a source of information upon an infinite number of subjects necessary or useful to the ruler'.

<sup>181</sup> Botero, *Reason of the State*, p. 48.

A ruler who can prevent his own subjects from uniting together will find it easier to prevent them from uniting with other peoples...This can be done by keeping spies both in the ruler's own country and in the country that is suspected of negotiating with them, and by guarding the ports and frontier passes. This is an easy task in islands and in countries bounded by the sea or by mountains or rivers, such as England.<sup>182</sup>

It is notable that Botero's comments on espionage frequently appear as tactics in Campanella's *De monarchia Hispanica*. In his chapter on 'contacts amongst the enemy' and the encouragement of 'factions' (*fattioni*), Botero discusses the use of 'forestalling' (*prevention*). He describes the strategy as wartime disinformation spread by state-sponsored groups and individuals. These factions effectively bolster the national strength of their ally by propagating fictions to incite fear or overconfidence in the opposing state:

They may persuade him not to bear arms against you, or they may direct them elsewhere and by slowing up operations render them useless ... if your contacts are so strong that they lead the enemy to fear treason, unrest, or riot, so much the better: your own country can enjoy peace if your enemy is disturbed within.<sup>183</sup>

Campanella may have derived his idea of recruiting professional intriguers (Florentine agents) to disrupt England's aristocracy from this technique. The chapter in *De monarchia Hispanica* devoted to England ends with a provocative claim that the country's history of 'horrid Civil Wars', 'strange Alterations, and Turns' makes it especially susceptible to those who aim to disturb the peace.<sup>184</sup> A similar sentence also appears in *Della Ragion di Stato*: 'It is well known how many civil wars the English have had, how many changes of regime and how many new kings.'<sup>185</sup> It may be that these sentences, distilled in Chilmead's translation of *De monarchia Hispanica*, helped to stir up and validate Prynne's fears of conspiracy. In his works which refer to Campanella, Prynne never speaks about the military power of Catholic forces. Instead, the focus of his rhetoric is the Church's capacity for underhanded coercion. Both Prynne and Stubbe see the threat as the undermining of English government and religion by a hostile force embedded within the fabric of contemporary society. While Stubbe states that the 'Papists' are Proteus-like, able to change shape into any form, and persuasive

---

<sup>182</sup>Ibid., p. 111.

<sup>183</sup>Ibid., p. 124.

<sup>184</sup>MH, pp. 209-10; SM, pp. 166.

<sup>185</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

(like orators), Prynne, as we shall see in the next chapter, associates Campanella with Richelieu and a number of Jesuit confederates.<sup>186</sup>

Still, Stubbe and Prynne's Campanella, filtered through the sieve of Botero's reason of state, could not have acquired this distinct 'Popish' tincture without the influence of anti-Jesuit and anti-Machiavellian rhetoric. Their conjuring up of a Campanella for propagandistic purposes was also conditioned by the charged atmosphere of fear and suspicion at the time. Both Prynne and Stubbe seem to have been well aware of the inflammatory connotations of their rhetoric. In seventeenth-century England, the terms 'Machiavel', 'papist' and 'Jesuit' were often used in an exaggerated way to refer to a type of person who was antipathetic to Puritan interests and the English monarchy.<sup>187</sup> Such a person was a master of deception and trickery, a 'politick' figure who, in a very theatrical but devious fashion, would use people, laws and religion to his advantage.<sup>188</sup> A hyperbolic version of Machiavelli, the 'Machiavel' was also shaped by xenophobic prejudices against Italians as naturally inclined to treachery and duplicitous priest craft.<sup>189</sup> It seems likely that these prejudices were a factor in the reception of Campanella in England. In the minds of Pynne and Stubbe, Campanella's specific instructions about the use of Florentine merchants may have been a further confirmation of what they already believed to be true. Moreover, within this particular context, the term 'Florentine' could easily have functioned as a byword for Machiavelli (who had long served as a secretary to the Second Chancery of the Florentine Republic) and his ilk. The next chapter will examine the anti-Machiavellian and anti-Jesuit currents present during the Cromwell Protectorate and the Restoration and identify the impact which they had on Prynne's conspiratorial and propagandistic strategy.

---

<sup>186</sup>Stubbe, *Campanella Revived*, pp. 1-2.

<sup>187</sup>Anglo, *Machiavelli*, 2005, pp. 325-414.

<sup>188</sup>G. Iannaccaro, 'Lexicographers as Censors: Checking Verbal Abuse in Early English Dictionaries', in *Enforcing and Eluding Censorship: British and Anglo-Italian Perspectives*, ed. G. Iannaccaro and G. Iamartino, Newcastle upon Tyne, 2014, pp. 180-1.

<sup>189</sup>R. Bushnell, 'The Machiavell', in *Tudor England: An Encyclopedia*, ed. A. F. Kinney and D. W. Swain, New York, 2001, pp. 451-2.

## Chapter 2

### The Enduring Appeal of the Campanella Plot in England

As has been mentioned in the previous chapter, Chilmead's English translation of Campanella's *De monarchia Hispanica*, published posthumously in 1640, had two editions in England, in 1654 and 1660. The particular way in which the treatise was read during the Interregnum is evident from Chilmead's own preface and from other paratextual details. The full title-page in the 1660 edition, for instance, demonstrates the Anglo-centric focus of the translation and reads like a true political programme:

Thomas Campanella, an Italian Friar and Second Machiavel, His Advice to the King of Spain for Attaining the Universal Monarchy of the World Particularly Concerning England, Scotland and Ireland, How to Raise Division between King and Parliament, to Alter the Government from a Kingdome to a Commonwealth, thereby Embroiling England in Civil War to Divert the English from Disturbing the Spaniard in Bringing the Indian Treasure into Spain: Also for Reducing Holland by Procuring War betwixt England, Holland, and Other Sea-Faring Countries.<sup>190</sup>

Chilmead suggested that readers could use his translation as a guide to understanding the current political and religious situation.<sup>191</sup> As we shall see in this chapter, this was precisely what happened with Campanella treatise on the Spanish monarchy. *De monarchia Hispanica* is clearly a work which owes much to the political ideas of what one eighteenth-century writer has elegantly described as an 'age of intrigue'.<sup>192</sup> Thus, even though Campanella expressly criticized Machiavelli and the *ragion di stato*, the treatise still incorporates aspects

---

<sup>190</sup> Tommaso Campanella, *His Advice to the King of Spain for Attaining the Universal Monarchy of the World*, tr. by E. Chilmead, London 1660.

<sup>191</sup> Chilmead, 'The Translator to the Reader', in SM, sig. A3<sup>r</sup>; the passage is quoted below at n. 27.

<sup>192</sup> The quoted phrase derives from *The History of the Works of the Learned; or, An Impartial Account of Books Printed in Europe from 1699 to 1711*, II, London 1700, p. 673: 'The last Century, especially towards the latter Part of it, may justly be stil'd an Age of Intrigue; wherein Most of the Princes of Europe, and their Ministers of State carry'd on their Projects and Designs with more Address and Policy than open Force and plain downright Violence. Those Successors of Machiavel, Richlieu and Mazarine refin'd upon, and improv'd the Maxims of their Masters so far that they had the Art (even whilst they were signing of Treaties, and caressing each other after the most endearing manner) to carry on Underhand a Scheme of Proceedings which look'd another way. The more we Reflect upon those dark Times, the more we are at a loss what to Infer from them; for all things seem'd to be Intricate, and the Arcana Imperii, the Mysteries of State were Vail'd with so thick a Cloud, that they were Skreen'd not only from Vulgar View, but even from the Eyes of those who pretended to be sharper Sighted than others.'

of the language of the *arcana imperii*, the secret arts of the state popularized by thinkers such as Scipione Ammirato (1531-1601) and Arnold Clapmar (1574-1604).<sup>193</sup> This literary tradition, ultimately deriving from Tacitus, exerted a powerful influence not only on Campanella but also on many of his acquaintances, including the physician and secretary Gabriel Naudé (1600-1653) and Cardinal Richelieu.<sup>194</sup> It is quite common, consequently, to find statements in *De monarchia Hispanica* which refer to espionage and the immense importance of princely secret-keeping.<sup>195</sup>

*De monarchia Hispanica*, moreover, showcases Campanella's belief that the supremacy of Spain's *imperium* was supported by prophecy and the testimony of the stars.<sup>196</sup> In this way, Spanish expansionism was tied to cosmological determinism, as the cosmos itself—speaking as it were, through the heavens—attested to Spain's destiny as the dominant power in global politics.<sup>197</sup> This was not an unusual belief in the seventeenth century. In England, Spain's semblance of militaristic indomitability was a major cause of anti-Spanish sentiment. Indeed, events such as the appearance of the Spanish Armada in 1588 introduced persistent doomsday tropes in English lore.<sup>198</sup> Still, it is important to understand that the

---

<sup>193</sup> See Campanella, *Lettere*, pp. 116-17, 167-71. For secondary sources on Campanella's hostility to Machiavelli and the reason of the state see G. Ernst, *Il carcere, il politico, il profeta: saggi su Tommaso Campanella*, Pisa 2002, pp. 103-32; V. Frajese, *Profezia e machiavellismo. Il giovane Campanella*, Rome 2002, 58-80. As for the milieu of the *arcana imperii* of which Campanella was certainly a part, see D. Jutte, *The Age of Secrecy: Jews, Christians, and the Economy of Secrets, 1400-1800*, New Haven 2015, pp. 18-21; N. Malcolm, *Reason of State, Propaganda, and the Thirty Years' War: An Unknown Translation by Thomas Hobbes*, Oxford 2007, pp. 92-111; P. Donaldson, *Machiavelli and the Mystery of the State*, Cambridge 1988, pp. 111-40; R. De Mattei, 'Polemiche secentesche italiane sulla "Monarchia universale"', *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 110, 2, 1952, pp. 145-65.

<sup>194</sup> Donaldson, *Machiavelli and the Mystery of the State*, pp. 141-85; W. Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State* Princeton 1972.

<sup>195</sup> See, e.g., MH, p. 15: 'enimvero de his secreto tractandum, non palam scribendum est', and p. 43: '...nam secretissima quaeque statuum chartae non committenda sunt'. See also *ibid.*, p. 73: '...Rex congregari iubeat omnes regnorum suorum barones, quorum quisque tres ad summum servos secum in aulam Regis adducat, & sapientissimum quemque in rebus & secretis status & imperii ... Nam si hoc fiat, consilarii cavebunt, ne quid indignum aut inutile consulant, sapientiores & circumspetiores facti; ipseque rex penitius semper introspiciet nova secreta status sui, & inde majorem se magis magisque efficiet ...' Campanella had initially mentioned his desire to 'make a secret book for the king of Spain' in 1608 and 1610; see *Lettere*, pp. 168: 'Far un libro secreto al re di Spagna, dove si mostra un modo facile e santo per politica e profezia d'arrivare a questa monarchia presto...'; *ibid.*, pp. 185-6: 'Far un libro secreto al Re Cattolico, dove si mostra con modi profetici e politici lo modo d'arrivar presto a questa monarchia ...'

<sup>196</sup> On the role of prophecy and astrology in Campanella's political thought, see P. Forshaw, 'Astrology, Ritual and Revolution in the Works of Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639)', in *The Uses of the Future in Early Modern Europe*, ed. A. Brady and E. Butterworth, London 2010, pp. 181-97; Ernst, *The Book and Body of Nature*, pp. 85-95; W. Eamon, 'Natural Magic and Utopia in the Cinquecento: Campanella, the Della Porta Circle, and the Revolt of Calabria,' *Memorie Domenicane*, 26, 1995, pp. 369-402.

<sup>197</sup> MH, pp. 13-23.

<sup>198</sup> Prynne, for instance, wrote that the 'memory' of the 'Armada' and the Gunpowder plot should make 'all Papists, Priests, & Jesuits...forever execrable to English hearts'. See Prynne, *The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, London 1629, p. 139. A concise discussion of early modern Hispanophobia in England can be found in W. Maltby, *The Black Legend in England. The Development of anti-Spanish Sentiment 1558-1660*, Durham NC 1971.

Campanella of *De monarchia Hispanica*, as opposed to the Jesuit Campanella, envisioned a kind of theocratic, cosmopolitan empire, a world in which Spain—in accordance with the supramundane and sublunary powers—had ascended to its rightful place as the leader of the world. Thus, Campanella’s advice with respect to the other nations of the world has a consequentialist bent: the end always justifies the means. This is a world away from Prynne’s provincialist perspective, which essentially understood Campanella’s globalism and political subtlety as a major threat to the national security of the Three Kingdoms. Before delving into Prynne’s world, it is therefore necessary to linger a little more on the way in which Campanella was employed as a tool of propagandistic mobilization during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This will provide us with a more nuanced contextualization of the conspiratorial setting in which Prynne was embedded.

Arguably, the most intriguing Enlightenment era distillation of the ‘Jesuit’ Campanella *topos* occurs in the essay ‘Of the Meanes of Disposing the Enemie to Peace’. First published in August 1761, the text is presented as an ‘extract’ from ‘the famous Jesuit Campanella’s discourses address’d to the King of Spain’, containing useful advice which can be studied in order to ‘discover the arts of our enemies’. In the excerpt, Campanella encourages rulers to employ ‘ingenious speakers and writers’ so as to expedite the process of establishing peace between warring nations. These persons, supported by the government would effectively produce propaganda by exploiting the moral and economic consequences of war in ‘their sermons, discourses, writings, poems and songs’.<sup>199</sup>

In the excerpt, Campanella *redivivus* suggests that this artifice, by influencing public opinion, would gradually bring an end to the war. Despite the similarity of this stratagem to Campanella’s actual instructions, we know that the text in question is entirely pseudographical, a concoction from the pen of Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790). At first glance, Franklin’s decision to denote Campanella as a Jesuit seems inexplicable. Upon further inspection, however, by examining earlier literary appearances of this *topos*, Franklin’s Campanella can be understood as one of the last vestiges of a tradition which, starting with Chilmead’s translation, continued to evolve during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

For example, a few decades prior to the publication of Franklin’s essay, a number of Protestant writers had also mentioned a ‘Jesuit’ Campanella. In 1711, the preacher Edward Reynolds, in referring to the ‘Politicks of the Jesuits’, spoke of the ‘counsel’ and ‘directions’

---

<sup>199</sup>Franklin, *Papers*, pp. 342-7.

of Campanella and Contzen.<sup>200</sup> Similarly, in 1710, the title page of *Undone Again; or, the Plot Discover'd* (a work which also contains extensive excerpts from Prynne's works) referred to the 'The Politick Schemes of the Jesuites Contzen and Campanella'.<sup>201</sup> Later, the anonymous author of the work elaborated on the subtitle by suggesting that England's dissenters were following Campanella and Contzen's 'scheme'.<sup>202</sup> We find the Jesuit Campanella in a memorial sermon given on 5 November 1704 (almost a century after the Gunpowder Plot). Here the vicar of Stone, Benjamin Gatton, cited Chapter 30 of Campanella's *De monarchia Hispanica* as a proof that it had 'always been the great design of the papists' to foment division and ruin the Protestant church.<sup>203</sup> Likewise, in *Some Testimonies of the Most Eminent English Dissenters* (1706), the geographer and divine Edward Wells (1667–1727) indicated 'that famous Jesuit Campanella' as one of the three evidences of the papists' interests in encouraging church discord.<sup>204</sup> It is important to note that the writer also included Contzen's instructions. I will explain the importance of this point later in the chapter. The theme of sowing internal discord recurs in *Answer to the Dissenters Plea* (1701) by the divine Thomas Bennet (1673–1728). Like the other authors mentioned above, Bennet presented Chapter 25 of the *De monarchia Hispanica* (along with excerpts from Contzen) as historical proof that Catholics favoured sectarianism: 'the Papists themselves think their Cause is promoted by our Divisions, as appears from 2 Jesuits', Campanella and Contzen.<sup>205</sup>

A closer look into a few texts published during the seventeenth century reveals how pervasive the same Jesuit stereotype was. For instance, in Edward Pelling's *A Sermon Preached on the Anniversary of That Most Execrable Murder of K. Charles the First Royal Martyr* (1682), we again are presented with 'Campanella the Jesuite', a plotter who intended to use schisms and factions to 'overthrow the established government'.<sup>206</sup> Notably, Pelling also linked Campanella to Richelieu: 'And in like manner Cardinal Richelieu counselled the French King, To use all possible means to change the Monarchy of England into a Commonwealth.'<sup>207</sup> A few years earlier, in a treatise entitled *The Case of the Bankers and*

---

<sup>200</sup> Edward Reynolds, *An Humble Exhortation to the Honourable House of Commons, ... Taken out of a Sermon Preach'd upon Hosea XIV. 1,2*, London 1711, pp. 7-8.

<sup>201</sup> *Undone Again; or, The Plot Discover'd*, sig. A1r.

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>203</sup> Benjamin Gatton, *A View of the Cruelty and Ignorance of the Romish Church*, London 1704, p. 21.

<sup>204</sup> Edward Wells, *Some Testimonies of the Most Eminent English Dissenters, as also of Foreign Reformed Churches*, London 1706, p. 41.

<sup>205</sup> Thomas Bennet, *An Answer to the Dissenters Pleas for Separation*, Cambridge 1700, p. 11.

<sup>206</sup> Pelling, *A Sermon Preached on ... That Most Execrable Murder of K. Charles*, p. 26.

<sup>207</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 26-7.

*Their Creditors Stated and Examined* (1674), Campanella also made an appearance as ‘Campanella the Jesuite a man of infinite subtilty’.<sup>208</sup> In Robert Fage’s *Cosmography* (1667), we find Campanella described as ‘a learned Jesuit’ who sought to bring about a universal monarchy.<sup>209</sup> In another work published the same year, the famous *Pyrotechnica Loyolana*, it is claimed that Campanella told the king of Spain to use the ‘serpent of sedition’.<sup>210</sup>

The above are only a handful of the many texts in which Campanella is given the Jesuit epithet. Nevertheless, in light of this evidence, it can be tentatively suggested that each of these references goes back to a primary document or documents in which Campanella is depicted as a Jesuit, who, moreover, advocated divide and conquer tactics. As I have shown in detail in the previous chapter, divisive tactics were present in *De monarchia Hispanica*; but, of course, the Jesuit sobriquet is not present in the treatise, although Campanella does praise Jesuit policies in the work. In Chapter 4 of *De monarchia Hispanica*, for instance, he referred to the Jesuits as one of the three orders (along with the Franciscans and the Dominicans) which should be included in the king of Spain’s supreme councils (*suprema concilia*).<sup>211</sup> In Chapter 18, Campanella noted that the ‘Societas Iesu’ had been very beneficial to Germany and the New World. The German cities where they had established their colleges had always persisted in the faith.<sup>212</sup> In addition, in Chapter 26, he proposed that the king of Spain could recruit Jesuits to use the bond of religion (*religionis vinculum*) as a means of forging an alliance with the Muscovites.<sup>213</sup> All these statements are clearly endorsements of the Jesuit order; however, I would argue that they are not the source of the ‘Jesuit’ Campanella. In the rest of the treatise, Campanella also made adulatory statements about the religious and military practices of the Ottomans; yet—as far as I am aware—English commentators did not speak of a ‘Turkish’ or ‘Ottoman’ Campanella in the literature.<sup>214</sup>

Therefore, since the Jesuit connotation is absent from Campanella’s own treatise, it is reasonable to assume that it was a *post hoc* addition, supplied either by commentators on the

---

<sup>208</sup> Thomas Turnor, *The Case of the Bankers and Their Creditors Stated and Examined*, London 1674, sig. E3r.

<sup>209</sup> Robert Fage, *Cosmography or, a Description of the Whole World*, London 1667, p. 113.

<sup>210</sup> *Pyrotechnica Loyolana*, p. 106.

<sup>211</sup> MH, p. 38.

<sup>212</sup> Ibid., p. 149: ‘in primis vero Iohannes III in India collegia & seminaria erexerunt in quibus magnus numerus adolescentulorum omnis generis sub disciplina Patrum e Societate Iesu educator: qui etiam Germaniae & Novo Mundo hoc modo plurimum profuerunt. Nam civitates Germaniae in quibus illi Patres vivunt, semper perstiterunt in fide’.

<sup>213</sup> Ibid., p. 212.

<sup>214</sup> See, e.g., *ibid.*, pp. 151-3, 255-60. On the theme of the ‘Ottoman’ Campanella, see Malcolm, ‘The Crescent and the City of the Sun’.

text or by its translators. But a closer survey of Chilmead's version provides no further clues as to the origin of the Jesuit Campanella. In fact, unlike those who claimed Campanella to be a Jesuit or a crypto-Jesuit, Chilmead tried to historicize Campanella in the preface to his translation and rightly maintained that he was a friar.<sup>215</sup> Then, after giving a short synopsis of Campanella's sufferings under the Inquisition and indicating the date of the original composition of *De monarchia Hispanica*, Chilmead advanced the notion that the treatise could be used as an interpretative tool to understand the political events of the day, a veritable 'Political Glasse', encouraging 'all wise, judicious men' to make use of Campanella's advice.<sup>216</sup> A further proof of the objective character of Chilmead's historiographic intent is his acknowledgment of the Italian Dominican's complex character. In his opinion, Campanella was both a man of erudition and a castigator of Protestants.<sup>217</sup>

While there is no trace whatever of the 'Jesuit' Campanella in Chilmead, there are many overt references to this mythical figure in another work which was released around the same time as Chilmead's translation. The work, compiled by an anonymous author and published by Michael Sparke, is *The Plots of Jesuites viz. of Robert Parsons an English-Man, Adam Contzen a Moguntine, Tho. Campanella a Spaniard, &c.* (1653).<sup>218</sup> Revealingly, the subtitle corresponds exactly to Campanella's supposed agenda: 'How to bring ENGLAND To the Romane Religion Without Tumult.'<sup>219</sup> In addition, the pamphlet's frontispiece depicts a fantastical scene in the fashion of the Last Supper. The pope, surrounded by Campanella, Parsons, Richelieu and Contzen, sits at the head of a table on which rest two books: Parsons's *Memorial for the Reformation of England* and Campanella's *De monarchia Hispanica*.<sup>220</sup> Furthermore, Sparke explicitly described the four men as 'Jesuites' in his preface.<sup>221</sup>

With regard to the structure of the *Plots of Jesuites*, it is effectively a digest of the programmes devised by Campanella and his putative associates. I will fully discuss the specifics of Contzen's and Richelieu's programme at a later point; but for now it is sufficient to say that each plot postulates subtle and coercive techniques to subdue Protestant kingdoms. Although the complete text of Richelieu's instructions is notably absent from the work, the main idea of the cardinal's plan is alluded to on the first page of the section devoted to

---

<sup>215</sup> Chilmead, 'The Translator to the Reader', in SM, sig. A2<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>216</sup> Ibid., sig. A3<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>217</sup> Ibid., sig. A3<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>218</sup> *Plots of Jesuits*, London 1653.

<sup>219</sup> Ibid., sig. A2<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>220</sup> Ibid., sig. A1<sup>v</sup>.

<sup>221</sup> Ibid., sig. A2<sup>v</sup>.

Campanella. Richelieu is specifically accused of advocating the ‘same advice’ as Campanella.<sup>222</sup> Furthermore, one Latin excerpt inserted into the margins appears to have been reformulated, making Campanella seem more anti-English. In the section on schools of natural sciences in Chapter 25, the original text begins: ‘the best way to weaken the religion of the region’ (*religio regionis*). The author of *Plots of Jesuits* changed it to: ‘the best way to weaken the religion of the English’ (*Anglorum Religio*).<sup>223</sup>

In addition, he makes two contradictory claims. First, he says that Campanella meant to bring England to the ‘Romane Religion’.<sup>224</sup> Second, he states that Campanella desired to ‘usher in a new Religion’ with a ‘new Philosophy’. Although the commentator rightly interprets Campanella’s advice about the possibility of exploiting the relations between the Irish, Scottish and the English, he seems to misunderstand or purposefully misconstrue the intention behind it. Unlike Chilmead, he ignores the fact that in the chapter in question, Campanella did not counsel the king to re-introduce Catholicism as an end *per se*. Rather, he suggested that the Spanish king should sow the seeds of inextricable war (*semina belli inexplicabilis*) between Scotland and England, ‘so that neither country would have the time to disturb Spanish affairs’.<sup>225</sup> It is therefore clear that the author of the *Plots of Jesuits* employed some degree of framing in order to characterize Campanella as the popish plotter portrayed in the frontispiece. Perhaps, we can go so far as to say that the *Plots of Jesuits* uniquely and imaginatively deemed Campanella, Richelieu, Parsons, and Contzen as participants in a contiguous and long-planned conspiracy. This differs drastically from Chilmead’s work, even though both texts were released in the same period.

As for the origin and framing of the ideas presented in the document, Sparke’s statements provide us with a number of clues. First, he claimed that he had first stumbled on allusions to the plots of the four conspirators in the preface to a work entitled *An Apologie of the Reformed Churches*. He maintained that he made the decision to publicize the details of the plots because he thought that they provided information which would be helpful for the preservation of his ‘Religion and Native Country’.<sup>226</sup> Another point worth noting is that

---

<sup>222</sup> Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>223</sup> Ibid., p. 9. It is unclear whether this amendment was made purposefully to put Campanella’s advice in a national context. In this way, Campanella could appear more as an enemy of the English people than as a critic of the British Isles in general. It is also possible that the translator shortened the text to make it punchier.

<sup>224</sup> Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>225</sup> MH, p. 208: ‘Quibus modis fiet ut semina belli inexplicabilis inter Angliam & Scotiam iaciantur, ita ut neutra spatium habitura sit ad disturbandas res Hispanicas.’

<sup>226</sup> *Plots of Jesuits*, sig. A2v: ‘Meeting with two Editions of a small (but very learned and pious) Treatise, highly commended by the most eminent Ministers in France (to say nothing of some in England) Entituled, An Apologie for the Reformed Churches, against those who accuse them of Schisme. with the Iudgement of an

Prynne is the text's most cited secondary source. He is mentioned as one of the few parliamentarians who, in December 1648, spoke out against a book by Robert Parsons. Prynne's *Romes Masterpeece* is recommended as a useful reading for those who 'would read more of such Jesuiticall Plots'.<sup>227</sup>

So far I have traced the tradition of the 'Jesuit' Campanella to 1653; but, as indicated in my Introduction, however, its origins go back at least to 1649, when Prynne suggested that Campanella and Parsons had provided the strategic foundation for the New Model Army's actions. In this context, Prynne explicitly associated Campanella with the Jesuits. It is worth noting, however, that there is another work of the same period that, while not referring to Campanella as a Jesuit, nevertheless portrayed him as a plotter against England. This work, *An Entertainment of Solitarinesse*, was written sometime after December 1648 and was published in 1649.<sup>228</sup> The author, the royalist colonel Richard Tempest (1619-1662), had, like Prynne, studied at Lincoln's Inn, matriculating on 18 May 1636.<sup>229</sup> In *Solitarinesse*, Tempest argued that it was the 'Pen of Campanella' which had delineated 'the Draught of our Ruine'.<sup>230</sup> Campanella, he declared, had 'inlarged his minde to the consideration of all Crownes'. Tempest demonstrated this point by reviewing Chapter 25 of Campanella's *De monarchia Hispanica*. He claimed that the defamers of the English polity were using tactics learnt at Campanella's school to escalate conflicts between the Presbyterians, the Independents and the Cavaliers.<sup>231</sup>

Tempest and Prynne may well have been aware of each other's ideas, but it is difficult to say if one was inspired by the other. Prynne's *Brief Memento* was published on 1 January 1649, and Tempest's work could have been known to him prior to this date. Still, we at least

---

Universitie-man, &c. And finding in the Preface of each Edition some mention of the Plots of Parsons, Contzen and Campanella, and other Jesuites, and of their Directions how to bring England to the Superstition and Idolatry of the Church of Rome, but seeing far more in one Edition of the said book than in another, I conceive my self obliged in Conscience, and faithfulness to my Religion and Native Country, not to suffer a Discovery, of which very excellent use may be made (for the preservation of both) to lie hid any longer: which in brief is the cause of this publication.' The work in question is Jean Daillé, *An Apologie for the Reformed Churches; Wherein is shew'd The necessitie of their separation from the Church of Rome: Against those who accuse them of making a Schisme in Christendome. And a Preface added; containing the Judgement of a University-Man, concerning Mr. Knot's last book against Mr. Chillingworth*, London 1653. The author of the preface asserted that he had heard news of Campanella's and Parsons's plots from 'English seminaries' and from 'relations' in Newcastle and Brecknock. See *ibid.*, p. 12.

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 14.

<sup>228</sup> Richard Tempest, *An Entertainment of Solitarinesse*, London 1649. Tempest's epistle is dated to 20 December 1648.

<sup>229</sup> *The Records of the Honorable Society of Lincoln's Inn*, 2 vols, London, 1896, I, p. 230. For corroboration of Tempest's military service, see *A Letter from Sir Arthur Hesilrige to the Honorable William Lenthall ... Together with Colonel Lilburn's Letter to Sir Arthur Hesilrige*, London 1648; *A True and Perfect Relation of a Great Victory Obtained by the Parliaments Forces in Northumberland*, London 1648.

<sup>230</sup> Tempest, *Entertainment of Solitarinesse*, p. 111.

<sup>231</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 108-9, 114-15.

know that Tempest did not label Campanella as a Jesuit. In addition, *Entertainment of Solitarinesse* was the only work of Tempest which mentioned Campanella. It is therefore more likely that Prynne—who was a much more high-profile individual than Tempest and who was also the only Briton consistently writing on Campanella in the 1650s—was the source of the legend. Thus, pending new information, Tempest can be excluded from the Campanella tradition which concerns us. This literary *topos*, as I have said, always explicitly refers to Campanella as a propagator of Jesuitical artifices. I am therefore inclined to consider the *Plots of the Jesuits* as a redaction of interrelated commonplaces which Prynne had already expressed in his popish myths (i.e., his Laudian and Ancient Plots). One piece of evidence is that Richelieu’s plot first appeared in Prynne’s *Sad and Serious Political Considerations* (1650), where the cardinal was presented as embroiling ‘all our kingdoms in civill wares against each other’ to benefit ‘France and the Catholike Religion’.<sup>232</sup> Prynne appears to have been the first writer to suggest publicly that Richelieu played a role in setting off the English revolution. As I shall explain later on, he had incorporated Richelieu into the Laudian Plot in 1643. As he understood it, Richelieu cooperated with Laud and other papists to spy on the English and incite rebellions in Ireland.<sup>233</sup> It could therefore be argued that Prynne was developing an unexplored strand of Richelieu’s plotting. Additional evidence confirming the hypothesis that Prynne’s influence was behind the *Plots of the Jesuits* is his condemnation of Parsons in 1648 and 1649 while militating against the New Model Army and the Independents.<sup>234</sup> Yet this was not the first time Prynne had denounced Parsons. In 1645, he had accused Parsons of instigating Catholics to disregard the Oath of Allegiance, not to mention that during the 1630s and 1640s he had portrayed Contzen as the main inspiration behind the Arminian conspirators.<sup>235</sup> All these elements show that the *Plots of Jesuites*, like the *Apologie of the Reformed Church*, was drawing on earlier anti-popery polemics rather

---

<sup>232</sup> William Prynne, *Serious and Sad Political Considerations*, London 1650, p. 20.

<sup>233</sup> See, for example, William Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darkenes Brought to Publike Light, or, A Necessary Introduction to the History of the Archbishop of Canterburie's Triall*, London 1645, pp. 84, 100, 215.

<sup>234</sup> Prynne, *Substance of a Speech*, p. 108. Prynne claimed that Parsons had written a book under the alias ‘Dolman’. This book, Prynne maintained, supported the doctrine of deposing kings. See also Prynne, *Brief Memento*, p. 5. Here Prynne mentions the title *Quodlibets* by William Watson, a work that, among other things, includes numerous invectives against Parsons and the Jesuits. I shall discuss Watson’s use of Parsons in Chapter 8.

<sup>235</sup> Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darkenes*, pp. 202-3. See William Prynne, *Histrio-Mastix*, London 1633, p. 827. Prynne wrote that the disciples of the ‘Moguntine’ Jesuit Contzen had a plot to ‘cheat a Protestant Church of her religion and to scruce in Popery into it by degrees without noyse or tumult’. See also William Prynne, *A Looking-Glasse for All Lordly Prelates*, London 1636, sig. c1v: ‘This Iesuiticall stratagem of theirs [the Lord Prelates](prescribed by Conc’ in his Politiques, as one of the chiefe meanes to undermine Religion, and all protestant States and Churches,) is worthy his Majesties and his Nobles most serious consideration, and prevention in due time; for feare it inslave them and the whole Kingdome to the Pope and Prelates, before they are aware of it.’

than casting Campanella, Contzen and Parsons in a new light. In addition, the fact that the ‘Jesuit’ Campanella is almost always grouped alongside these figures from the 1650s onwards suggests that the writers behind these treatises were reproducing the conclusions of a source which had already made those connections.<sup>236</sup>

To reinforce my contention that Prynne fashioned the ‘Jesuit’ Campanella, I will now supply two more points. The first is that Prynne himself, in the infamous preface in which he portrayed Campanella as a ‘Second Machiavel’, claimed to be the ‘chief cause’ of the decision to translate Campanella’s *De monarchia Hispanica* into English.<sup>237</sup> The second point is that the *Plots of Jesuits* was brought out sometime between 1653 and 1654—around the same time that Prynne was released from a three-year-long prison term.<sup>238</sup> Like many of Prynne’s works, *Plots of Jesuits* was printed by Sparke at Blue Arbour, probably after August 1653.<sup>239</sup> Prynne’s *Gospel Plea* was published in September and his *Jus Patronatus* (which refers to the plots of Richelieu, Parsons and Campanella) was released in May of 1654.<sup>240</sup> As Prynne was actively collaborating with Sparke during this period, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Prynne had supplied his publisher with some sort of input, such as his own notes or additional tracts from other outlets. It is also possible that the *Plots of Jesuits* came out as a brief, straightforward condensation of Prynne’s burgeoning theories on the Ancient Plot. As such, it could have functioned as a practical and rapid way for Sparke both to gauge the public’s interest and to reintroduce Prynne’s ideas before publishing his *Jus Patronatus*. We may assume that Sparke, by printing the *Plots of Jesuits*, intended to make the public more familiar (or perhaps more open) to the arguments of *Jus Patronatus*, in which Prynne attributed the changes in the government to Campanella and his associates.

Another point worth noting is that Sparke’s decision to publish the *Plots of the Jesuits* was likely influenced (directly or indirectly) by the Anglo-Dutch wars. Chilmead himself

---

<sup>236</sup> Richelieu and Parsons are occasionally excluded from the grouping. See, e.g., Claudius Gilbert, *The Libertine School’d, or A Vindication of the Magistrates Power in Religious Matters*, London 1657, p. 11; John Rogers, *Diapoliteia. A Christian Concertation with Mr. Prin, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Harrington, for the True Cause of the Commonvealth*, London 1659, pp. 27-9, 33, 36-7, 77; David Lloyd, *Modern Policy Completed, or, The Publick Actions and Councels both Civill and Military of His Excellency the Lord Generall Monck*, London 1660, p. 37; Henry Foulis, *The History of the Wicked Plots and Conspiracies of Our Pretended Saints*, London, 1662, pp. 29-30; Henry Stubbe, *Campanella Revived*, pp. 2-3; William Denton, *The Ungrateful Behaviour of the Papists, Priests, and Jesuits*, London 1679, pp. 32-3; Robert Hancock, *The Loyalty of Popish Principles Examin’d*, London 1682, pp. 53-4, 88; Edward Pettit, *Visions of Government*, London 1684, p. 109; *Brethren in Iniquity, or, The Confederacy of Papists with Sectaries*, London 1690, pp. 22-3.

<sup>237</sup> Prynne, ‘Epistle’, sig. A4v.

<sup>238</sup> Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, p. 189.

<sup>239</sup> I am assuming this because of Sparke’s remark that he had been incited to action by statements made in the preface of the 1653 edition of the *Apologie of the Reformed Churches*. The epistle of the edition is dated 2 August 1653. See *Apologie of the Reformed Churches*, sig. A2v.

<sup>240</sup> Kirby, *William Prynne*, p. 201.

indicated in the introduction to his translation that the ‘war with the Dutch’ seemed to be a ‘kind of an Accomplishment’ of Campanella’s counsel.<sup>241</sup> Perhaps hoping to capitalize on the public’s interest in the war, Sparke could have been prompted to take a topic which was already making the rounds in the press and give it an inflammatory spin.<sup>242</sup> He and Prynne had been producing incendiary material for years, and there is no reason to doubt that he was capable of doing so again.

To sum up what I have been arguing so far, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Prynne was the originator of the strand of thought which portrayed Campanella as an anti-English Jesuit. I have shown that the Jesuit Campanella was almost always clustered together with Contzen, Parsons and Richelieu. These Catholic figures are recurrent characters in Prynne’s Laudian and Ancient plots, which I would characterize as part of one contiguous popish myth. With regard to my study of Prynne’s political storytelling, Campanella—by way of the clustering mentioned above—is a literary key, a shibboleth which can be used both to unlock the mechanisms of Prynne’s narrative methods and to distinguish the English reception of his mythography. Richelieu, for example, is associated with the Laudian plot as one of Laud’s confederates and as a foreign traducer of English liberties. Similarly, Parsons is a precursor of the Laudian plot and is fleetingly depicted as an Elizabethan-era traitor and intriguer working in the interest of Rome. In the Ancient Plot, Parsons’s role comes to the forefront, and he becomes the foundation on which Richelieu and Campanella devise their plots.<sup>243</sup> Contzen, finally, plays a main part in the Laudian Plot, while in the Ancient Plot he is cited as a key source for the New Modern Army’s ultimate agenda.<sup>244</sup> In the Laudian Plot, Prynne describes him as the subtle Jesuit who outlined the schemes by means of which the Arminians (and their leader Laud) could completely subdue the Protestants. In this narrative capacity, he functions as a bridge between the Machiavellian Arminianism of the English prelacy and the Jesuit-inspired insurrectionary sectarianism of the New Model Army, the radical Independents, the apologists of the Good Old Cause and the religious separatists. Thus, to get a better understanding of these figures and their importance with respect to

---

<sup>241</sup> Campanella, *Discourse Touching the Spanish Monarchy*, sig. A2v.

<sup>242</sup> Steven Pincus has suggested that the Anglo-Dutch wars significantly contributed to the media’s interest in Campanella’s work. He noted that at least four newspapers ran advertisements for Chilmead’s translation. See S. Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650-1668*, Cambridge 2002, pp. 185-86.

<sup>243</sup> Prynne, *The Re-publicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause*, pp. 5-6.

<sup>244</sup> Prynne, *Substance of a Speech*, sig. R4r: ‘This I am most confident is their designe, by what I have met with in their papers, and in the Jesuit Contzens politiques and others, who have chalked out a way by degrees insensibly to crue Popery into any Protestant Church: by those very steps which our Prelates followed, who were directed by them, and to alter and subvert any Protestant State and Kingdom, by this new modelling of them into such a popular Anarchy, as is now suggested and presented in the Armies Remonstrance.’

Prynne's narratives, it will be helpful to scrutinize the broad ideas which most informed his conceptualization of the Catholic threat: Arminianism, Machiavellianism and Jesuit chicanery. In my opinion, these three strands provided the conditions which enabled Prynne to give narrative form to his fears.

## Chapter 3

### The Arminian Conspiracy and the Emerging of Prynne's Foundational Myths

As has already been indicated, Prynne was quite inflexible about the way Protestants should worship and behave, basing his beliefs on Elizabethan era criteria such as the Lambeth Articles. Those whom he opposed included advocates of various degrees of church reform. Usually, they supported changes such as amendments to seminal liturgical texts (for example, the Book of Common Prayer), new forms of ritualism and sacramentalism (such as bowing to the name of Jesus) and less stringent interpretations of the doctrine of predestination.<sup>245</sup> All these proposed innovations, many of which—Prynne grudgingly admitted—were embraced by learned ecclesiastics as well as others in positions of influence and authority, suggested that there was a real danger that the Protestant Church of England might return to the Catholic fold.<sup>246</sup>

Prynne called this group 'Arminians' after the Dutch Protestant theologian Jacob Arminius.<sup>247</sup> Among other things, Arminius wrote in support of the doctrine of free will and criticized Calvin's determinism. In Prynne's view, this kind of thinking was inimical to salvation because it bridged the gap between Protestantism and Catholicism.<sup>248</sup> 'Arminian novelties' were just 'Popish tenets' in disguise.<sup>249</sup> Deceptively innocuous, consisting of seemingly minor violations of church tradition, they were a 'bashfull' evil which was threatening to subtly destroy the Church of England from within.<sup>250</sup>

As regards the term 'Arminianism', it can only be imprecisely defined as a school of theology or as a fixed set of beliefs and practices. In reality, it was more akin to a form of

---

<sup>245</sup> M. Quaestier, 'Arminianism, Catholicism, and Puritanism in England during the 1630s', in *The Historical Journal*, 49, 1, 2006, pp. 53-78.

<sup>246</sup> See, for instance, Prynne, *Quench-Coale*, pp. 5, 28, 189, 320. The phrase 'backsliding to popery' was most prominently employed by King Charles in *His Maiesties Declaration to All His Loving Subiects, of the Causes Which Moved Him to Dissolve the Last Parliament*, London 1628, p. 42.

<sup>247</sup> For details on the life and enduring influence of Arminius in England and on the Continent see, K. D. Stanglin and T. H. McCall, *Jacobus Arminius: Theologian of Grace*, Oxford 2012; P. White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*, Cambridge 2002, pp. 22-38, 238-55.

<sup>248</sup> Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, p. 441.

<sup>249</sup> Prynne, *A Quench-Coale*, p. 68.

<sup>250</sup> *Ibid.*

‘philosophical skepticism’.<sup>251</sup> The anti-Arminians generally tended to define Arminianism by way of negation (that is, by whichever Calvinist tenets it excluded or reformed). Thus, Arminians were those who denied predestination and irresistible grace—in many respects they were ‘anti-Calvinists’. Given that, as Nicholas Tyacke has aptly noted, Calvinism was then the ‘*de facto* religion of the Church of England under Queen Elizabeth and King James’, Arminians were perceived as threats to the religious establishment.<sup>252</sup> Prynne and many of his contemporaries also saw Arminianism as a descendant of earlier heretical movements such as Pelagianism and Socinianism.<sup>253</sup>

The most expedient way to understand Prynne’s concept of Arminianism is to survey the chart which he outlined in the second edition of his *Antithesis to Arminianisme*. Here he summed up the ‘erroneous doctrine’ in seven propositions.<sup>254</sup> First, Arminians think that predestination is mutable and conditional. Moreover, they believe that the number of ‘the elect and reprobate is not so certain, but that it may be diminished and augmented’.<sup>255</sup> Second, they maintain that faith and good works, instead of ‘Gods free-grace’ are the preconditions for election and predestination.<sup>256</sup> Third, they hold that personal sins, as opposed to God’s prerogative are the cause of non-election. Fourth, they subscribe to the view that any person, by his or her own will, can choose to repent and be saved due to the existence of a universal divine grace. Fifth, they believe that Jesus died for every man, and not exclusively for the elect.<sup>257</sup> Sixth, they think that it is in the power of individual persons to withstand the spiritual call of God and resist conversion. Seventh, they think that reprobates are as capable of having faith as the elect. Additionally, they contend that it is possible for the Elect ‘by falling into sinne’ to ‘fall totally and finally from the very habits, seeds, and state of grace’.<sup>258</sup>

---

<sup>251</sup> See N. Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of Arminianism c. 1530-1640*, Oxford 1987, p. 245: ‘Arminian denotes a coherent body of anti-Calvinist religious thought, which was gaining ground in various regions of early seventeenth-century Europe. Arminianism itself can plausibly be understood as part of a more widespread philosophical skepticism, engendered by way of reaction to the dogmatic certainties of the sixteenth-century Reformation.’

<sup>252</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

<sup>253</sup> Prynne, *The Perpetuities of a Regenerate Mans Estate Wherein It Is Manifestly Proved by Sundry Arguments, Reasons and Authorities. That Such as Are Once Truly Regenerated and Ingrafted into Christ by a Lively Faith, Can Neither Finally nor Totally Fall from Grace*, London 1626, sig. c3r; *id.*, *The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, pp. 214-6.

<sup>254</sup> Prynne, *The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, pp. 72-5.

<sup>255</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 72.

<sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 73.

<sup>257</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 73-4

<sup>258</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 75.

On the basis of these propositions, it is clear that, from a theological point of view, Prynne linked Arminianism with a kind of pure, autonomous spiritual liberty. Taken together, the propositions convey his belief that Arminians gave too much weight to the power of individual choice. It was an inversion of authority, a supplanting of the role of determinism by the arbitrary will of individuals. In essence, Prynne's propositions illustrate his fear that Arminians subscribed to the idea that human beings, not the divinity, could choose their own destiny. It is therefore not hard to see why Prynne described Arminian thought as 'bridge, an usher unto grosse Popery'.<sup>259</sup> Arminians were treading too close for comfort to the Catholic doctrine of free will.

While these seven propositions are useful in that they tell us where Prynne felt the Arminians stood on theological matters, they do not reveal much about his attitude towards their practices (for example, 'popish' ritualism, censorship of the press and suchlike). Nor do they provide us with a historical background for Prynne's concept of orthodoxy. For Prynne, orthodoxy and orthopraxy were very much entangled with his view of the culture and traditions of the English people.<sup>260</sup> To begin with, he generally approved of the ecclesiastical customs and catechisms set down during the reigns of Edward VI, Elizabeth I and James I.<sup>261</sup> His appreciation for those periods reflected his admiration for the righteousness of the ancients. These 'ancients' were not persons from the classical age, but rather heroes from an age of faithful martyrs and learned sages who were instrumental in turning Protestantism into a *force majeure*, despite widespread persecutions and assaults on Calvinist communities in the Three Kingdoms.<sup>262</sup>

As a result, Prynne believed that the 'ancient' doctrines of the Church of England, proclaimed and expanded on during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I, were fundamentally correct. As representative of true orthodoxy and ecclesiology, they were antithetical to papist doctrines and needed to be conserved for future generations. Prynne insisted that they were 'the life of our soules, the foundation of our eternal blisse, the onely Evidences and Assurances that we haue to intitle us to saluation'.<sup>263</sup> He often defended his assertions by making appeals based on *argumenta ad verecundiam*. In the second edition of *Antithesis to Arminianisme*, for instance, he wrote that Arminianism 'in King Iames' Iudgement is

---

<sup>259</sup> Ibid., p. 258.

<sup>260</sup> Larkin, *The Making of Englishmen*, Leiden, 2013, pp. 120, 203-4.

<sup>261</sup> Prynne, *The Church of England's Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, sigs ¶2v- ¶3r, ¶¶1v; pp. 37, 52, 127-30.

<sup>262</sup> Ibid., pp. 52-6, 130, 138.

<sup>263</sup> Ibid., p. 138.

Heresie'.<sup>264</sup> Prynne's key reference was James's *A Declaration against Vorstius* (1612), a work produced to reverse the appointment of Dr Conrad Vorst as professor of divinity at the University of Leiden. Vorst (or Vorstius) had been elevated to the position in 1611; and, as a disciple of Arminius, he was seen by many to hold views which were inimical to the doctrine of predestination.<sup>265</sup> With regard to anti-Arminianism, 'Predestination and election' were tenets to which James subscribed, and he voiced his support of both at the Hampton Court Conference in 1603.<sup>266</sup>

In the *Declaration*, James also wrote that he was infuriated by the actions of another Leidener, Petrus Bertius. What especially drew James's ire was Bertius's 'shamelesse' and 'impudent' decision to send his book, the *Apostasie of the Saints*, to the Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>267</sup> For James, this was the final straw; he was 'constrained' as the 'Defender of the Faith' of the Reformed Church to put a stop to the 'abominable heresies' promoted by the 'followers of Arminius'.<sup>268</sup> He repeatedly referred to Arminian doctrines as infectious and afflicted by 'gangrene', maintaining that they would bring Christendom to utter destruction.<sup>269</sup> In the margins, of *Antithesis to Arminianisme*, Prynne reminded his readers of the significance of James's incontrovertible words. Any Arminian who disagreed was daring to call the king a liar:

... by King James his expresse resolution, the Arminian heresies are contrary and no waies agreeable to the Religion and doctrine of the Church of England, and dare any Arminian be so bold as to give him the lye?<sup>270</sup>

Although the true motivations behind the composition of *A Declaration* were certainly not as straightforward as Prynne apparently assumed, his aim was to make James appear to be a fierce opponent of the Arminians. James's denunciations were presented as proof of the antiquity of anti-Arminian sentiment and as evidence that Arminianism was not approved by the monarchy. Yet Prynne did not solely rely on James. He also linked his arguments for the

---

<sup>264</sup> Ibid., p. 204.

<sup>265</sup> For further information on the controversies surrounding Vorstius see, J. Rohls, 'Calvinism, Arminianism and Socinianism in the Netherlands until the Synod of Dort', in *Socinianism and Arminianism: Antitrinitarians, Calvinists, and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-century Europe*, ed. M. Muslow and J. Rohls, Leiden 2005, pp. 21-8.

<sup>266</sup> Prynne, *The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, pp. 88-9. For the primary source text, see William Barlow, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference... at Hampton Court*, London 1604, p. 43.

<sup>267</sup> Prynne, *The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, p. 204.

<sup>268</sup> Ibid., pp. 206-7.

<sup>269</sup> Ibid., p. 205.

<sup>270</sup> Ibid.

antiquity of anti-Arminianism to the precepts of the many Protestant writers who lived during the reigns of King Edward VI, Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth, such as John Knox, John Foxe, William Tyndale, William Whitaker, John Prideaux and Peter Martyr.<sup>271</sup> Analysing all of Prynne's sources is beyond the scope of this chapter; and it will be more useful here to focus on an event which left a deep and tangible impact on Prynne's anti-Arminian thought.

The Lambeth Articles were issued by a council of scholars, prelates and presbyters in response to the ostensibly subversive ideas of William Barrett (fl. 1595) and Peter Baro (1534–1599). Both men were theologians at the University of Cambridge who were doubtful about many of Calvin's teachings.<sup>272</sup> This brought them into conflict with the staunchly Calvinist wing of the faculty, the notable members of which included Laurence Chaderton and William Whitaker. Baro, who was then the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, has been described as an 'Arminian *avant le lettre*'.<sup>273</sup> He espoused, among other things, the doctrine of free will and the ability of humans to reject divine grace.

When, in 1595, Barrett preached a sermon in which he questioned the extent to which individuals could be confident of their own salvation, the university took action and demanded that Barrett formally renounce his statements.<sup>274</sup> He was eventually forced to recant, but did so, Prynne claimed, 'not with that remorse or humility as was expected'.<sup>275</sup> Baro and Barrett resigned from their posts, and Barrett—perhaps unsurprisingly—was later received into the Catholic Church. Predictably, Prynne wrote that this outcome was another sign that Arminian positions were 'only a bridge to popery':

Not long after this *Palinodium* [recantation], Master *Barret*, (to shew that these positions are but a bridge to Popery) departs the Uniuersitie, and gets beyond Sea; where he (as *Bertius*, and some other *Arminians* since have done) turnes a professed Papist.<sup>276</sup>

---

<sup>271</sup> A full list of writers can be found in *ibid.*, sigs rr\*4r-ss\*4r.

<sup>272</sup> For an overview of the actions and beliefs of Baro and Barrett, see H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge*, 2nd edn, Cambridge 2015, pp. 314–90; P. Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, Cambridge 1982, pp. 201–42; Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, pp. 29–36.

<sup>273</sup> N. Tyacke, 'From Laudians to Latitudinarians: A Shifting Balance of Theological Forces', in *The Later Stuart Church, 1660–1714*, ed. G. Tapsell, Manchester 2017, p. 48.

<sup>274</sup> An excellent summary of the fiasco and the ensuing (albeit semi-official) censuring of Barrett and re-affirmation of Calvinist orthodoxy is in J. Collier, *Debating Perseverance: The Augustinian Heritage in Post-Reformation England*, Oxford 2018, pp. 20–58.

<sup>275</sup> Prynne, *The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, p. 61.

<sup>276</sup> *Ibid.*

In his recantation, Barrett specifically apologized for asserting: 1) that no man can be assured of his salvation except by revelation; 2) that the faith of some men could ‘faile’; 3) that having certainty regarding ‘the time to come’ (that is, the afterlife) was ‘proude’; 4) that there were ‘distinctions’ between the faith of individuals; 5) that ‘no true faithfull man’ can be sure that his sins are forgiven; and 6) that one’s personal sin is the ‘first cause of reprobation’ (that is, damnation). Barrett also expressed regret for criticizing Calvin, Jerome Zunchius, Theodore Beza, Francis Junius the Elder and Peter Martyr.<sup>277</sup> After censuring Barrett, a group of dons and bishops met with the Archbishop of Canterbury in order to put the Arminian controversy to rest once and for all. Their discussions resulted in the drafting of the Lambeth Articles.<sup>278</sup> In short, the nine articles defended the doctrine of predestination, re-affirmed the concept of unconditional grace and re-iterated the believer’s complete assurance in salvation.

In his commentary on the aftermath of the Cambridge controversy, Prynne declared that the Articles comprised the ‘ancient, received, and undoubted Doctrine of the Church of England’.<sup>279</sup> This was because they were produced in accordance with ‘the best approved divines, both at home and abroad, during the whole Raigne of Queen Elizabeth’.<sup>280</sup> These men had ‘force and credit’; they demonstrated that they could restrain ‘men from preaching Arminianisme’.<sup>281</sup> This was evidence that the articles were not ‘novel or singular opinions’, but ‘substantiall points of Religion’. Anti-Arminianism was therefore ‘the ancient, received Religion of the Uniuersity of Cambridge, and the Church of England’. With these observations in mind, Prynne, appealing to the authority of the past, asked: ‘Arminianisme was then reputed corruption and disturbance, & is it not so now?’<sup>282</sup>

So far I have only considered Prynne’s rejection of the legitimacy of Arminianism. Much more can be said a propos of the voluminous number of works which helped to mould his overall perception of Arminianism. I would like now to focus on two other major influences which form the backdrop to Prynne’s anti-Arminian thought and conspiracy-orientated storytelling. First, regarding theology, Prynne thought that the Arminians’ emphasis on arbitrariness was heretical. Second, he felt that his stance on the orthodoxy of anti-Arminianism was justified since it was apparently upheld by the Protestant divines and monarchs of the mid-sixteenth century.

---

<sup>277</sup> Ibid., pp. 56-9.

<sup>278</sup> Ibid., pp. 12-15.

<sup>279</sup> Ibid., p. 255.

<sup>280</sup> Ibid., p. 258.

<sup>281</sup> Ibid., p. 255.

<sup>282</sup> Ibid., pp. 255-8.

Prynne's repeated stress on the conclusiveness of the judgement of King James and the University of Cambridge is sufficient evidence that these events served as formative elements of Prynne's early anti-Arminianism. It would, however, be impossible to identify a direct link between Prynne's anti-Arminianism and his earliest anti-Catholic conspiracy theories without also considering a third factor: the practices associated with Arminianism. Indeed, it can be argued that Prynne developed his first stories in reaction to the rituals and policies which were first proposed in the late 1620s. Things eventually came to a head in the 1630s, when he became convinced that Laud and a popish coterie associated with King Charles I's court were deliberately fostering programmes which were hostile to English Protestantism.<sup>283</sup>

Yet, before Prynne came into conflict with Laud, he had engaged in besmirching the reputation of prominent clergymen whom he felt were overly sympathetic to Arminian reformers. One of the many targets of his scandalmongering was Dr John Cosin (1594-1672). In 1627, he published his *Collection of Private Devotions*, a 'Book of Hours' which included customs that smacked of the Catholicism of the pre-Reformation Church.<sup>284</sup> Cosin also wrote in support of other ostensibly popish activities and practices, such as keeping a calendar of the saints, making the sign of the cross, venerating holy images, praying for the dead, and believing in the intercessory or mediatory powers of angels. Especially troublesome for Prynne was the fact that Cosin's appeared to advocate the seven sacraments.<sup>285</sup> The similarities between the author of the *Devotions* and the Roman Church were too obvious for Prynne to ignore. He mounted a spirited response in his *Cozen's Cozening Devotions*, lambasting Cosin for attempting to resurrect 'popish absurdities'. A conspiracy was afoot, and, according to Prynne, Cosin was not a true Protestant, but a 'professed papist', a secret agent for Rome.<sup>286</sup>

It is important here to remember that Prynne did not simply believe Cosin had misinterpreted the Bible or misunderstood Calvinist orthodoxy. For Prynne, there was no middle ground. Cosin, like Barrett, was plainly guilty of heresy, and his actions in publishing

---

<sup>283</sup> See, for example, Prynne, *A Looking-Glasse for All Lordly Prelates*, pp. 43, 46-7, 59.

<sup>284</sup> For a summary of main criticisms of *Private Devotions* by Cosin's Calvinist contemporaries, see Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England*, pp. 79-85.

<sup>285</sup> At the time, the Church of England approved only of baptism and the Lord's Supper. See William Prynne, *A Briefe Survey and Censure of Mr Cozens His Couzening Devotions Proving both the Forme and Matter of Mr Cozens His Booke of Private Devotions, or the Houres of Prayer, Lately Published, to Be Meerely Popish: to Differ from the Private Prayers Authorized by Queene Elizabeth 1560*, London 1628, pp. 21-1.

<sup>286</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 104: 'I haue heard: with the publik bruite, and same of most that know him; proclaime him an open and professed Papist, an industrious Factor, and an undoubted member of the Church of Rome, whose good he wholly labours: and no true member of our English Church.'

the book 'were advantageous onely to the Church of Rome'.<sup>287</sup> By launching into *ad hominem* attacks and making insinuations about Cosin's motives, Prynne was invoking the language of conspiracy. This sermonizing method of rhetoric, as I shall argue later on, helped him to create strongly polarized narratives. As Prynne would ultimately conclude in his condemnation of Laud, Parsons and Campanella, the only logical explanation for Cosin's bad judgement was that he was a part of a conspiracy.

### Arminianism and Prynne's Proto-Myths

Nowhere is the essence of Prynne's argument for alarmism made clearer than in the 'Epistle' of the *Cozening Devotions*. After stating that Arminian teachings should be suppressed, Prynne proposed that 'higher and superior spheres' and 'greater streames, and higher fountaines' were the real causes of the unorthodox ideas which were being propagated by Protestant churchmen. These seemingly abstract forces were slowly but effectively poisoning the English Church and producing the bitter fruits of Arminianism and popery. A proper excision of the roots of such outgrowths was therefore needed, and Prynne was convinced that he was the one to do it.<sup>288</sup>

In the concluding remarks of his 'Epistle', Prynne asserted that 'Romane and Arminian pioneers' were hard at work attempting to bring about the downfall of the Church of England. The state and kingdom, moreover, were in decline because of the Church's backsliding. 'Our state enemies', he declared, 'are none other than our Church enemies.'<sup>289</sup> Who were the Church's enemies? Later, Prynne explained that Cosin's *Devotions* seemed as if it was composed for the benefit of foreign and domestic nuns, friars and monks ('who now lurke among us') as well as Roman Catholic converts ('who swarm so thicke of late in every corner').<sup>290</sup> With its nearly 'impregnable' arguments, the book's purpose was to empower all 'popish factors' and bring 'weak' Protestants over to 'Romes Allegiance'.<sup>291</sup>

Prynne expanded on this theme in *Newes from Ipswich* (1636) and *Quench-Coale* (1637). In *Newes*, he took the Church of England bishops to task for seeking to murder the

---

<sup>287</sup> Ibid., p. 88. See also *ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>288</sup> Ibid., sig ¶¶4r-v

<sup>289</sup> Ibid., sigs A3v-A4r.

<sup>290</sup> Ibid., pp. 40-1.

<sup>291</sup> Ibid., p. 84: 'in administring strong, & almost impregnable Arguments, to all seducing Priests, & Popish Factors, [the *Private Devotions* helps] to inuegle, peruert, and seduce the weeke, the feeble, and vnstable members of our Church, (yea, and the stronger to,) and to winne them vnto Romes Allegiance'.

‘peoples soules’.<sup>292</sup> They were doing this, he claimed, by profaning the Sabbath (forbidding ministers from preaching on Sunday afternoons during the public fast of 1636).<sup>293</sup> Prynne argued that frequent preaching was powerfully beneficial, as godly ministers saved more people in a year ‘than all the Lord Bishops in England or the world have done in divers ages’. Moreover, the de-sacralization of the Sabbath fostered immorality and had an adverse effect on people’s physical health. The plague’s persistence was a sign of God’s displeasure, and it would not be dispelled unless ‘Gods ministers and people’ were liberated from the ‘tyrannizing lordly prelates’.<sup>294</sup>

Specifically, Prynne accused the prelates of incurring God’s wrath by expunging clauses and passages from the Book of Common Prayer, such as the ‘prayer for seasonable weather’.<sup>295</sup> All these actions signalled to him that there was ‘a resolved professed conspiracy of these Romish Prelates even now againe utterly to drown us in popish superstitions and idolatry’.<sup>296</sup> In the margins he clarified his claim by linking the bishops’ injunctions to Arminian practices:

Witnes their a tering of the Gunpowder treason booke, their pleading for the Pope and church of Rome, and setting up Altars, Images, Crucifixes, and bowing to them in all Cathedrals, and elsewhere, and in their own Chappels.<sup>297</sup>

In the pamphlet’s peroration, Prynne amplified his conspiratorial denunciations by reminding Charles (to whom the pamphlet was addressed) of his father’s virtue. King James, Prynne explained, had been the English monarch most worthy of the title ‘Defender of the Faith’ precisely because he fought against popery and ‘restored the preaching of Gods word’.<sup>298</sup> Charles needed to do the same because the ‘prelates’ had traitorous intentions of ‘exercising their ecclesiastical power’ or ‘papal jurisdiction’ to overthrow both the monarchy and the

---

<sup>292</sup> William Prynne, *Newes from Ipswich, Discovering Certaine Late Detestable Practises of Some Domineering Lordly Prelates, to Undermine the Established Doctrine and Discipline of Our Church, Extirpate All Orthodox Sincere Preachers and Preaching of Gods Word, Usher in Popery, Superstition and Idolatry; with Their Late Notorious Purgations of the New Fastbooke*, Ipswich 1636, sig. ¶1r.

<sup>293</sup> In October 1636, the Church of England, troubled by the apparent surge in plague-related deaths and concerned for the public heath, had put restrictions on the preaching of sermons after certain hours. In some districts it was effectively a moratorium, and preaching was completely forbidden. For more on the controversy which this elicited from dissidents, see T. Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620-1643*, Cambridge 1997, pp. 69-72.

<sup>294</sup> Prynne, *Cozens Cozening Devotions*, sig. ¶3v. See also, Prynne, *Quench-Coale*, pp. 43-4.

<sup>295</sup> Prynne, *Newes from Ipswich*, sig. ¶2v.

<sup>296</sup> *Ibid.*, sig. ¶3r.

<sup>297</sup> *Ibid.* See also, Prynne, *Quench-Coale*, pp. 10-17.

<sup>298</sup> Prynne, *Newes from Ipswich*, sig. ¶4r.

laws of the land.<sup>299</sup> One of the ways they meant to achieve this, Prynne maintained, would be the creation of an ‘Index expurgatorius’ of ‘Ancient English writers’.<sup>300</sup>

Prynne maintained this doom-saying tenor in *Quench-Coale*, providing his readers with a backstory. Markedly, he initiated his criticism by proposing the existence of a link between Jesuits (who had ‘secretly undermined’ the Church) and ‘Some English priests and prelates’.<sup>301</sup> Noting the recent appearance of meteorological and infectious phenomena (for example, the plague and misshapen rainbows), as well as the ‘backslidings’ of the ‘past 4 years’, Prynne concluded that another subversive plot against the state was imminent.<sup>302</sup> This statement, in addition to further information which he presented in the pamphlet, shows that he was already indulging in conspiratorial rhetoric. It would take him only six more years to unveil the new Gunpowder Plot in *Romes Masterpeece* and *The Popish Royall Favourite*.

*Quench-Coale* is also the earliest work of Prynne’s to include two contemporary anecdotes about a clandestine alliance between the Catholic Church and Arminian ecclesiastics. If we see Prynne’s propaganda as dependent on the mythology which he devised, then these anecdotes should be interpreted as proto-myths. Later, I shall show that these tales, combined with a longer story which appears in *Canterburies Doome*, can be seen as early models—in terms of narrative structure—of Prynne’s Jesuit plots. The *Quench-Coale* is therefore especially important for this study because it both reveals the origins of Prynne’s conspiratorial storytelling and serves as a sort of summation of the practical and theological aspects of his anti-Arminianism.

As regards the problem of Arminianism, Prynne expanded on much of what he had already touched on in *Newes*. The censorship of the press, the proliferation of popish rituals and the oppression of Calvinist ministers were all banes which originated with a cohort of malicious Arminians and papists. In particular, Prynne expressed his anger that innovators were attempting to ‘dogmatize’ about the necessity of installing and bowing to altars in churches.<sup>303</sup> The introduction of these rituals Prynne attributed to ‘Cozen and his party’ or the Arminian faction, a group which included churchmen like Peter Heylyn (1599-1662) and

---

<sup>299</sup> Ibid.: ‘these perfidious prelates... pulled thy Crowne off thy Royal head, to set it on their own trayterous ambitious pates, by exercising all ecclesiastical power, yea Papal jurisdiction over thy subjects in their own names and rights alone; and by trampling all thy lawes and Subjects liberties like Cobwebs’.

<sup>300</sup> Ibid. ‘Index Expurgatorius’ is an allusion to the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, the official list of works deemed heretical by the Catholic Church. Given the context, ‘ancient English writers’ here signifies anti-Arminian pamphleteers.

<sup>301</sup> Ibid., sig. a2r.

<sup>302</sup> Ibid., pp. 316, 319- 20.

<sup>303</sup> Prynne, *Quench-Coale*, sig. a3r; pp. 31, 34.

Richard Montague (1577-1641).<sup>304</sup> The early Church had done without the rites until the year 260, and it had not been a tradition established ‘in the time of Queen Elizabeth’; therefore, in Prynne’s eyes, it was popery.<sup>305</sup>

Furthermore, Prynne (much like the ‘King James Only’ movement of modern times) declared that small grammatical changes in the Book of Common Prayer (for instance, changing ‘in’ to ‘at’) were intentionally made to legitimize heretical acts such as bowing at the name of Jesus and venerating images.<sup>306</sup> He asserted that these alterations (in fact, entirely imagined) were illegitimate and therefore incompatible with the ‘Primitive’, that is, true church because they had not been used for ‘1200 years’ after the death of Christ.<sup>307</sup> In addition to claiming that the bishops had attempted to deflect culpability for the Gunpowder Plot away from the Jesuits, Prynne observed that a new sentence had been added to the twentieth clause in the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion in the Book of Common Prayer. The ‘forgery’ reads thus: ‘The Church hath power to decree Rules and Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith.’<sup>308</sup>

According to Prynne, the sentence had been subtly inserted into the text to override the restrictions put forward in the original article. The initial formulation rejects outright the legality of the Church performing anything ‘that is contrary to Gods word’.<sup>309</sup> For Prynne, who likened the addition to the Donation of Constantine, the amendment was significant because it revealed that the bishops were willing to forge laws in order to make the subverting of them legal.<sup>310</sup> The ‘Church’, Prynne affirmed, meant ‘nothing else but the bishops’ and the ‘Cleargie’, and their tampering with the text demonstrated that they intended to authorize new policies without the consent of the king and Parliament.<sup>311</sup>

---

<sup>304</sup> Ibid., p. 12. See also, pp. 30-2. For a fuller depiction of Montague’s relationship with Arminianism, see A. Streete, ‘Arminian is Like a Flying Fish: Region, Religion and Polemics in the Montagu Controversy 1623-1626’, in *Region, Religion and English Renaissance Literature*, ed. D. Coleman, Farnham 2013, pp. 105-21.

<sup>305</sup> Ibid., pp. 5, 11.

<sup>306</sup> Ibid., p. 8: ‘All the Common Prayer-Bookes before the yeare of our Lord 1629...read that text of Phil. 2. 10. according to the original...That IN the name of Iesus every knee should bow, &c. But these Innovatours, to Jdolize the name Iesus, and usher in the Ceremony of Capping and bowing to it (thereby to make way for bowing to Images, Altars, Adoration of the Eucharist and other Romish Innovations) in the yeare of our Lord 1629 (the very next yeare after your Majesties Declarations) turned this IN into AT the Name (as one Prelate did the like before in the New Translation of the Bible for the same purpose).’

<sup>307</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>308</sup> Ibid., pp. 18-9.

<sup>309</sup> Ibid., p. 18: ‘It is not Lawfull for the Church to ordaine any thing that is contrary to Gods Words’. For the full article in the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, see *Articles Whereupon It Was Agreed by the Archbishopbes and Bishoppes of both Provinces, and the Whole Cleargie, in the Convocation Holden at London in the Yere of Our Lorde God. 1562*, London 1571, sig. C3r.

<sup>310</sup> Prynne, *Quench-Coale*, p. 22.

<sup>311</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

Prynne insisted that Charles should move to strip offending prelates and clergymen of their influence and privileges. Through their malice, they had caused believers to flee the country, and some had lost their beliefs entirely.<sup>312</sup> Moreover, anti-Arminian preachers were being dismissed from their posts, and Jesuits and a ‘Babilonish crew’ of papists, emboldened by the social unrest, were pullulating in swarms, progressively making inroads into the Church.<sup>313</sup> Prynne argued that these events were due to the embracing and implementation of Arminian doctrines by the elite, many of whom he claimed were crypto-papists.

Indeed, Prynne alleged that priests, Jesuits and monks ‘have now a bishop or two at least’.<sup>314</sup> Furthermore, he repeated the rumour that many international observers, including a number of Catholics, believed that prelates in the Church of England would soon return to the Catholic faith. This, Prynne said, was the ‘common discourse and persuasion’ of the papists in England.<sup>315</sup> To support his claims, Prynne recounted two anecdotes in which Queen Henrietta Maria, the ‘Archbishop of Canterbury’ (Laud), the Archbishop of York (Richard Neile) and Cosin were presented as being implicitly sympathetic to papists and potentially supportive of the Catholic Church. Prynne stated that they were worthy of Charles’s attention because he personally ‘had a certain intelligence’ of their validity. Additionally, he could produce witnesses ‘if need be’.<sup>316</sup>

The first tale recounts an exchange which had purportedly taken place on Easter in 1636. According to Prynne, a ‘Berkshire gentleman’ and ‘recusant’ had, in the presence of justices of the peace and other members of the gentry, made the following exclamation while engaged in a debate on the ‘controversies of religion’ between Protestants and Catholics:

Well Gentlemen, you may talke and discourse of your Religion as long as you please, but we have the Queens Majesty and the Arch Bishop of Canterbury firme on our side; And so long wee shall make our partie good enough with you.<sup>317</sup>

---

<sup>312</sup> Ibid., pp. 36-7.

<sup>313</sup> Ibid., pp. 37-9.

<sup>314</sup> Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>315</sup> Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>316</sup> Ibid., p. 40.

<sup>317</sup> Ibid. I should note that (generally) in the parlance of early English news publications, a ‘gentleman’ signified both a member of the gentry and a credible (even unrefutable) witness. Citing gentlemen was a way to declare that the one’s story was a true. Prynne, as I shall demonstrate in Chapter 8, often used gentlemen as interlocutors in his narratives. For more on the relationship between gentility and truthfulness in seventeenth-century England, see S. Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England*, Chicago 1994.

To substantiate his claims, the gentleman then promised to come back and ‘make good what he said’.<sup>318</sup> According to Prynne, though, he never returned.

The second account is similar to the first in that it also describes discussions between Protestants and boastful papists. Apparently, after one of Cosin’s sermons in Newcastle during the summer of 1636, a group of Protestants and papists had struck up a conversation at a local tavern while drinking ‘their morning draughts’. In the course of their discussion, the papists asked the Protestants their opinion of Cosin’s sermon. The Protestants were generally unimpressed: ‘it was a plaine and ordinary sermon’; there was ‘nothing extraordinary about it’. But the papists, highlighting Cosin’s robes and his genuflections to Jesus and the altar, called Cosin priest-like. What is more, they declared that Cosin and the Archbishop of York were ‘both ours’. The Protestants, accusing the papists of calumny, took them to court, but no action ensued. Later, however, the defendants’ claims were proven true when a group of ‘Gentlemen Papists’ escorted Cosin to York.<sup>319</sup>

Prynne stated that another reason for the frequency of such reports was that the king’s government, rather than making an example of heretics, was supporting their advancement by awarding them lucrative appointments.<sup>320</sup> Among the prominent churchmen whom Prynne identified as popish favourites of the episcopate were Richard Montague, Cosin and Theodor Price (c. 1570-1631). Montague was the author of *Appello Caesarem: A Iust Appeale from Two Uniust Informers* (1625) and, Prynne alleged, an avowed supporter of Arminian doctrines.<sup>321</sup> Nonetheless, he had been ‘punished’ (that is, awarded) with the bishopric of Chichester.<sup>322</sup> Likewise, despite Cosin’s problematic opinions, he had been enriched and advanced, so much so that he had become a potential candidate for a bishopric.<sup>323</sup> Price, on the other hand, had been strongly preferred and promoted by Archbishop Laud, even though he reportedly had written only a single sermon in his entire career. Prynne went so far as to reproduce rumours that Price was privately an atheist.<sup>324</sup>

All the above evidence factored into and strengthened Prynne’s framing story. The prelates were ‘Antichristian tyrants’ pure and simple, not disciples of Christ.<sup>325</sup> Machiavellians (I shall explain my use of this term in the next chapter), they had employed

---

<sup>318</sup> Prynne, *Quench-Coale*, p. 40.

<sup>319</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

<sup>320</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 31.

<sup>321</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 68. See also *id.*, *The Perpetuitie of a Regenerate Mans Estate*, pp. 192-3, 201-2. See also S. Lambert, ‘Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship’, in *Past and Present*, 124, 1, 1989, pp. 36-68.

<sup>322</sup> Prynne, *Quench-Coale*, p. 31.

<sup>323</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 32. Prynne’s prediction came true in 1660 when Cosin was elevated to the see of Durham.

<sup>324</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 42.

<sup>325</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 348.

the full power of the state to impose their Arminian policies on the faithful. Their directives, which, according to Prynne, ultimately came from Rome, were part of a larger conspiracy. They were putting the souls and livelihood of true believers in jeopardy while slowly providing for the disenfranchisement of anti-Arminian leaders. Prynne was confident that what was happening was tantamount to a *coup d'état*; and from his frequent insinuations at the time, it is clear that he was already attributing major responsibility to Laud.

### Archbishop Laud in perspective

As indicated above, Prynne's *animus* against Laud (which reached a kind of zenith in the years following the *Histrion-Mastix* affair) was obviously hugely influential on the formation of his Laudian Plot. This plot was first etched out in Prynne's *Romes Masterpeece* and *Popish Royall Favourite*, but it was developed further in *Canterburies Doome*. *Romes masterpeece* and *Popish Royall Favourite* are immensely important for this study, for they bear witness to the outcome of Prynne's anti-Arminianism theories. Additionally, they show the extent of his investigations into what he believed was an unprecedented Jesuit plot. The pamphlets were brought out while Laud was on trial: both effectively served as targeted works of propaganda intended to sway the public against Laud.<sup>326</sup> I shall have more to say about the conflicts between Laud and Prynne in the following chapter; but the key role of Laud in Prynne's mature anti-Arminianism makes it necessary to review some general points here.

In 1633, Laud was appointed to the archbishopric of Canterbury, at which point he attempted to centralize and optimize (in the sense of improving outdated or impractical customs) church governance.<sup>327</sup> In Prynne's view, Laud pursued this programme by draconian means. The issue was not that Laud was policing thought (after all, Prynne sought to do the same thing), but rather that he was doing it the wrong way and employing covert coercion. In Prynne's view, Laud's most egregious offense was his active suppression of sectarian groups like the Puritans. Prynne regarded Puritans as Christians who exemplified

---

<sup>326</sup> See Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers*, pp. 262-3.

<sup>327</sup> For summaries on the politics and printing activities of William Laud and his chaplains, see A. Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*, Manchester 2007, pp. 81-100; A. Milton, 'The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach', in *Politics, Religion, and Popularity in Early Modern Stuart Britain*, ed. T. Cogswell, R. Cust, and P. Lake, Cambridge 2002, pp. 162-84; Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England*, pp. 124-34; A. Cromartie, 'The Mind of William Laud' in *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*, ed. C. A. Prior and G. Burgess, Farnham 2011, pp. 75-100.

Protestant orthodoxy.<sup>328</sup> He believed that Laud was attempting to establish religious uniformity by orchestrating the removal of dissident ministers from their parishes and rewarding those like Peter Heylyn who complied with and enforced his policies.<sup>329</sup> Moreover, Prynne was certain that Laud was playing the primary role in instituting laws which both severely restricted and outlawed the speech of Puritan-aligned publishers.<sup>330</sup>

A particular affront to Prynne and to many others were Laud's increasing powers to interfere with and disrupt the activities of the printing industry. For polemicists like Prynne, pamphlets were the prime media of resisting unrighteousness. Consequently, he interpreted Laud's support of policies which censored Puritan literature as an outright and systematic oppression of traditional English Protestantism.<sup>331</sup> The boiling point came when Laud allegedly with the help of his intelligencer and propagandist Heylyn initiated the prosecution of Prynne for his *Histrion-Mastix*, a polemical book on the immorality of theatre published in 1633. Recently, Laud's personal involvement in the matter has been called into question.<sup>332</sup> In fact, the case can be made that Prynne's downfall was the result of his written support of seditious beliefs, such as—ironically—the Jesuit doctrine of deposing kings.<sup>333</sup>

Regardless of the fact that Laud can no longer be unequivocally considered the prime mover behind Prynne's prosecution, it is important to understand that, for Prynne, there was no doubt as to Laud's culpability.<sup>334</sup> Prynne claimed that his books were 'neither scandalous nor libellous', but 'necessary Apologies, Pleas' against Laud's tyranny.<sup>335</sup> His insistence on Laud's responsibility for his suffering fed directly into what we can describe as his character

---

<sup>328</sup> See Prynne, *The Perpetuitie of a Regenerate Mans Estate*, sigs \*1v-\*\*2r; id., *Quench-Coale*, pp. 13-5.

<sup>329</sup> Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, pp. 359-60.

<sup>330</sup> Ibid., pp. 152-4, 159, 178-9, 183-5.

<sup>331</sup> For discussions on Laud's relationship with the publishing industry see, A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640*, Cambridge 1995, p. 66, and id., 'Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England', in *Historical Journal*, 41, 1998, pp. 625-51 (639). Peacey has argued that some of Laud's actions were motivated by very real and pervasive fears of a 'Puritan plot'. See J. Peacey, 'The Paranoid Prelate: Archbishop Laud and the Puritan Plot', in *Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theory in Early Modern Europe*, ed. B. Coward and J. Swann, Aldershot 2004, pp. 113-29 (especially 116): 'Laud's paranoia lay not so much in perceiving a threat from Puritan ideas, as in his understanding of the collaborative nature of the Puritan movement ... . Laud sought, in other words, to demonstrate that Puritan authors stood at the head of a larger faction ... . Laud treated Puritan sympathisers as collaborators, and in the process defined conspiracy as combination.'

<sup>332</sup> M. Kishlanksy, 'A Whipper Whipped: The Sedition of William Prynne', in *Historical Journal*, 53, 3, 2013, pp. 603-27. Basing his research on an unpublished manuscript of Prynne's trial, Kishlanksy has argued convincingly, and contrary to the work of William Lamont, that there is insufficient evidence that Laud had used litigation to sabotage Prynne. Rather, Prynne's fate was effectively sealed by the frequency of seditious statements contained in *Histrion-Mastix*.

<sup>333</sup> Ibid., pp. 610, 614, 627.

<sup>334</sup> William Prynne, *A New Discovery of the Prelates Tyranny*, London 1641, pp. 1-9.

<sup>335</sup> Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, p. 496.

arc. Prynne was wounded by Laud's hands ('stigmata Laudis'), and his future release and punishment of Laud was a sign of Prynne's blessedness and God's vengeance.<sup>336</sup>

The main upshot of what became one of the highest profile trials in the seventeenth century was that Prynne lost the case on what he believed were trumped up charges. He was subsequently pilloried and imprisoned, and he lost much of his social standing. The experience made him feel like a victim of a conspiracy, but, more importantly, it served as an impetus for his later campaign against Laud after his release in 1640. From 1641, Prynne, fully convinced that the Archbishop was driven by the Machiavellian ambition of disenfranchising Protestants and propagating popery, produced pamphlet after pamphlet in which he denounced Laud as the greatest threat to English Protestants. His tracts, carefully published at strategic moments in Laud's trial, certainly had an effect on the court of public opinion.<sup>337</sup> Laud was eventually executed in 1645, an outcome which doubtless produced in Prynne deep feelings of vindication. Yet his sense of closure, if indeed there ever was one, was short-lived.

I should now like to address a few details which remain to be said apropos of the nexus of Prynne's anti-Arminianism and the formation of his conspiracy model. As suggested in Chapter 2, Prynne's understanding of the Laudian Plot was heavily influenced by his interpretation of sections of Adam Contzen's *De politicorum libri decem*. He suspected that the Arminians could, by following Contzen's advice, obtain dominance 'without tumult', essentially by gradually affecting the thinking processes of state officials as well as of ordinary citizens at large. Because this strategy of Contzen became a defining and connective element of the Laudian and Ancient plots it is worth describing its fundamental details.

#### Adam Contzen as the Arminian Arch-Strategist

As we have seen, Prynne's earliest reference to Contzen's work seems to be in the margins of *Histrion-Mastix* (1632). Three years later, in *Looking-Glasse*, Prynne invoked Contzen again to highlight the 'Iesuiticall' stratagems of Arminian prelates, telling readers that the same policy was 'prescribed by Co[ntzen] in his Politiques, as one of the chiefe meanes to undermine Religion, and all protestant States and Churches'. In this context, Prynne

---

<sup>336</sup> William Prynne, *Comfortable Cordials against Discomfortable Feares of Imprisonment, and Other Sufferings in Good Causes*, London 1641, p. 15.

<sup>337</sup> Hibbard, *The Popish Plot*, pp. 242-3; Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, pp. 132-4.

described what amounts to a form of top-down social engineering, a *modus operandi* by which the bishops became despots—able to ‘do or say what they list without opposition or controule’.<sup>338</sup> As Prynne understood it, the prelates did this first by practising a kind of nepotism or cronyism to benefit their particular faction. Next, they bolstered the reputation of their faction so as to make other parties think twice about challenging them. To do this, they offered bribes to deter scrutiny, hired clergymen to promulgate their doctrines and established deep networks of spies across the country. With this strategy, they suppressed and manipulated public discourse and—by silently crushing opposition—set a course for the reestablishment of popery.<sup>339</sup>

The following year, Prynne in *Quench-Coale*, said that the chief rule ‘the Iesuite Contzens Disciples’ used to usher in popery was defamation. In short, this means that, before Arminians had created the conditions for consent to their surreptitious takeover, they had to discredit righteous Protestants by making them ‘appear odious both to the Prince and People’.<sup>340</sup> Elsewhere in the same text, Prynne referenced the ‘cunning-pated Iesuite Adam Contzen’, whose policy of re-introducing popery had been followed ‘within a hairebreadth’ by the popish faction ‘sprung up of late’ in England.<sup>341</sup>

To get a better understanding of Prynne’s frame of mind, a summary examination of Contzen’s *De politicorum libri decem* will be helpful. It was first published in 1621 at Mainz. A selection of the work, consisting of Chapters 18 and 19 of Book 9, was translated into English and published as *Looke about You* in 1630. A reprint appeared in 1641. Notably the

---

<sup>338</sup> Prynne, *A Looking-Glasse for All Lordly Prelates*, sig. ¶v.

<sup>339</sup> Ibid., sig. ¶r-v: ‘By this policy: First, they keepe all men from preferment (how deserving, learned and pious soever) but those of their owne faction and creatures. Secondly, they make their owne party very great and strong in all Courts of Iustice, and places of the Realm, so as none dare oppose them in the least measure, no not in cases which highly concerne both GOD, the King, Religion, and the whole Realme. Thirdly, they are more feared and crowched to then the King himselfe, or all his Nobles. Fourthly, they would win all men to their own opinions, humours and superstitions, out of hopes of preferment, which else they have no way to attaine. Fifthly, they have many Clergie men so wholly at their command, that they will write, preach, practice, defend, any errorrs, false Doctrines, Innovations, Superstitions or popish Ceremonies, their Lordships shall command or desire them, to obtaine their favours and advancement. Sixtly, by this meanes they gaine scouts and spies in every corner of the Kingdome, in Court, City, Countrey, and in most Noble-mens, and Gentlemens families; (whose Chaplaines are now for the most part, nought else but these great Prelates agents and Intelligencers;) so that nothing can be done or spoken against them, or intended for their prejudice, but they have present information of it. Seventhly, by this policy, they keep all men under their girdles, crush all that dare oppose them, stop the current of Iustice; bolster out all their popish agents and opposing officers, setup Popery againe without much noyse or opposition’.

<sup>340</sup> Prynne, *Quench-Coale*, sig. b4r: ‘And then you will never heare any more fables of Puritans, with which your Royall eares are now so oft abused by the Iesuite Contzens Disciples; Who gives this as one chiefe rule how to usher Popery into any Christian State, to slaunder and disgrace the Puritans and zelots, to make them odious both to Prince and people, and then Popery will breake in without any opposition or noyse at all.’

<sup>341</sup> Ibid., sig. i2r.

preface is a useful indicator of how quickly Contzen (who, like Campanella, wrote against Machiavelli) was demonized by some elements of the English press.

Described as a fiddling cat who gets ignorant statesmen to dance around him like ‘rats and mice’, Contzen is charged with teaching the ‘art of secret undermining the gospel without any noise’.<sup>342</sup> The preface concludes with the observation that ‘some Ecclesiasticks in some countries’ are using Contzen’s advice to introduce Arminianism. For this reason, the heads of the ‘popish faction’ hold that ‘Arminianisme is the best engine to bring the Grand Plot’ [reconverting defectors to Catholicism] to ‘the wished perfection’.<sup>343</sup> This is exactly the way Prynne understood Contzen’s teachings. For Prynne, Contzen’s ‘Iesuiticall tricks and stratagemes’ were so repulsive that the ‘divell himselfe’ was ashamed of them.<sup>344</sup>

In *Look about You*, both chapters outline the possible ways by which a problematic religious movement could be neutralized. In Chapter 18 (‘The Way Back to the True Religion’), Contzen uses musical and medical analogies to advance the argument that republics must be tuned ‘little by little’ and run at a gentlebut steady pace to circumvent the precipitous ‘malady of errors and superstitions’.<sup>345</sup> He takes it for granted that all men have an inherent love of Roman Catholicism (what he terms the ‘Old Religion’). New belief systems lack its ancient foundation, which makes them prone to factionalism and dissolution. Over time, religious sectarians become less disciplined and more inconstant in their practices and opinions, so that they will ‘readily suffer themselves’ to be directed back to the Catholic Church.<sup>346</sup> Contzen notes two exceptions to this rule: extreme heretics (such as Anabaptists)

---

<sup>342</sup> Adam Contzen, *Looke about You: The Plot of Contzen, the Moguntine Jesuite, to Cheate a Church of the Religion Established Therein and to Serve in Popery by Art without Noiseor Tumult*, London 1630, sig. A2r: ‘A subtile Iesuite, like a crafty Cat, lustily plaies on his Fidle: Iesuited States-men like so many silly Rats and Mice full a dauncing after him, as if they were mad. The Iesuite laies his Plot (and please God) for any Prince; that being in heart a Papist, yet ignorant (till a Iesuite prompt him) of the means how to fetch over his subiects (quietly) to that superstition, from the True Religion established among them by his owne Lawes, is willing to be taught the Art of secret undermining the Gospell without any noise.’

<sup>343</sup> *Ibid.*, sig. A2v.

<sup>344</sup> Prynne, *A Looking-Glasse for all Lordly Prelates*, pp. 44-5: ‘our... prelates...with an high hand against his Majesties Lawes and publique declaration, and by sundry other such Iesuiticall tricks and stratagemes prescribed long since by the Iesuite Contzen *Politiq.* liber. 5... which their Lordships follow to an haire bredth. Since some, or all these their execrable practises I say (at which the very divell himselfe might blush and hide his head)’.

<sup>345</sup> Contzen, *Looke about You*, pp. 1-2: ‘What Musitians observe in tuning their Instruments, gently setting up the strings by little and little; and what, in curing diseases, Physitians practise, abating noxious humours by degrees, and pauses: the same must bee done in a Common-wealth, labouring under the Malady of Errors and Superstitions.’

<sup>346</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3: ‘It is no difficult piece, for any Prince in Europe to call backe mens minds to the ancient rites of our Predecessours, if he list. A matter heretofore held impossible to be effected. But now men begin againe to love the old Religion. Nor can they be so held on by their Ministers, but that many doe every yeere, returne to the Catholique unity...That levity of the Vulgar, to admire new things, and contemne old, is fatall. Heresie, therefore, which while it was in the first carrire, could by no force be stayed; nor by Art restrained, afterwards growing weary and faint, goes on more leasurely: and being in it selfe divided and bruised, the violence of it

and individual leaders of heresies. The former must be repressed immediately like an infectious disease, and the latter must be banished to preserve civil concord. Contzen then goes on to say how in his study of the politics of three German rulers (Elector Palatine Frederick III of Simmern, Philip I, Landgrave of Hesse, and John Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg) he observed that each successfully changed the official religion from Lutheranism to Calvinism ‘without tumult’.

First, they concealed their intent from the ‘multitude’. Second, they privately gave their support to Calvinist preachers and made a show of tolerating them to persuade the people of their own (the princes’) liberality. Third, they gave the Calvinists churches, and by doing so weakened the financial resources of the Lutheran churches. Most importantly, the princes instituted a policy which had a semblance of free speech. In reality, the strategy added further credibility to nascent Calvinism and prevented Lutherans from condemning their teachings.<sup>347</sup> Further programmes were implemented to see what the people would bear. *Inter alia*, while Calvinists were given university positions, Lutheran students were worked on with ‘divers arts’, and Lutheran preachers were stripped of their positions in local parishes. Eventually, the Calvinists—‘excessively laughing in their sleeves’—overtook the Lutheran churches. Even then, Lutherans did not violently protest, but only sued for pensions, ‘immunity from taxes and the like’.<sup>348</sup>

In addition to such tactics, Contzen also describes a cronyism culture. In court, only the writings of the Calvinists were favoured. In addition, opponents of the ‘True Religion’ (that is, Calvinism as understood by the German nobles) were denied honours and privileges. In this way, Lutherans were marginalized and prevented from positioning themselves in places of greater influence. In order to disparage the perception of Lutherans in the court of public opinion, strategists also popularized information about its most fanatical sectarians. By utilizing scandal to attack the reputation of Lutheranism, Calvinists hoped to create further internecine disputes and, by so doing, gradually dismantle all Lutheran factions.<sup>349</sup> Contzen

---

abates, and so at last it comes backe to the same point from whence first it departed...if a prudent Magistrate please to take up his people, loathing so many intricate mazes into which they have beene led, and having made triall of the sraudes of ungratious Apostates, will readily suffer themselves to be reduced into the way.’

<sup>347</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5: ‘an Edict was published, that none should cast aspersions upon, or contentiously brawle with one another, nor condemne one another of error; but, by all meanes cherish peace and concord. This Edict of the Princes proved an effectuall Engine to further the intended mutation. For by this meanes it was brought to passe, that no man durst to contradict the Calvinists, Zuinglians, Sacramentarians; no, nor so much as to name them’. Here Contzen seems to have both the Articles of Schwabach and the articles of the Marburg Colloquy in mind.

<sup>348</sup> Contzen, *Looke about You*, p. 6.

<sup>349</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9: ‘first of all, let those particular Tenents which heare ill of the Vulgar, and in their very first aspect carry absurdity in them, even to the rude and ignorant, be pulled out; and load laid on them...These are to be

also adds his own advice: princes should ‘make profit of the quarrels of erring men’. In matters of religion, the prince *should* take sides. Doing this would inculcate doubt within the members of the opposing faction, who will want to reconcile their position with the stance of their sovereign.<sup>350</sup>

In Chapter 19, Contzen emphasizes other social-conditioning techniques. To eliminate heresies, the ‘Orthodox Magistrate’ should be given absolute control over ecclesiastical appointments. Thus, he can install his own supporters in high positions and dismiss anyone who disagrees with his policies. In this way, he can completely eliminate error and foster uniform thinking.<sup>351</sup> In addition, Contzen states that prince should ‘nourish the differences of the Teachers of errors’. By this diversionary tactic, he can encourage sectarian disputes and lay the grounds for future reconciliation. Contzen makes the following assumption about religious disputation and its eventual consequences:

by this meanes [debate], when all shall understand that there is nothing settled and certaine among them, they will easily joyne hands with the truth. For if any man list but to read those scolding Bookes of the Lutherans against the Calvinists; or of the Calvinists against the others, he will verily perswade himselfe that those be not the invectives of one man against another; but rather, the rages and bellowings of Devils against Devils.<sup>352</sup>

It is somewhat ironic that a few of Contzen’s English readers chose to interpret his advice as an Arminian programme. As I have already shown, most of Contzen’s suggestions and

---

drawne out to their full length, aggravated to the utmost, that so, by just hatred, they may be discarded. By this sluce all the credit of false Teachers, thus taken in the very Act of a manifest fault, will soone empty it selfe.’

<sup>350</sup> Ibid., pp. 9-10: ‘Sixt meanes... of abolishing error is, to make profit of the quarrels of erring men. For what Prince might not reduce the Puritanes of *England* into order if hee would (by force sufficient) extort from the[m] an approbation of the Bishops? And who could not worke as great a Cure upon the Puritans in the Netherlands, if he would declare himselfe for the milder party, in the controversies yet flaming amongst them? For the variableness of the Princes believe, makes those that erewhile took themselves to be cocksure of the right, now to grow doubtfull which way to take. So that when the consent of the Prince goes over to the other sides of them that contend, he overturnes the other part with case, and puts the whole into his power to doe with them as he list.’

<sup>351</sup> Ibid., p. 27: ‘If it fall out that wandring soules must be leasurely, and by Art, reclaimed; and, that the Propagators of perverse opinions cannot bee put from the places they once enjoy; then, let an Orthodox Magistrate bring to passe that the instituting, presenting, confirming, and examining of such men bee committed to him. For so they may soone chace away every one that is most apt to doe mischief. Some wrangling companions, carelesse of the controversies on foot, that study onely their owne private affaires, or the Prince, he may (safely, now and then) set over those Churches: so shall he be able to abate the rage of heresie, and yet not be troubled to remove the unlearned: for by that meanes error will grow into contempt; and for as much as unskilfull men are want to erre often, all constancy in errors will be taken away.’

<sup>352</sup> Ibid.

observations derive from policies which, as he saw it, were initiated and maintained by Calvinist rulers. Nonetheless, Prynne was evidently disturbed by the subtle processes of disenfranchisement and behavioural change which could be secretly imposed on the populace by cunning potentates. In his opinion, those very same schemes had been put into place by Arminians and Jesuits to indoctrinate Protestants, vilify the most outspoken anti-Arminian preachers and—ultimately—to return the Three Kingdoms to Catholicism. As indicated by Prynne’s marginal references, Contzen’s work was certainly influential on his thesis that the Jesuits utilized clandestine incrementalism to advance their agenda of mass subjugation. Indeed, as we have observed, the motif about ‘screwing in Popery by degrees’ continued to appear in Prynne’s works (especially in reference to Campanella’s advice) for at least three decades.

#### *Canterburies Doome* and the Maturation of the Arminian Conspiracy

Having examined Contzen’s link to the Laudian Plot, I want to conclude this chapter by reviewing key aspects of *Canterburies Doome*. The text is compendious and encyclopedic. As the mature version of the Laudian Plot, it provides ample summaries of Prynne’s thoroughgoing research into the corruption of the Arminian clergy; and it includes a good deal of epistolary material and testimonies which bring together the Arminians, the Jesuits and Laud, thus laying the foundation for the connection between the Laudian and the Ancient Plots.

One such testimony is of particular interest. It is the ‘viva voce’ (as Prynne noted) of Thomas Challoner, a moral witness (and later writer of hoaxes) who had testified against Laud in 1643, disputing his loyalty to the Church of England.<sup>353</sup> Prynne (whom Laud had privately suspected of tampering with witnesses) included Challoner’s words verbatim in his record of the trial’s proceedings, the entirety of which forms the second half of *Canterburies Doome*. I believe that the story put forward in Challoner’s deposition serves as a prime

---

<sup>353</sup> Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, pp. 414-5. Challoner (1595-1660) served on the Long Parliament and later became a regicide. His later exploits attest to his skills of invention. In 1656, Challoner anonymously published *The Strange Finding out of Moses His Tombe* a fantastical tale about the discovery of Moses’ burial place and its attempted coverup by of a conclave of French Jesuits. The tale was passed off as a true account and immediately cause a stir. Eventually, the antiquary and biographer Anthony Wood revealed that Challoner had contrived the tale in a tavern. Kate Loveman has provided a thorough summary of the affair and Challoner’s literary methods in *Reading Fictions, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture*, Aldershot 2008, pp. 47-59.

example of what would later become Prynne's narrative style. The rumour-filled tales in *Quench-Coale* can be counted among his earliest attempts at propagating conspiracy lore. The labyrinthine narrative from Challoner, however, should be understood as a foreshadowing of the sort of 'deep plot' storytelling Prynne would later employ to convey his Ancient Plot.<sup>354</sup>

In his testimony, Challoner introduced himself as a man who had made a number of learned acquaintances in the course of his many travels on the Continent. The gentlemen he met ('Lawyers priests, and men of the long Robe') had always made known their desire to see the Church of England reduced to the Catholic faith. They had also claimed that Laud was a Catholic and 'wholly theirs' and that they 'had many great parsons in England who were secretly of their religion'.<sup>355</sup> Challoner then went on to recount two encounters with an Englishman in Brussels who explained the intricacies of the papists' plan. During the first meeting, the gentleman told Challoner that he had often heard 'strange reports' of England's coming demise as a result of a plot 'at hand' to change the country's religion. The man then promised that he would look into the report and that, when the two met up again, he would confirm the plot's existence. According to the intelligencer, all the best minds in England and 'on that side of the sea' were interested in seeing to it that the English became papists. The plan was 'so politickly laid, that he did not see how in the judgment of man it could possibly be prevented'.<sup>356</sup> Everything would be done in 'gradations'. First, the virtuous clergy would be forced to comply with corrupt bishops in order to maintain their offices, and then eventually the common people would 'slide' into popery unawares.<sup>357</sup>

The Englishman also asserted that the papists were already 'more in number, and better armed' than was popularly believed. Moreover, they had been controlling England's government for 'many yeeres'. Furthermore, they were planning to attack England with a combined force of French, Irish and Spanish troops. But the greatest danger would come from Protestants themselves:

---

<sup>354</sup> Here I use the expression 'deep plot' to refer to Prynne's tendency of propounding the existence of mysterious, pervasive, and predatory powers that underlie the fabric of English society. To describe these secret forces, Prynne often used the word 'deep'. See for example Prynne, *Cozens Couzening Devotions*, sigs A1r-A1v: 'a world of treachery... a deepe, obstruce, and hidden Mysterie of Iniquitie'; id., *Romes Masterpeece*, sig. a3r; id., *The Popish Royall Favourite: or, a Full Discovery of His Majesties Extraordinary Favours to, and Protections of Notorious Papists, Priestes, Jesuites, against All Prosecutions and Penalties of the Laws Enacted against Them Notwithstanding His Many Royall Proclamations, Declarations, and Protestations to the Contrary*, London 1643; id., *The First and Second Part of a Seasonable, Legal, and Historicall Vindication and Chronological Collection of the Good Old Fundamentall Liberties, Franchises, Rights, Laws of all English Freeman*, London 1655, sig. F3r: 'the Jesuites and their Jesuitical deep court of Parliament'.

<sup>355</sup> Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, p. 414.

<sup>356</sup> Ibid.

<sup>357</sup> Ibid., pp. 414-15.

he [the Englishman] told me [Challoner], that the war should be so disguised, under false notions and pretences, as the Protestants should ignorantly become the Jesuits servants, and by the effusion of their owne blood, set up popery by force.<sup>358</sup>

The last part of Challoner's testimony pertains to his record of a meeting in Rome between him and a Benedictine named 'Father John'. According to Challoner, John had explicitly expressed his desire for England's reconversion. Naturally, Prynne fully accepted Challoner's version of the events. He wrote that it was 'so home and punctuall' because it accurately 'informs us of a long since plotted and actuated confederacy' of Rome, Laud, and other 'English prelates'. Moreover, it set out the details of all their hidden proceedings and 'politick contrivances', proving unquestioningly that Laud was Rome's 'Archinstrument'.<sup>359</sup>

Prynne's comments illustrate that, by the early 1640s, his anti-Arminian thought had coalesced into one idea. This idea I have described as the 'Laudian Plot', the theory that Laud was a handpicked Catholic agent singlehandedly responsible for coordinating all religious and military upheavals in the Three Kingdoms for over a decade.<sup>360</sup> Initially, Laud was not the main enemy in Prynne's works. Previously, he had been one of number of popish antagonists, troublesome for his favourable opinion of some Arminian notions. *Canterburies Doome* (repeating the arguments of *Romes Masterpeece* and *Popish Royall Favourite*, as I shall show later on), however, reveals that Prynne ultimately went on to blame Laud for the promulgation of Arminian theology and rites, as well as for the intolerance of the episcopate and the Crown towards orthodox Protestants. Moreover, whether or not Prynne was involved in the creation of Challoner's attestation, the fact remains that the substance of Challoner's claims, along with those advanced via interlocutors in *Romes Masterpeece* and *Popish Royall Favourite* (to be discussed in my chapter on the Jesuits), were incorporated into 'The Ancient Plot'. For now, it will suffice to highlight a few recurring motifs.

Firstly, the conspiracy theories of Prynne's *juvenilia* are typified by a tendency towards anti-elitism and anti-episcopalism. He sees corruption as always arising from depraved powerbrokers at the highest stratum of society: cardinals, influential Jesuits and recusant courtiers. These autocrats and bureaucrats govern two governments, one public, that is, the Holy See, and the other clandestine. This second kind, a cryptocracy of sorts, has no

---

<sup>358</sup> Ibid., p. 415.

<sup>359</sup> Ibid.

<sup>360</sup> Ibid., sig. b1v.

borders. It operates subtly in England and in other countries where it maintains fifth columns, cells of operatives who ultimately derive their orders from the pope. The *telos* of this secret government is the destruction of Protestant Christendom.<sup>361</sup>

Secondly, in every anecdote, the existence of the conclave is repeatedly defended via the testimonies or correspondence of high-ranking informants. Prynne's sources are usually patriots (those known for their record of anti-Catholic sentiment), former Catholics or other gentlemen of good repute. In the case of Challoner, it is an 'English Gentleman'.<sup>362</sup> In the plots which appear in *Romes Masterpeece* and *Popish Royall Favourite*, the whistle-blowers are English pursuivants (also Prynne's witnesses) and a self-confessed Jesuit conspirator.<sup>363</sup> Similarly, in Prynne's later pamphlets such as *The Quakers Unmasked, True and Perfect Narrative* and *Brief Vindication*, the sources are lawyers, ex-priests and noblemen. As Prynne's narrative interlocutors, these informants always report four key facts. First, they insist that the papists and Jesuits are living in England in disguise. They validate their claims with information gleaned from a private (often unnamed) contact. Second, they announce (often by referencing their contact) that there is a plan to convert England gradually without detection. Practically this involves extirpating or rendering useless Parliament and the monarchy in the process. Third, they affirm that wealthy English court Catholics have allied themselves with Spain or France. And last, they blame the Jesuits and other papists for stoking up civil unrest in Scotland and Ireland.<sup>364</sup>

This brief account cannot by itself serve as a proof that Challoner's testimony was forged.<sup>365</sup> Nor can it be argued that Prynne was the only pamphleteer to employ such a model for disseminating anti-Catholic propaganda. I believe, however, and aim to show that the model is an accurate thematic and structural outline of Prynne's 'Ancient Plot'. Furthermore, by the end of this study, it will become apparent that Prynne was not only one of the most prominent pamphleteers to link the English revolution consistently with a Jesuit conspiracy. I shall demonstrate that he was also the first to report a number of tales which, decades after his death, were still being used in anti-Catholic propaganda.

---

<sup>361</sup> Ibid., pp. 448, 453, 456-60.

<sup>362</sup> Ibid., p. 414.

<sup>363</sup> See Prynne, *Popish Royall Favourite*, pp. 30-2; id., *Romes Masterpeece*, pp. 1-2, 13-14.

<sup>364</sup> See Prynne, *Quakers Unmasked*, pp. 3-6; id., *True and Perfect Narrative*, pp. 43-4; id., *A Brief Necessary Vindication of the Old and New Secluded Members, from the False Malicious Calumnies; and of the Fundamental Rights, Liberties, Privileges, Government, Interest of the Freemen, Parliaments, People of England*, London 1659, pp. 35-6, 44-6.

<sup>365</sup> I will examine a number of these claims in my penultimate chapter on Prynne's supplementary myths.

The final aspect of *Canterburies Doome* to which I want to draw attention is a selection of remarks. These statements ought to be taken as direct, written evidence of what I have already argued: that by 1646 (a year before the onset of major hostilities between the Army and Parliament) Prynne's anti-Arminianism had become synonymous with a form of anti-Laudian, anti-clerical and anti-Jesuit polemics which both assumed the existence of and decried a conspiracy to undermine the sovereignty of the Three Kingdoms. First and foremost, Prynne advanced the notion that England was being controlled by a court-based 'Arminian confederacy'. This confederacy was the ruling faction of the government, 'having greatest power at court'. Their unchecked authority allowed them to 'vent their Erronious Tenets every where in Presse, Pulpit, Court, both Universities [Cambridge and Oxford], without any reall convention or suspension'.<sup>366</sup> Since they operated with virtual impunity, they were able to exploit the powers of the ecclesiastical courts, using them to neutralize all proponents (via exile, imprisonment or forced redundancy) of anti-Arminianism.

Laud, of course, was the confederacy's leader and had used his position of eminence to promote Arminianism's 'soul-destroying errors'.<sup>367</sup> Monopolizing the press, Laud and his agents had systematized the repression of all 'old Orthodox' literature, permitting (and in many cases promoting) the circulation of books by Cosin and Montague, while placing injunctions on writers (such as Prynne) who wrote against them.<sup>368</sup> Prynne also accused Laud and the prelates of suppressing the Geneva Bible. In addition, he denounced Laud for attempting to force Church of England ministers to adopt the *Book of Sports*, the order issued in 1617 by King James I (reissued by Charles I in 1633) to establish which leisure activities were permitted on Sundays and holy days.<sup>369</sup> These actions, among other things, confirmed for Prynne that the 'principall end' of the Laud's 'usurping of the power of licensing books' was to usher in popery by degrees.<sup>370</sup>

Also unacceptable to Prynne was Laud's apparent desire to create a 'poysoned Church' by appointing 'Arminian, Popish, Superstitious, Scandalous persons' to positions of power. Laud's strategy, Prynne asserted, involved exposing the royal family, the universities and the 'nationall churches' to clergymen and professors who were 'tainted' by Arminianism. According to Prynne, the appointments Laud had made in this regard were 'almost

---

<sup>366</sup> Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, p. 161.

<sup>367</sup> *Ibid.*, sig. b1v.

<sup>368</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 178-9, 185. Prynne believed that Laud had encouraged Montague to dedicate *Appello Caeserem* to King Charles to give weight to its contents. See Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, p. 157.

<sup>369</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 152-4.

<sup>370</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 184.

numberlesse' and included prominent academics at Cambridge and Oxford, as well as King Charles' household chaplains.<sup>371</sup> Among those ill-conceived appointees (all of whom were made prebendaries, rectors or chancellors) were: Peter Heylin, Thomas Bletchenden, William Bray, Thomas Lushington, John Weekes, Brian Duppa, John Bramhall, William Beale, William Brough, Samuel Baker, Thomas Brown and a certain Dr Mumford.<sup>372</sup>

In sum, Prynne concluded that Laud and the Arminian party would have succeeded in over-running the kingdom with popery and massacring the remaining Protestant leaders had 'God himself' not intervened through the investigation launched by the Long Parliament (which had given Prynne authorization to make a case against Laud).<sup>373</sup> The final stage of the Arminian threat, if we can call it that, was actually the 'Laudian Plot'. Like the New Model Army officers, Independents, Quakers and Jesuits who would later serve as central antagonists in Prynne's political stories, Laud in 1646 represented the pinnacle of Catholic malevolence, the greatest 'advancer of popery' who had ever lived:

Archest Traytor, the cunningest Underminer Subverter of our established Religion, the greatest Advancer of Popery, and most sedulous Agent to reduce us back to Rome, of any Archbishop or pretender to the Protestant Religion, that our English Soile or the Christian world have ever bred ...<sup>374</sup>

As we shall see, in Prynne's storytelling the designation of an arch-villain was a way to consolidate his research and create consistency. His later conspiracy narratives focused not on one, but many arch-villains, all of whom he charged with colluding against the English state. Arminianism as such ceased to be a critical issue for Prynne from 1647 onwards, not just because he had taken down its main proponent, but also because he perceived Laud-like traits in the Cromwell's New Model Army and its allies.<sup>375</sup> Prynne essentially went on to believe that England's monarchy and government was caught between the Scylla of tyranny and the Charybdis of anarchy.

---

<sup>371</sup> Ibid., p. 359.

<sup>372</sup> Ibid., p. 360.

<sup>373</sup> Ibid., p. 361.

<sup>374</sup> Ibid., p. 565.

<sup>375</sup> Prynne, who castigated what he interpreted as the tyranny of Cromwell, New Model Army, and the Council of State, also attributed the downfall of Laud to tyrannical ambition. See William Prynne, *The First Part of an Historical Collection of the Ancient Parliaments of England, from the Yeer of Our Lord 673, till the End of King John's Reign, Anno 1216*, London 1649, p. 4: 'What overthrew and destroyed the late beheaded... Canterbury...and our Prelates with their Courts, but their encroaching, usurping, exercising of an exorbitant, illegall, over-swelling, transcendent power and jurisdiction, above, against, and beyond the rules and bounds of Law?'

Prynne who, as we have observed, understood Laud as an overbearing tyrant and plotter, understood Cromwell, the Independents, the New Model Army, the Jesuits and the anti-royalist supporters of the Good Old Cause in the same way. These were the metaphorical Scylla. On the other hand, sects like the Quakers and Ranters (whom Prynne ultimately associated with the Jesuits) represented Charbydis. They served as instruments of chaos, crypto-Jesuits who, in order to facilitate an easily-won *coup*, aimed to mislead the faithful with fantasies. While Prynne's perception of the first group was indubitably influenced by Laud, there is also evidence that popular descriptions of Machiavelli were behind the construction of 'tabloid' Jesuits. Prynne was upfront about his conviction that that the New Model Army had put a despotic Machiavellianism into practice.<sup>376</sup> Furthermore, as indicated in a number of Interregnum era treatises, Prynne often denounced Campanella, Parsons and Richelieu as Machiavellians.<sup>377</sup> As I have maintained at the beginning of this dissertation, this connection provides tangible evidence of the narrative continuity between the Laudian and the Ancient Plots. Therefore, now that the formative and generative function performed by Arminianism within Prynne's storytelling has been established, we need to examine the role of Machiavellianism.

---

<sup>376</sup> By despotic, I mean the state in which one has the ability to freely and selfishly exercise unlimited power. See for example William Prynne, *Romish Emissaries*, p. 35; *Demophilos, or, The Asserter of the Peoples Liberty Plainly Demonstrating by the Principles even of Nature Itself, and by the Primitive Constitutions of All Governments since the Creation of the World that the Very Essence and the Fundamentals of All Governments and Laws Was Meerly the Safety of the People, and the Advancement of Their Rights and Liberties*, London 1658, p. 23; id., *Eight Military Aphorismes Demonstrating the Uselesness, Unprofitableness, Hurtfulness and Prodigall Expensiveness of All Standing English Forts and Garrisons*, London 1658, p. 31; *TheMachiavilian Cromwellist*, pp. 3-11.

<sup>377</sup> For Campanella as a Jesuit and Machiavellian see Prynne, *First and Second Part of a Seasonable Vindication*, sigs C4r, G3v; id., *A Legal Vindication of the Liberties of England, against Illegal Taxes and Pretended Acts of Parliament, Lately Enforced on the People*, London 1659, p. 53; id., *True and Perfect Narrative*, p. 93; id., *Brief Necessary Vindication*, pp. 33, 38, 57; *A Gospel Plea (Interwoven with a Rational and Legal) for the Lawfulness and Continuance of the Antient Setled Maintenance and Tenths of the Ministers of the Gospel*, 2 vols, London 1660, II, pp. 140, 147.

## Chapter 4

### The Unholy Mix of Politics and Religion: Prynne's 'Machiavillian State-Religion'

The best place to begin the investigation about Prynne's position on Machiavelli and Machiavellism is with the texts containing Prynne's earliest references to the Italian author. Like so many of his fellow Englishmen, Prynne knew the author of the *The Prince* as 'Machiavel'. Given the flexibility of early modern English orthography, there were of course, variations of this spelling. Some of these variants (viz. "Machevil") it has been argued, were employed by playwrights as puns on the contraction 'Make-evil'.<sup>378</sup> Indeed, it cannot be doubted that this stock character, a staple of English theatrical literature since the 1590s, factored into Prynne's own interpretation, especially given Prynne's familiarity (or fluency, as his *Histrion-Matrix* demonstrates) with contemporary English dramaturgy. In Prynne, alternate versions of the name include 'Machivill' and 'Machiavil'. His followers are generally called 'Machivillian' or 'Machiavillan', but Prynne's orthography is demonstrably erratic, and he often manipulates the spelling of the word *ad libitum*.

One, if not the earliest of Prynne's references to Machiavelli, occurs in the 1629 edition of *Antithesis to Arminianisme*. Here Prynne spoke of a 'Machiavillian state-religion' which was 'made vp of Heresie, Pollicie, Luxury, Pride, and Couetousnesse, the greatest Opposites to Religion'.<sup>379</sup> The earliest appearance of 'Machiavil' in Prynne's texts appears to be in *Looking-Glasse for All Lordly Prelates* (1636). On the whole, this pamphlet presents Prynne's disagreements with the station of English bishops during the episcopacy of Archbishop Laud. In particular, Prynne denounced what he understood to be a widespread corruption amongst high-ranking ecclesiastics. As mentioned above, Prynne believed they regularly participated in cronyism (Prynne makes explicit mention of 'temporall preferments'), political posturing, bribery, espionage, and obstruction of justice.<sup>380</sup> He rejected their supposed God-given (*jure divino*) authority, arguing that they were of 'Diabolicall ordination, not divine'.<sup>381</sup> What is fundamentally at stake in this treatise (as in Prynne's later polemics on Arminianism) is the spiritual decline of bishops who—Prynne believed—had profaned themselves in their pursuit of material wealth and influence.

---

<sup>378</sup> T. Rutter, *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*, Cambridge 2012, p. 61.

<sup>379</sup> Prynne, *The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, sig. C2v.

<sup>380</sup> Prynne, *A Looking-Glasse for All Lordly Prelates*, sig. C2r-v

<sup>381</sup> Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, pp. 17-18.

Although Prynne stated that he knew ‘some bishops have been godly men, and Gods deere saints’, he nevertheless criticized the fallen nature of the majority of the English church’s leadership whom he characterized as ‘absolute Law-givers’ and ‘atheists’. Their arbitrary power had led them

to doe all things like absolute Law-givers, Lords, Popes, and Monarks, or rather professed Atheists, fearing neither God nor man and breaking all their lawes, to bolster up base, drinke, idle, scandalous clergie men, exempting them from secular power & jurisdiction, to maintaine their Officers in manifold open exortions, oppressions, abuses, exhorbitant misdemeanor & the like...<sup>382</sup>

In effect, Prynne saw the bishops as pharisaic tyrants, rulers who in many ways, ‘farre outstrip the very Divell himselfe’ in their persecution of ‘Gods ministers’.<sup>383</sup> Thus Prynne’s anti-prelacy converged with anti-Machiavellianism. The bishopric, he declared, was constituted of the most ‘grosse Hypocrites, Machiavils, Equivocators & perfideous faithlesse persons breathing’ in ‘Divine as temporall affaires and transactions’.<sup>384</sup> Not surprisingly, then, from the very outset he linked Machiavelli with ecclesiastical depravity and secular power. This association is something we will continue to find in Prynne’s other pamphlets. Like his later works, the *Looking-Glasse* is a rhetorical piece which uses moral and antagonizing language to exaggerate the differences between two apparent classes of people: the entitled and hedonistic princes of the world (i.e. the bishops and their Romish counterparts), and the pious Englishmen. By emphasizing this dichotomy, Prynne laid the groundwork for future treatises, all of which employ similarly divisive language to describe the diametrically opposed political and religious forces operating in England and abroad.

Relevantly, Prynne’s *Antipathie of the Lordly Prelacie* (1641) also links Machiavellianism with the misuse of temporal power. It is arguably Prynne’s most exhaustive dissertation on what he saw as the failures and dangers of the episcopate. In the dedicatory epistle, Prynne denounced English bishops as guilty of ‘long-concealed Treasons, Conspiracies & seditious practices’.<sup>385</sup> These offences, he insisted, had chiefly arisen from

---

<sup>382</sup> Prynne, *A Looking-Glasse for All Lordly Prelates*, p. 51-2.

<sup>383</sup> Ibid., p. 6. For further instances of Prynne associating the bishopric with the devil and general *diablerie*, see William Prynne, *Catalogue of Such Testimonials in All Ages as Plainly Evidence Bishops and Prebysters to be Both One Equal and the Same in Jurisdiction, Office*, London 1641, pp. 20-3.

<sup>384</sup> Prynne, *A Looking-Glasse for All Lordly Prelates*, p. 12.

<sup>385</sup> Prynne, *The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie, both to Regall Monarchy, and Civill Unity*, London 1641, sig. ¶3v.

‘ambition’ and ‘covetousnesse’ and were not limited to present-day exploits.<sup>386</sup> Rather, they were a matter of historical record, part of a long tradition of ecclesiastical wrongdoing. Thus, in their pathological misuse of prelatic privileges, bishops acquired properties for themselves, stopped carrying out their preaching responsibilities, and punished or suppressed (with impunity) those who, like Prynne, ventured to question their authority. For these reasons, Prynne argues that they were not inerrant, and therefore did not have divine authority:

Ye shall know them by their fruites. Since then the fruites of our Lordly Prelates, in this (and in other kindes too as I could abundantly manifest) have beene so desperately evill, and they generally the greatest Monsters of impiety, that ever pestred the world, (as appeares by the lives of sundry forraine and Domesticke Pontifs;) I may infallibly conclude, their calling not to be Divine, but Antichristian, or meerey humane at the best, and inconsistent with the safety, both of our Prince, Church, State.<sup>387</sup>

As, in the *Looking-Glasse*, Prynne saw in *Antipathie* the bishops as enemies of the state and colluders with papists by reason of their luxuriance and lack of continence. Given this association, it is significant that Prynne used the formulation ‘a very vicious, false and crafty Machiavilian’ to describe John Spottiswoode (1565-1639), the archbishop of St Andrews in Scotland.<sup>388</sup> Prynne accused him of ‘confederating’ with Laud to become the Chancellor of Scotland. Once in office, Spottiswoode then formed an alliance with Scottish bishops to impose Laudian reforms on Scottish communicants. For Prynne, this fact was a matter of concern because Laud had in 1636 ‘usurped a kinde of generall and Papall Superintendency over all his Majesties three Kingdomes’.<sup>389</sup> So, when Prynne noted Spottiswoode’s changes to the Scottish constitution and his endorsement of the new Book of Common Prayer, the implication was that Spottiswoode was working as Laud’s agent of influence. As such he was a *de facto* promoter of Laud’s popish and Arminian policies and complicit in the oppression of Puritans and Presbyterians. We can therefore say that, in this context, a ‘Machiavilian’ is

---

<sup>386</sup> Ibid., sig. ¶¶v.

<sup>387</sup> Ibid., sig. ¶3v.

<sup>388</sup> Ibid., p. 341. Laud went beyond his jurisdiction when he forced Spottiswoode to implement canons (such as restrictions on public fasting) which he himself had crafted. See, L. James, ‘I was no “master of this work” but a servant to it? William Laud, Charles I and the making of Scottish ecclesiastical policy, 1634–6’, *Institute of Historical Research*, 90, 2017, pp. 506-525. See also, A. S. W. Pearce, *John Spottiswoode: Jacobean Archbishop and Statesman*, Edinburgh 2014, pp. 296–7.

<sup>389</sup> Ibid.

one who acquires both secular and religious power in underhanded ways, and in doing so, transforms religion into an instrument of political control. Such a person is bound to enforce the questionable policies of his sponsor(s) (in this case Laud). Prynne claimed that Spottiswoode's liturgical changes directly restricted the Scottish laity's freedom of assembly.

Thus far, we have seen that Prynne's concept of Machiavellianism is linked to temporal misrule, prelatic self-enrichment, and popery. From 1640s onward, however, Prynne frequently articulated his belief that Machiavellianism supplied the operating code of conduct for the Catholic Church. He explicitly advocated this idea in his poem *A Pleasant Purge for a Roman Catholike*. Published in 1642, the work is a collection of 'polemicall epigrams' that focuses exclusively on the central doctrines and practices of the Catholic church. In his forward to the reader, Prynne claimed that his poems resulted from his conferrals with 'sundry Papists', whom he figuratively engaged with over the course of his incarceration in the Tower of London.<sup>390</sup> His aim, he stated, was to lay bare 'their false fond tenets, worship, blasphemies'. Particularly illuminating is Prynne's ninety-first epigram entitled 'On Romes Religion Turn'd to Policy'. The brief lyric shows Prynne's conception of the Catholic Church's aim and its incompatibility with Protestant orthopraxy.

At the outset of the stanza, Prynne posed the following question: 'What Romes religion now decay'd? Pray why?'. The answer, he added, was that it had been replaced by 'state, wealth, wordly pollicy'. In fact, he suggested, religion *per se* was no longer the purpose of Rome's magisterium; religion had instead become an all-encompassing name for the sort of temporal statecraft advocated by Machiavelli:

Profit, and worldly honour comprise all  
Those points which Rome doth now religion call:  
Substract these two, and all Romes faith is gon;  
Its Policy then, not Religion  
Which Rome professeth: if these will her save  
Her Machiavill chiefe in heaven shall have.<sup>391</sup>

Once again, Prynne linked Machiavelli with irreligious ambition and political self-assertion. As he saw it, Rome's adoption of Machiavellian precepts meant that the ethics of its

---

<sup>390</sup> Prynne, *Pleasant Purge for a Roman Catholike*, London 1642, sig. A3r. See also Prynne, *Popish Royal Favourite*, p. 36.

<sup>391</sup> Prynne, *Pleasant Purge*, p. 103.

communicants—adhering to the programme of Rome’s ‘Machiavill chiefe’—were non-existent. There was no moral determinism, no heavenly arbiter who could keep Catholics accountable. Instead their mandate, as it were, came from the stirrings of human ambition, the nature of which—according to Prynne—is depraved and capricious.

Prynne clearly thought that this unmediated depravity, itself a product of Machiavellian misguidance, could explain the immoral behaviour of papists. For example, in the same work Prynne also maintained that papists have a predilection for committing regicide (a topic which would become a major theme in Prynne’s future works). In Epigram 92, Prynne made the claim that papists feel justified in deposing kings and overthrowing governments because their judgement rests on the judgement of the pope, who can interpret scripture as it suits him:

The Popes Supreame head of Christs Church: nay more  
They hence inferre, that they may judge, depose,  
Kill Christian Kings, & of their Crownes dispose:  
Feeding is killing now with Popes, and they Good shepherds are,  
when they their flockes spoyle, slay.<sup>392</sup>

According to Prynne, because absolute power rests with the popes (to whom all Catholics must pledge their unconditional allegiance and by whose intercession all are saved from purgatory), they are (to Catholics) akin to a human ‘god’.<sup>393</sup> A foil of Christ, the pope uses his wisdom to exploit and deceive, twisting texts to justify despotic, uninhibited behaviour. He can, Prynne concluded, ‘from any text High treason draw’.<sup>394</sup> From these passages, we can see that in Prynne’s mind the pope was a Machiavelli-type figure, the living embodiment of what Prynne described in other texts as ‘the law of the longest-sword’.<sup>395</sup> What is most especially clear from Prynne’s statements however, is his belief in the violent tendencies of the papal office and its associated militaristic capability. According to Prynne’s survey of

---

<sup>392</sup> Ibid., p. 104.

<sup>393</sup> Ibid., p. 105.

<sup>394</sup> Ibid., p. 109.

<sup>395</sup> Prynne frequently uses constructions such as this to describe his belief that tyrannical governments equate virtue with military power. To Prynne, Machiavelli was the populariser (if not the originator) of the doctrine as it was practised in his own time. See Prynne, *True and Perfect Narrative*, p. 40: ‘...Machiavills [Politicks] the Sole argument of the Longest Sword, the most brutish, unjust, unchristian, Turkish, of all others’. See also Prynne, *The First and Second Part of A Seasonable, Legal, and Historicall Vindication*, p. 47; id., *Brief Necessary Vindication*, p. 22.

papal misdeeds, such unhinged power had been used in the past to subvert and destroy kingdoms. As such, the pope was the greatest threat to the national security of Protestant polities.

In other works, Prynne continued to strengthen the differences between ‘true Christian’ rule and Machiavellian ‘policy’.<sup>396</sup> In *The Sovereigne Powers of Parliaments and Kingdoms* (1643), Prynne also warned of the ‘Machivilian deepe Plots of Priests and Papist long since contrived’.<sup>397</sup> This secret state was supposedly tasked with setting up ‘Popery and Tyranny’ to enslave the English and bring their laws and religion to ‘utter ruine’. In the same treatise we also find what appears to be the only reference to Machiavelli’s *The Prince* (indicated as ‘Machiavels Princeps’) in Prynne’s corpus. During an excursus on the anti-Machiavellian treatise *Vindiciae contra tyrannos* (a treatise, which—it has been shown—Prynne had a hand in popularising), Prynne complained that *The Prince* was ‘a most accursed and mischievous treatise’.<sup>398</sup>

The year 1643 also saw the publication of Prynne’s two seminal anti-popery works, both of which brought his suspicions about ‘deepe plotes’ to the fore: *Romes Master-Peece* and *The Popish Royall Favourite*. In these path-breaking tracts, Prynne proposed for the first time his thesis concerning the organized, Machiavellian-like (in the sense previously described) plot to subsume the Church of England. This plan had been allegedly directed by an entrenched network of Catholic spies, nobles, ecclesiastics, and Arminians. In *Romes Master-Peece*, Prynne claimed that this network’s power in England was due in part to the influence of Jesuit conventiclers over King Charles I, whom they had reportedly threatened with assassination.<sup>399</sup> Famously, the main documents which Prynne used to substantiate his assertions were a bundle of memoranda and epistolary material from Laud’s private correspondence, which he had obtained with the permission of Parliament. This information, destined to become—in a certain sense—canon in the ensuing anthologies of seventeenth and eighteenth-century popish plot compilers, was hardly insignificant.<sup>400</sup> Laud himself, in one of

---

<sup>396</sup> See, for example, William Prynne, *A Sovereign Antidote to Prevent, Appease, and Determine Our Unnaturall and Destructive Civill Warres and Dissentions*, London 1642, p. 31.

<sup>397</sup> Prynne, *Sovereigne Power of Parliaments and Kingdoms*, I, sig. A2v.

<sup>398</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 143. A recent study on Prynne’s involvement with the translation of *Vindiciae contra tyrannos* is S. Tutino, ‘Huguenots, Jesuits and Tyrants: Notes on the *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos* in Early Modern England’, *Journal of Early Modern History*, 11, 3, 2007, pp. 175-96. See also, *Vindiciae, Contra Tyrannos: Or, Concerning the Legitimate Power of a Prince Over the People, and of the People Over a Prince*, ed. and tr. H. Languet, Cambridge 1994.

<sup>399</sup> Prynne, *Romes-Master-Peece*, pp. 18-19.

<sup>400</sup> The Habernfeld plot and the conclusions drawn from it as first advanced by Prynne were widely accepted and espoused by both propagandists and writers of history from the 1650s to late seventeenth century. The plot was also cited as a precedent during the onset of renewed anti-Catholic sentiment in the 1670s and 1680s,

the letters to the king included in the incriminating bundle, admitted that the danger from the suspected plot ‘seems imminent’.<sup>401</sup> For this reason, he concluded that it ‘is the greatest business that ever was put to me’.

In the subsequently released *Popish Royall Favourite*, however, Prynne made more of an attempt to attribute culpability to the king by chronicling his efforts at foreign diplomacy and his management of public affairs. Citing controversies such as the proposed Spanish Match, the Irish Rebellion, and the king’s ostensible deference to his consort Henrietta Marie on matters of faith, Prynne questioned the king’s ability to defend the English church from an ever-growing Catholic threat.<sup>402</sup> As in *Romes Master-Peece*, the organisation responsible for furthering the atmosphere of delusion was the Jesuits. Prynne surmised that they inflated Charles’s habit of impetuosity which, exacerbated by his favouritism towards court Catholics and Arminians, caused him to make decisions mainly benefiting Rome. Prynne believed that this partiality to Catholic interests constituted a clear and unprecedented threat to the prosperity and longevity of English Protestantism. He feared that the Jesuits planned to resurrect the not-so-distant past, a society virtually indistinguishable from what had previously occurred ‘in the daies of [Queen] Marie’.<sup>403</sup> In Prynne’s opinion, Mary’s reign had not only seen the resurgence of a Catholic elite, but also the persecution and extermination of English Protestants *en masse*.

Since I have set out to forge a more complete understanding of the narrative overlap between the Laudian and Ancient Plots, it is imperative that I thoroughly scrutinize the *Romes Master-Peece* and *The Popish Royall Favourite*. There is not only a palpable thematic

---

partially triggered by the media publicisation of the Titus Oates plot. For general attestations of the Habernfeld plot, see, for example, Hamon L’Estrange, *The Reign of King Charles: A History Faithfully and Impartially Disposed into Annals*, London, 1655, p. 170; William Sanderson, *A Compleat History of the Life and Raigne of King Charles from his Cradle to his Grave*, London 1658, p. 287; Richard Baxter, *A Key for Catholicks to Open the Jugling of the Jesuits*, London 1659, pp. 316-7; Peter Heylin, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, pp. 451-2; Henry Care, *The History of the Damnable Popish Plot, in Its Various Branches and Progress*, London 1680, pp. 59-63; Bulstrode Whitelocke, *Memorials of the English Affairs from the Beginning of the Reign of Charles the First to the Happy Restoration of King Charles the Second*, London 1682, p. 31; Nalson, *Foxes and Firebrands*, p. 83. For accounts that explicitly or implicitly relate the Habernfeld plot to the Titus Oates plot, see Henry Hills, *The Grand Designs of the Papists, in the Reign of Our Late Sovereign, Charles the I and Now Carried on against His Present Majesty*, London 1678, sigs A2r-A2v; John Smith, *The Narrative... Containing a Further Discovery of the Late Horrid and Popish-Plot*, London 1679, p. 7; Andreas Haberveschl von Habernfeld, *A True Narrative of the Popish-Plot against King Charles I and the Protestant Religion*, London 1680, sigs A1r-A1v, pp. 29-36; Thomas Frankland, *The Annals of King James and King Charles the First*, London 1681, sig. A2r; *The History of Popish Sham-Plots from the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to this Present Time*, London 1682, pp. 5-6; Roger L’Estrange, *A Brief History of the Times*, 3 vols, London 1688, II, pp. 49-107.

<sup>401</sup> Prynne, *Romes Master-Peece*, p. 10.

<sup>402</sup> Prynne, *Popish Royall Favourite*, pp. 71-5.

<sup>403</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 69. The hostile campaigns of Queen Mary I against her Protestant subjects were a matter of public record and had been sensationalised in *Acts and Monuments of These Latter Days* (1563) by John Fox. In Prynne’s time the book was an influential and popular work of English martyrology, ‘a best-seller second only to the Bible’. See Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*, p. 4.

continuity between these treatises and the anti-Arminian pamphlets examined above. Here, too, are the beginnings of Prynne's evolving anti-Jesuit mythography, his transference of responsibility and agency from popish and Arminian malcontents to a body of supreme, all-pervasive intelligencers and potentates. This is the thesis which features prominently in Prynne's propaganda from 1645 through the 1650s. The Jesuits become the deep state, as it were, the tenebrous underworld both engendering and sustaining popish factions and Arminian allies such as Laud.

In effect, the Machiavellian elements of the Church of England bishopric, which are broached in Prynne's early works, are subsumed into the overarching Jesuit-centred narrative. Ironically enough, this use of generic Machiavellianism as both a glue and a lubricant to connect ideas of political tyranny, Catholic Aristotelianism and atheism had already been brought to fruition by Campanella in such works as the *Atheismus triumphatus* (1631) and *De gentilismo non retinendo* (1636). In a sense, the Anglican bishopric and Jesuit organization gradually became two sides of the same coin, such that Prynne (in later texts), within the boundaries predetermined by his own narrative, enumerated Oliver Cromwell's Machiavellian and 'Jesuiticall' principles, and branded Campanella as both a Jesuit and Machiavellian.<sup>404</sup> Again, Prynne did this fairly cogently by relying on the information he had first outlined in his anti-Arminian and anti-prelatic works as well as his *Romes Master-Peece* and *Popish Royall Favourite*, which can be seen collectively as a thematic bridge between the different phases of his thought from the Caroline era to the Interregnum. On the whole, the conclusions Prynne drew in these works became *a posteriori* axioms for his 1650s propaganda. This is one of the reasons why during the Interregnum, Prynne frequently casted himself as an authority on Jesuit intrigue in the margins of his own treatises.

---

<sup>404</sup> It appears that Prynne was careful not to openly accuse Cromwell of being a Jesuit. However, he did not refrain from casting the militancy and anti-parliamentarism of Cromwell and the New Model Army as principally 'Jesuited' and 'Jesuiticall'. Their actions, which to Prynne signified irreverence for public order and royal sovereignty, also suggested that they had been put into power or infiltrated by the Jesuits. On the other hand, Prynne frequently identified Campanella as a Jesuit and a Machiavellian. For comparisons of Cromwell and the Army with the Jesuits, see, for example, William Prynne, *A True and Ful Relation of the Officers and Armies Forcible Seising of Divers Eminent Members of the Commons House, Decemb. 6. & 7. 1648*, London 1648, pp. 9, 14-15; id., *Substance of a Speech in the House of Commons*, London 1649, pp. 97-100, 107, 111-2; id., *A Brief Memento to the Present Unparliamentary Juncto Touching Their Present Intentions and Proceedings to Depose and Execute, Charles Stuart, Their Lawful King*, London 1649, pp. 3-5, 12-13, 16.

## Chapter 5

### Prynne and the Laudian Plot

In the introduction to *Romes Master-Peece*, Prynne set out to provide a context for his coming exposition by producing a series of illustrative facts that would resonate with readers. He considered them to be evidence that would be readily and widely accepted. After putting forward a statement acknowledging the existence of a ‘long-persecuted conspiracy’ (the secret purpose of which has been the extirpation of Protestants and the re-establishing of popery in Scotland, Ireland, and England), Prynne cited a report recently conducted by Parliament: *A Declaration of the Commons Assembled in Parliament; Concerning the Rise and Progresse of the Grand Rebellion in Ireland* (1643).<sup>405</sup> Among other things, the formal declaration made the following conclusions about royal abuses of power in the twenty years leading up to the Irish uprising in 1641: 1) Charles had shown ‘superlative indulgence’ to ‘Irish papists’ by allowing them to purchase noble titles and freedoms;<sup>406</sup> 2) the king had illegally intervened to prevent Irish Catholics from being prosecuted for not attending Church (a crime outlined in Queen Elizabeth’s Act of Supremacy);<sup>407</sup> 3) the king had levied a £120,000 tax on all three kingdoms to cover the ‘new graces’ of his Catholic constituents;<sup>408</sup> 4) the king had met clandestinely with Irish persons (who later became rebel leaders) and agreed to cede eight counties (Roscommon, Mayo, Slogo, Clare, and Galloway, Limerick, and Tipperary) in exchange for a significantly discounted prince of £2,000.<sup>409</sup>

Moreover, Parliament—lamenting the fact that the king’s actions set ‘Religion for sale’ and furthered the ‘tolleration of popery’—alleged that Catholic religious buildings (i.e. monasteries and nunneries) were also furtively being erected across the Irish kingdom.<sup>410</sup> In addition, the report highlighted the crimes of Irish rebels who reportedly made a habit of committing massacres, ‘the dashing of infants to pieces, ripping up of women with childe,

---

<sup>405</sup> Prynne, *Romes Master-Peece*, p. 1.

<sup>406</sup> Henry Elsynge, *A Declaration of the Commons Assembled in Parliament; Concerning the Rise and Progresse of the Grand Rebellion in Ireland*, London 1643, p. 8.

<sup>407</sup> Prynne, *Romes Master-Peece*, p. 5.

<sup>408</sup> Ibid.

<sup>409</sup> Ibid., pp. 7-8.

<sup>410</sup> Ibid., p. 4.

and the like'.<sup>411</sup> For Parliament, these testimonial-supported allegations indicated that there was a clear intention to denigrate and disenfranchise Protestants in the three kingdoms. In a word, papists were instrumentalising internecine violence. Therefore, the Irish Rebellion itself was a means to an end:

this unheard of and monstrous Rebellion of Ireland, was projected, incited, and assisted, by those Councells now onely prevalent with His Majestie... the Queen with her Romish Priests, the Papists of all His Majesties three Kingdoms, have been principall Actours and Sticklers herein. That now those bloody Rebels have, in a manner, rooted out the Protestant Religion in Ireland, there is a Designe to pardon them, and to bring them into England to do the like.<sup>412</sup>

Naturally, this conclusion fit smoothly into the narrative underlying Prynne's *Master-Peece*. Indeed, the exclamatory promise to repel foreign subversion and preserve the English nation mirrored Prynne's impassioned patriotism:<sup>413</sup>

the House of Commons do conceive it impossible... to surrender up at once, The Protestant Religion, The Parliament, Liberties and Lawes of England, into the hands of Papists and Strangers; that so this Renowned Kingdom may be no more a Nation.<sup>414</sup>

Thus, by referring to the Parliament's *Declaration of the House of Commons* at the onset of the *Master-Peece*, Prynne placed his freshly acquired findings alongside what he understood to be widely demonstrated facts. Moreover, in disclosing the Habernfeld plot, Prynne gave readers further evidence of the magnitude of the international conspiracy. Even so, to provide additional validation for his discovery, Prynne stated that he was 'raised' from the grave of imprisonment by 'Providence' to bring the issue to light. It constitutes a testimony from 'Heaven super-added to the premises'. For this reason, anyone who choosed to ignore its truths 'may well be reputed an infidel or monster of incredullity'.<sup>415</sup>

---

<sup>411</sup> Ibid., p. 20.

<sup>412</sup> Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>413</sup> Ibid.

<sup>414</sup> Ibid., p. 23.

<sup>415</sup> Ibid., p. 2

The *Master-Peece* is organized as a series of letters between Archbishop Laud, Sir William Boswell (an agent at The Hague) and Andreas von Habernfeld. Apparently, Habernfeld had contacted Boswell over concerns about the testament of an unnamed former associate of Cardinal Antonio Barberini, who claimed that the Jesuits were meddling perniciously in the affairs of European nations.<sup>416</sup> Most concerning, however, was their secret plan to overthrow the English government: ‘a certain society hath conspired, which attempts the death of the king, and lord archbishop; and convulsion of the whole realm’.<sup>417</sup> Boswell relayed the information to Laud, who subsequently informed the king. As the content of the plot had only been discovered at random during Prynne’s investigation, the details were ultimately kept secret from the public. This fact, in addition to Laud’s apparent perfunctory interest in crushing the plot, suggested to Prynne that Laud was ‘not a real Protestant’, but a likely crypto-popish sympathizer who would ‘farre sooner hugge a popish Priest in his bosome, then take a Puritan by the little finger’.<sup>418</sup>

According to the anonymous informant, all factions in Christendom originate from machinations of the Jesuits. The Jesuits themselves were divided into four orders: Ecclesiastics (who ‘take care of things promoting religion’), Politicians (‘whose office is by any means to shake, trouble, reforme the state of Kingdomes and Republikes’), Seculars (who ‘obtrude themselves into offices with kings and princes’ and are ‘busied in civill affairs’), and Intelligencers (who deceive the ‘mindes of their masters’). These orders worked in tandem to ‘effect a universall reformation of the kingdom of England and Scotland’.<sup>419</sup> In his ensuing statements, the informant goes on to describe what amounts to a fifth column of sorts, a Jesuit-aligned conventicle embedded in the very fabric of English society.

The informant related that the recently-established body responsible for supplying manpower and funds to these covert cells was the ‘Congregation for Propagating the Faith’, an organisation based in Rome and headed by Cardinal Barberini.<sup>420</sup> Under Barberini’s direction, he claimed, the London society (supervised by the pope’s legate) became a kind of intelligence-gathering headquarters which invested its resources in prominent individuals (such as Francis Windebank, Kenelm Digby, George Gage, and Toby Matthews). They vowed to use their political influence to gradually reverse the Church of England’s

---

<sup>416</sup> Ibid., p. 5.

<sup>417</sup> Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>418</sup> Ibid., p. 29.

<sup>419</sup> Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>420</sup> Ibid.

restrictions on the liberties of English Catholics.<sup>421</sup> At first, the then ‘chief patron of the society’, George Conn, a Scottish Catholic priest close to Queen Herrietta Maria, had pursued his objectives with Charles and the ‘chief men of the kingdome’, openly bribing them with, the informant claims, ‘gifts of Pictures, Antiquities, Idols, and of other vanities brought from Rome’.<sup>422</sup> Finding his bribery ineffective, Conn and his associates then attempted to lure Laud by offering him a ‘Cardinals cap’. After Laud seemed to reject these advances, Conn hatched a violent plan to ensnare the king and his subjects with wars and threats of assassination.<sup>423</sup>

From here the plot became a game of strategy and dissimulation in which Conn and his agents forcibly caused Charles to submit to their demands. First, using the Scottish Prayer Book as a *casus belli*, they arranged for Scottish contacts to ‘stir up the people to Commotion’ and ‘precipitate them to arms’.<sup>424</sup> In quelling the ensuing insurrection, the king asked for military assistance from the papists as he remained ‘inferiour in Arms’. The papists agreed, but only with the Faustian provision that Catholics be given ‘Universall liberty of the excersie of the Popish Religion’. The papists also made arrangements for collateral operations, ‘if the king should show himself more difficult’; namely, if he did not comply with their demands, he would ‘be despatched’ with a specially prepared poison nut, which is kept in the London Jesuit headquarters.<sup>425</sup> For Prynne, the plot represented therefore a conundrum which could have real consequences for the English people. In a way, the Habernfeld plot illustrated a clear course of action (however inconceivable) that Catholics could implement to overrun both the soul and the body, so to speak, of the English nation. In disrupting the supremacy of the Protestant religion (the soul), Catholics would continue to foment power and freely challenge the authority and legitimacy of the Anglican clergy and liturgy. Moreover, in threatening the king and effectively seizing monarchical power (the body), Catholic intriguers would exploit his special royal privileges to influence public policy.

The foregoing represents the core plot as communicated by Habernfeld’s anonymous informant, but the full account also includes numerous details about the inner workings of the secret society, details which, I think, are pertinent to the subject matter at hand. Indeed, as regards the reportedly pervasive culture of Jesuit intrigue in London, Habernfeld’s informant

---

<sup>421</sup> Ibid., pp. 16-20, 22-4.

<sup>422</sup> Ibid., p. 16.

<sup>423</sup> Ibid., pp. 17-18.

<sup>424</sup> Ibid., p. 18.

<sup>425</sup> Ibid., pp. 18-19.

had much to say. Specifically, he claimed that all operations were run out of the house of a certain ‘Captaine Reade’ on Long Acre street.<sup>426</sup> This house, he maintained, was the *de facto* command centre in which ‘the businesse of the whole Plot is concluded’. Here Jesuit spies worshipped at a secret chapel and assembled to share strategic information.<sup>427</sup> Habernfeld’s informant also mentioned two primary resources that facilitated the outfit’s exchange of both domestic and intercontinental intelligence.

Local intelligence was aggregated by an underground network of contacts who operated satellite conventicles. Among the leading conventiclors mentioned by the informant were the Earl and Countess of Arundel (patrons of a secret ‘monastery of Nunnes’) and George Gage (fl. 1614–1640), a diplomat to the papal court who ‘palliated a monastery’ of forty nuns in his palace on Queens Street.<sup>428</sup> The informant then went on to add that, since Gage’s death, his property had been purchased by ‘secular Jesuites’, who had furtively ‘reduced it into a quadrangle, where a Iesuiticall Colledge is tacitly built’.<sup>429</sup> The most ‘unfaithful’ of the conventiclors was the king’s Secretary of State Francis Windebank (1582–1646), who the informant accused of outright treason:

Secretary Windebanke, a most fierce Papist, is the most unfaithfull to the King of all men, who not onely betraies and reveales even the Kings greatest secrets, but likewise communicates Counsels by which the designe may be best advanced. He at least thrice every week converseth with the Legat in Nocturnal conventicles, and reveales those things which he thinkes fit to be knowne.<sup>430</sup>

Foreign intelligence was supplied by Toby Matthews (1577–1655), the English member of parliament who converted to the Catholic faith and became a priest. According to the informant, Matthews was ‘of the order of Politicians’, an intelligencer especially adept at insinuating himself into all kinds of feasts, banquets, and conferences to ‘fish out the minds of men’. He communicated directly with the pope’s legate, Cardinal Barberini, and the pope himself. Furthermore, the informant stated that the main part of Matthews’ strategy involved

---

<sup>426</sup> Lieutenant-Colonel John Reade first appeared as a Jesuit-affiliated intriguer in *The Confession of John Brown, a Jesuit*, London 1641. In his testimony before the House of Commons, Brown, a Jesuit, accused Reade of leasing property on Long-Acre to groups of ‘lay-brethren’. See *Confession of John Brown*, sig. A2r-v. See also Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darkenes*, sigs Cc3r-Cc3v.

<sup>427</sup> Prynne, *Romes Master-Peece*, pp. 20-1.

<sup>428</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 22-4.

<sup>429</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

<sup>430</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

his cataloguing and disseminating of confidential information. He did this annually at an elite summit in Wales:

whatever he hath fished out, he reduceth into a Catalogue, and every summer carrieth it to the generall Consistory of the Jesuites politicks, which secretly meets together in the Province of Wales, where he is an acceptable guest. There Councells are secretly hammered which are most meet for the convulsion of the Ecclesiastick, and politick estate of both Kingdoms.<sup>431</sup>

Thus, in the Habernfeld plot Prynne saw a troubling eventuality. Based on the firsthand claims made by the informant (allegedly the ‘chiefe Actor’ in the plot)<sup>432</sup> and revealed by primary interlocutors (Habernfeld’s confidante), Prynne was compelled to accept that ever-increasing ‘regiments of most active subtill Jesuits’, whose power was bolstered by a seemingly network of papal and recusant interlopers and spies, were planning to change the English government and religion in radical terms.<sup>433</sup> These never-before-detected secret agents had not only created and maintained the Scottish wars; they had also evaded prosecution. Extrapolating from these evidences, Prynne claimed that the same cabal had launched the Irish Rebellion. He accused Captain Reade, the duchess of Buckingham, Queen Henrietta Marie, and others of stirring up trouble in Ireland, and then creating a ‘diversion’ to incite a civil war in England. This band of wealthy and sycophantic conspirators (Prynne explicitly called them ‘merit-mongers’) then granted their troops and munitions to the king to ingratiate themselves to him, and bargain for the ‘universal publique tolleration’ of Catholicism.<sup>434</sup>

Instead of proposing numerous antidotes to the varying dangers of the plot, Prynne made a peculiar recommendation. Ironically, he urged his fellow Protestants to ‘learn wisdom from these our adversaries’ and outdo them with their own espionage and counterintelligence strategies. Protestants, Prynne declared, would be able to salvage their liberty if they ‘equalize, if not transcend’ their enemies in coordination, subtlety, and industry.<sup>435</sup> This

---

<sup>431</sup> Ibid., pp. 19-20.

<sup>432</sup> Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>433</sup> Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>434</sup> Ibid., pp. 33-4.

<sup>435</sup> Ibid., pp. 35-6: ‘Finally, therefore, let the serious consideration of all the premises instruct us, to learne wisdom from these our adversaries; let their indefatigable industry, subtill policy, sincere fidelity, cheerfull constancy, bountifull liberality, fraternall unanimity, undaunted magnanimity, indissolvable confederacy, and uninterrupted pertinacie in prosecuting, establishing, propagating their Antichristian Religion, Treasons, designes, excite all Protestants (according to their severall late Covenants and Protestations much forgotten) to

exhortation, couched in hardly inconspicuous praise for Jesuit plotters, seems to suggest that Prynne actually admired some elements of their policy. His marginal notes, mostly gnomic commentary on the character of Jesuits and their machinating at-large, would appear to confirm such a premise.

In the section ‘The general Overture and Discovery of the Plot’, Prynne stated that Jesuits never stop plotting ‘until they obtaine their desired ends in all things’.<sup>436</sup> Later, in the section entitled ‘The large particular Discovery of the Plot and Treason against the King, Kingdom, and Protestant Religion’, Prynne spoke of the ‘ability’ and ‘diligence’ of Jesuits to ‘remove their greatest opposites’ at court.<sup>437</sup> He also admitted that it was ‘admirable’ that the popish ‘faction’ had risen to such power.<sup>438</sup> Elsewhere, when describing Toby Matthew’s clandestine fraternising and intelligence-gathering activities, he made a point of reminding his audience of their ‘slothfulnesse’ in relation to Matthew’s industry.<sup>439</sup> He then took his criticism further by stating that Protestants still had much to learn from the Jesuits with regard to espionage. Their lack of interwoven correspondents was a weak point: ‘The Protestants want of such mutuall correspondency, and intelligence is a great weakening to their cause. Let them learn Wisedome by their Enemies.’<sup>440</sup>

To conclude this section on *Romes Master-Peece*, I would like to recapitulate and expand on a few interesting points. The first is the somewhat awestruck stance Prynne had towards the Jesuit-orchestrated subversion of the Three Kingdoms. In the margins, he took a blatantly laudatory approach to Jesuit policies, reminding his audience of the order’s tenacity and adroitness in bringing its plans to fruition. This certainly sits at odds with Prynne’s appeals in his closing peroration, where he cast them as conspirators, apostates, Antichristians, executors of catastrophes; truly Machiavellian—in Prynne’s sense of the word. And yet, curiously, these were the very people Prynne wanted the Protestants to imitate. In my view, Prynne’s conceptualisation of the Jesuit as intrigant is evidence of his strong familiarity with anti-Jesuit literature. As I will argue later, his conceptions were deeply saturated by the ideas and caricatures put down by a number of anti-Catholic propagandists

---

equalize, if not transcend them in all these, in defending, securing, propagating our true Christian Religion, protecting our King, Kingdomes, Parliament, Lawes, Liberties, Posterity, all we yet have, or hereafter hope for, from that imminent ruine, which these Popish conspirators threaten to them.’

<sup>436</sup> Ibid, p. 8. See also ibid, p. 19: ‘Jesuites will not give over acting, till they accomplish their designes.’

<sup>437</sup> Ibid, p. 17: ‘Jesuites are both diligent and able to remove their greatest opposites at Court from out of place and favour too.’ Compare with ibid, p. 21: ‘The Jesuites it seems are very powerfull at Court.’

<sup>438</sup> Ibid: ‘It is admirable this faction should be so powerfully predominant as to displace the greatest and faithfullest Officers.’

<sup>439</sup> Ibid, p. 20: ‘His industrious activity should shame our slothfulnesse.’

<sup>440</sup> Ibid.

such as Lewis Owen (c.1532–1594), John Gee (c.1596–1639) and James Wadsworth (1572?–1623). I will explain their influence on Prynne’s anti-Jesuitism in the next chapter.

The second major work that contributed to the Laudian Plot is *The Popish Royall Favourite*. In terms of content and style, it is more of an extension of *Romes Master-Peece* than an autonomous work. Consisting of official and private letters, as well as myriad public records, it is fundamentally a selection of supplementary information arranged to provide an illustrative account of the king’s overwilling leniency and partiality towards English Catholics.<sup>441</sup> Prynne essentially hoped that it would serve as conclusive evidence of the king’s bad faith regarding the preservation of English Protestantism. As in *Romes Master-Peece*, there were effectively two deleterious powers affecting the king’s judgement and as a result, threatening his relationship with the Protestant majority: Queen Henrietta Marie and her clique of Catholic courtiers, and the ‘prelatical and popish faction’, effectively a broad coalition of domestic and foreign Jesuits, Papists, and Arminian clergymen.<sup>442</sup> This faction or ‘party’ (as Prynne occasionally called it) necessarily included Habernfeld’s version of the ‘Congregation of Jesuits’, that is, the ‘Congregation of Propagating the Faith’ in its ranks.<sup>443</sup>

*The Popish Royal Favourite* also contains a number of passages on the backstory concerning the confidential engagement proceedings of Charles I, the chronicle of which Prynne explicated vis-à-vis the correspondence of Charles (then the Prince of Wales) and Pope Gregory XV. Known popularly as the ‘Spanish Match’, the proposed nuptials were drafted to unite Charles and Maria Anna, daughter of Philip III of Spain. Prynne’s primary sources for the Spanish Match were letters and commentary from *Le Mercure françois* and select excerpts from André Duchesne’s *Histoire générale d’Angleterre, d’Écosse, et d’Irlande* (1614).<sup>444</sup> For Prynne, one letter in particular demonstrated Charles’s moderate—and therefore sinister—allegiances. In the letter, which was sent to Pope Gregory in the spring of 1623, Charles repeatedly praises the pope, makes clear his dedication to religious tolerance, and explains why his marriage would help reunite the princes of Christendom. Not only does he delineate his willingness to hazard his ‘estate and life’ for a universal church; he also expressly denies supporting any ‘novelties’ or factions against the ‘Catholick Apostolike

---

<sup>441</sup> Prynne, *Popish Royall Favourite*, pp. 34-6, 55-9.

<sup>442</sup> Ibid, sig. ¶3r. See also, pp. 25-6.

<sup>443</sup> Ibid, p. 55.

<sup>444</sup> *Le Mercure françois* was an early news journal and purveyor of French propaganda. From 1624 it was edited by Cardinal Richelieu’s aide, Pere Joseph. Jeffrey Sawyer has described it as ‘perhaps one of the most important political publications of the time’. See J. Sawyer, *Printed Poison: Pamphlet Propaganda, Faction Politics, and the Public Sphere in Early Seventeenth-Century France*, Berkeley 1990, pp. 136-7. See also S. Kettering, ‘Political Pamphlets in Early Seventeenth-Century France: The Propaganda War between Louis XIII and His Mother 1619-20’, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 42, 4, 2011, pp. 963-80.

Roman Religion'.<sup>445</sup> In response to these two points, Prynne surmised in the margins that the king deemed 'our Religion [Protestantism] but a Novelty' and that the king's involvement in the Scottish and Irish Wars was the fulfilment of his promise to hazard his estate to 'advance popery'.<sup>446</sup>

Although the protracted discussions of the marriage treaty eventually focused on the religious concessions, James's original interests had been in the prospect of brokering an alliance with Spain and securing monies through the princess's dowry without having to perform the degrading (one should think) deed of supplicating Parliament. Ultimately, neither party could sufficiently appease the other, and the marriage treaty (though signed) was nullified upon Charles' sudden departure from Spain in August, 1623. Nevertheless, Prynne thought a major insight into the king's (and, for that matter the royal family's) hidden allegiances was revealed in the aborted plan.

First of all, there was the problem that the entire operation was conducted clandestinely without the informed consent of the public and the supervision of Parliament. Charles and his attachés had, by the order of King James, secretly disguised themselves and left England's shores under the shadow of the night, later emerging amongst grandees in the midst of the royal court in Madrid. Such supranational diplomacy (that is, diplomacy in which agents act extrajudicially, outside the parameters of national laws) was—as expressed by James, a case of *arcanum imperii*—a mystery of the state.<sup>447</sup> Technically speaking, the negotiations ran counter to the established laws of the English kingdom, since Spain and the See of Rome were, from a religious point of view, sworn enemies. Hence, to Prynne, the parapolitical, secretive nature of such proceedings indicated that the king and his closest

---

<sup>445</sup> Ibid., p. 41: 'for as the common enimie of the peace, watcheth alwayes to put hatred and dissention amongst Christian Princes, so I beleeve that the glory of God requires that we should indeavour to unite them; And I do not esteeme it a greater honour to be discended from so great Princes, than to imitate them in the zeale of their piety. In which it helpes me very much to have knowne the minde and will, of our thrice hououred Lord and Father, and the holy intentions of his Catholike Maiestie to giue a happie concurrence to so laudable a designe: for it grieues him extreamely to see the great evils that grow from the devison of Christian Princes, which the wisdom of your Holines foresaw, when it iudged the Marriage which you pleased to design, between the Infanta of Spain & myself, to be necessary to procure so great a good; for 'tis very certaine, that I shall neuer be so extreamely affectionate to any thing in the world, as to endeauour allyance with a Prince that hath the same apprehension of the true Religion with myselfe: Therefore, I intreat your Holinesse to beleeve, that I haue been alwaies very far from incouraging Nouelties, or to be a partisan of any Faction against the Catholick, Apostolike Roman Religion: But on the contrary, I haue sought all occasions to take away the suspition that might rest upon me, and that I will employ my selfe for the time to come, to haue but one Religion and one faith, seeing that we all beleue in one Iesus Christ. Hauing resolued in my selfe, to spare nothing that I haue in the world, and to suffer all manner of discommodities, euen to the hazarding of my estate and life, for a thing so pleasing unto God: It rests onely that I thanke your Holinesse, for the permission you have been pleased to afford me, and I pray God to give you a blessed health and his glory, after so much paines which your Holinesse takes in his Church'.

<sup>446</sup> Ibid.

<sup>447</sup> Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darknes*, p. 12.

counsellors had pursued a special relationship with foreign powers that, in spite of it all remained opposed the legitimacy of the English state.

Secondly, the fact that the negotiations had failed did not reduce the significance of the Spanish Match. As Prynne saw it, the motive was deeply revealing. He maintained that the ‘maine end’ was the ‘seducing of the king and realme to the Romish religion’ and ‘the reducing of them to their ancient Vassalage to the Sea of Rome’.<sup>448</sup> This goal was in the end achieved in November of 1624, when Charles decided to wed Henrietta Maria of France. Like the earlier proceedings, the terms of the French-English marriage was concomitant with the ratification of a treaty which provided for certain privileges for the queen consort and her Catholic retinue. Specifically, the treaty stipulated that the queen and her children would have the freedom to practise Roman Catholicism in their own, private chapels. It also required the queen to keep a personal chaplain, twenty-eight priests, as well as a bishop-almoner (who would have some powers over the secular courts).<sup>449</sup> Most importantly, it indicated that the queen was and would always be exempt from having to convert to Protestantism.<sup>450</sup> Responding to this point in the margins, Prynne commented: ‘We have little hopes then of her conversion to our Religion.’<sup>451</sup>

For Prynne, the fact that Henrietta Maria was allowed so many dispensations represented a blatant sign of Rome’s ulterior motives with regard to England and its people. In Prynne’s eyes, the queen’s coming to England would trigger a kind of exodus, and papists emboldened by the queen’s lucrative concessions would immigrate to England in droves.<sup>452</sup> In Prynne’s chronology, this was the Pandora’s Box moment that accounted for the impressive, ever-growing number of *sub rosa* belligerents. Moreover, according to *LeMercure françois*, other articles from the marriage contract provided for the repatriation of imprisoned Catholics in English prisons. Prynne saw these clauses as loopholes which gave the king and his secretary of state Francis Windebank the freedom to suspend, terminate, or reverse (i.e. remove the record of their offences) the sentencing of Catholics. He also argued

---

<sup>448</sup> Prynne, *Popish Royall Favourite*, p. 43.

<sup>449</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 52-3.

<sup>450</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 53: ‘the king of Great Brittain, is by oath bound not to indeavour by any meanes at all to have his said qveene to renounce the Catholike Apostolike and Romish Religion, nor compell her to doe any thing whatsoever that is contrary to the same religion’.

<sup>451</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>452</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54: ‘Upon these Articles, Oathes, Proceedings of the King in these Treaties of Marriage with Spaine and France, and his enter-marriage with the Queen, (a most sedulous Promoter of the Roman Catholike Religion;) these severall effects ensued... an extraordinary great multitude of most dangerous seducing Seminary Priests, Iesuits, Monks of all sorts, especially Benedictines. Nunnes and Iesuitesses came flocking over into England, and other his Majesties Dominions, without any restraint or inhibition whatsoever, there being no lesse then 261 Romish Priests, Monks, Iesuites, (besides Popish Physitians, Apothecaries, and Chirurgions) constantly residing in and about London, in the yeare 1624.’

that Windebank had occasionally operated in an independent way, without the king's knowledge, to release Catholic prisoners. To give proof of this upper-echelon countermanding, Prynne compiled a list of examples, which he doubtless painstakingly assembled after consorting with John Glynne (recorder of London), Richard Graves (the Clerk of Peace of Middlesex), and Miles Corbet (Chairman for the Committee of Examinations). The entire section accounts for almost fifty percent of the entire *Popish Royall Favourite* (not including the epistle and preface) and provides a tangible dimension to his arguments.

The first eleven pages include seventeen letters from Charles showing that he repeatedly invoked his 'special grace' to discontinue the prosecutions of Catholics who had been charged with recusancy.<sup>453</sup> All the recipients of his clemency were either nobility or members of the gentry, a point which for Prynne demonstrated the exceptional influence of the court Catholic lobby. A few of the letters also include statements that suggest the king was acting solely on behalf of Henrietta Maria or her family.<sup>454</sup> Pages eighteen through thirty-two contain supplementary evidence in the form of 'special warrants' issued by Windebank, discharge letters, and depositions by pursuivants. As in the already-mentioned letters to recusants, these letters also show that the impetus for royal interventions was often attributed to the queen or her relatives.

For us, the main import of Prynne's argument is that Windebank (himself a 'Jesuited Secretary' and protégé of Laud) with or without the king's explicit permission, had co-opted the state's judiciary to manage a scheme whereby convicted priests could be granted pardon, asylum, and even restitution.<sup>455</sup> The procedure usually involved the king or Windebank circumventing the administration of justice by formally discharging and then 'inlarging' a priest who had been condemned. On occasion, the discharge would occur after the prisoner had the presumption to lodge an appeal, something which Prynne found particularly repulsive.<sup>456</sup> In some cases, the released convicts were whisked away to the safety of their home countries. Prynne, however, alleged that the excuse of extradition had also been used to

---

<sup>453</sup> Ibid., pp. 1-11.

<sup>454</sup> See, for example, *ibid.*, p. 5: 'we have been often and earnestly moved by our deare Mother the Queene Mother of France, to extend our favour to Sir Henry Bedingfield Knight, his Wife and Family, who are Popish Recusants, and we are very willing that for her sake they should receive our favour'. See also, *ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>455</sup> Ibid., p. 24: 'It was the usuall practice of this Jesuited Secretary (who had a pension from the Papists, and was a Lay-Jesuite brought up by the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose scholar he was, and made Secretary of State at his suite, as the memorialls of his life attest) First, if any Priests were brought before him by the Officers, if he could not discharge them without commitment, to commit them to prison for 4 or 5 dayes, for a shew, and then to discharge them.'

<sup>456</sup> Ibid., pp. 28-9.

secretly reinstate priests in undisclosed parishes across the kingdoms.<sup>457</sup> Overall, Prynne recorded over fifty counts of exploitative behaviour, but alleged that the true number of the offences was much higher, almost ‘infinite’.<sup>458</sup> He also contrasted the crown’s placatory treatment of Catholic prisoners with his own experience. The difference between the two, he maintained, was staggering. Prynne and his compatriots had been prosecuted unforgivingly, to the full extent of the law. Each man had been pilloried, deprived of his ears, branded, and exiled into ‘forraigne islands’, while Catholics had suffered minimal or no corporal punishment. To Prynne this demonstrated the ‘exorbitant power and prevalency’ of the ‘Priests and popish faction’.<sup>459</sup>

In addition to the material evidence of Windebank’s improprieties, *The Popish Royall Favourite* also includes several narratives which Prynne believed accurately illustrated the magnitude of the Jesuit invasion. One of these is paradigmatic as a frame story, as it were. It is a tale that is comparable to Challoner’s testimony about a papist invasion. The testimony in question came from a pursuivant named Francis Newton. Apparently Newton and his colleague Thomas Mayo had been given permission to apprehend ‘divers Jesuits and Priests’.<sup>460</sup> Prynne wrote that Windebank relentlessly obstructed their progress with threats, by releasing or protecting those whom they had arrested. At one point, Newton and Mayo discovered an infamous Jesuit convict and associate of Laud in the Surrey house of Bartholomew Frumann. Living under several aliases, this man (Henry Lloyd) had also been ‘a chiefe agent in the grand and damnable plot of the Gun-powder-treason’.<sup>461</sup> According to the pursuivants, Llyod had a warrant from Windebank, boasting that more Jesuits would be arriving the next day and that there was nothing they could do about it.<sup>462</sup> The pursuivants

---

<sup>457</sup> Ibid., pp. 20, 24.

<sup>458</sup> Ibid., p. 22: ‘Secretary Windebankes Warrants for releasing of Priests are almost infinite.’ See also *ibid.*, pp. 23, 27. Parliament had already brought formal charges against Francis Windebank in December 1640. He was accused of issuing seventy-four letters of grace to recusants and discharging more than sixty priests over a four-year period. Windebank chose not to stand trial and quickly absconded to France. The full list of charges can be found in *Speeches and Passages of This Great and Happy Parliament: from the Third of November 1640, to This Instant June, 1641*, London 1641, p. 327. For a detailed account of Windebank’s political life in England and France, see B. Quintrell, ‘Windebank, Sir Francis’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

<sup>459</sup> Prynne, *Popish Royall Favourite*, pp. 25-6: ‘D. Bastwicke, Mr. Burton, and Mr. Prynne, were most grievously censured in the Star-chamber, and most barbarously pilloried, deprived of their eares, stigmatized, yea sent away Close-prisoners and exiles into forraign Islands, and there shut up so strait, that not so much as their Wives of Friends might have accesse by person or letter to them, nor set footing in the Islands where they were cloistered up, under pain of imprisonment and the severest censures... To such an exorbitant power and prevalency had the Priests and Popish faction then attained.’

<sup>460</sup> Ibid., p. 30.

<sup>461</sup> Ibid.

<sup>462</sup> Ibid.: ‘The said Newton, together with one Thomas Mayo, about August in the tenth yeare of the King, searching the house of one Bartholomew Frumman Esquire, of Cheame, in the County of Surrey, found the said

also reported that years after their initial encounter, the same Jesuit declared that the change of religion would come about ‘by fire and sword’, a threat that foreshadowed Prynne’s conception of the New Model Army’s Machiavellian politics:

the Jesuit said to M. Waddesworth and M. Taxley these words (in Norfolk) some yeers since, That it is not now a time nor way to bring in their Religion by disputing or books of Controversie, BUT IT MUST BE DONE BY AN ARMY, AND BY FIRE AND SWORD.<sup>463</sup>

Prynne continued by saying that, according to what he was told by ‘Captain Francis Conesby Surveyor of Ordinance’, underground masses were being conducted in the New Prison at Clerkenwell. In vivid detail, Conesby had described the secret transactions therein and suggested that the jailers themselves were crypto-papists.<sup>464</sup> His account was another validation of one of Prynne’s theory that hidden, collegiate networks had arisen in England in concurrence with Charles’ marriage to Henrietta.<sup>465</sup>

From what I have been arguing so far, we can conclude that what I have called Prynne’s Laudian Plot synthesizes his views on the role of the Arminians and the Jesuits in destabilizing the delicate balance of the Protestant nation. In the last section of *The Popish Royall Favourite*, Prynne explicitly declared that the ‘Lordly Prelates’ were ‘fellow-labourers’ and ‘confederates’ with ‘popish priests and Jesuits’.<sup>466</sup> Their ‘resolved, purpose,

---

Lloyd, alias Ryvers the Jesuite there; who going to carry him away, the said Jesuit shewed him and two high Constables the said Windebankes Warrant, that no Messenger or any other person should molest him, whereupon they left him there. Moreover the said Jesuite then said to Newton and Mayo and the high Constables, these words: Are you angry with me for being here? if you will stay till tomorrow being Monday, you shall see seven more Priests of us here; this he spake in a vaunting way, having a protection from Windebanke.’

<sup>463</sup> Ibid., p. 31.

<sup>464</sup> Ibid., p. 33: ‘as he [Francis Conesby] was returning backe through the Hall, hee found a Priest there saying Masse, and the Jaylor himselfe with a Censor perfuming the roome, and censeng the same, (at they use in Popish Masses) and so many people, men and women, kneeling downe in the Hall, that hee could hardly passe by’. In the popular mind, Clerkenwell had been associated with clandestine Romanism since the 1590s. In 1628, officials busted a Jesuit novitiate sequestered within the Earl of Shrewsbury’s Clerkenwell mansion. Following the discovery several publications labelled the training house as a conclave and sought to link it with another gunpowder plot. Prynne had referenced the selfsame Clerkenwell raid in *Romes Master-Peece*. Generally, news of the ‘college’ (as it was subsequently called) stoked public fears and helped to popularise the image of Jesuits as invasive intriguants and bogeys. For Prynne’s account of the raid, see Prynne, *Romes Master-Peece*, p. 30. For an in-depth look at the Jesuits in Clerkenwell and the paraphernalia confiscated from the mansion, see H. Foley, ed., *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, 8 vols, London, 1875-83, I, pp. 98-141.

<sup>465</sup> Prynne, *The Popish Royall Favourite*, pp. 54-5.

<sup>466</sup> Ibid., p. 65: ‘This disperate confused Babel-plot of theirs, long smothered from the vulgars knowledge, is now palpably discovered to the publike view of all men, not onely by the Towers, Statues, and walls of Babel

practise, designe' was reconciliation with Rome.<sup>467</sup> He encouraged his readers to 'consider' the Arminians in this way, for it was only by thinking of them in those terms that they could 'withstand these conspiratours'.<sup>468</sup> Prynne's fatalistic tone was truly that of Hofstadter's paranoid spokesman. He exclaimed that there could be no toleration whatsoever for the prelates as they had, in service to their antithetical religion, exterminated and tortured thousands.<sup>469</sup> Furthermore, any Protestant who believed that the 'Kings and Courts designes are really to maintaine the Protestant Religion' was free to 'perish in his incredulity'.<sup>470</sup>

Prynne used the same sermonising tone to refer to the queen's allurements over the royal court. As previously stated, Prynne saw the marriage to Henrietta Maria as a consequential moment in Catholic-Protestant relations, the 'greatest means to advance popery in England'.<sup>471</sup> What ensued from the treaty ratified by the match were a number of special privileges that effectively gave rise to a culture of meritocratic favouritism, allowing for persons such as Windebank to manipulate the justice system in order to benefit meritorious or well-connected Catholics. In Prynne's mind, the immediate result of this new culture was the demotion of English Protestants to second class citizens, undesirables even. The additional worry was not only that the king had no *legal* power to constrain the queen's actions to propagate Catholicism; it was also that, as a *man*, he was inherently susceptible to the

---

(to wit, high Altars, Crucifixes, Images, Altar-clothes, Tapers, Basons, &c.) lately erected in most Churches (especially Cathedrals) by these Lordly Babel-builders, but likewise by their fellow-labourers, and confederates in this plot and structure, to wit, Popish priests and Iesuits.'

<sup>467</sup> Ibid., p. 69: 'these great Lordly Prelates resolved purpose, practise, designe, is speedily to set up the Pope and popery in our Church, and reconcile us once more to Rome'.

<sup>468</sup> Ibid., p. 70: 'we may now clearly discover our great swaying Prelates concealed practices and intentions to set up Popery, and easily conjecture that all their late Innovations... tend onely to this purpose, to bring in the whole body of popery among us, by degrees; which they have well nigh effected, and almost quite accomplished. This therefore being their cleare resolution, intention, confederacy, as most men plainly discern, and generally complaine of; let us all now at last, before it be too late, ere our Religion be quite lost and betray'd beyond recovery: begin to consider, view, and to the utmost of our powers, by all just and lawfull means resolve manfully to oppose, withstand these conspiratours practices, designes'.

<sup>469</sup> Ibid., p. 71: 'that Religion which they would seeme to professe, can never be loyall, faithfull to his Majesty, or His people committed to their care and cure: scarce one of our swaying Lord Prelates being able to say, that he ever converted one Papist to our Religion, or one soule to God, either by life or doctrine, though they have perverted, murdered, starved, destroyed thousands'.

<sup>470</sup> Ibid.: 'If any English Protestant, after all these visible most apparent evidences of the long prosecuted Court-designe, to set up popery, and extirpate the Protestant Religion, and the present proceedings of the Papists in Ireland and England by His Majesties Commissions and authority, (who wholly sides with, and relies upon them, as His best, trustiest, and loyallest Subjects, as they formerly have stiled many of them) will be yet so wilfully blinded, as to believe, that the Kings and Courts designes are really to maintaine the Protestant Religion, the priviledges of Parliament, the lawes and liberties of the Subject; and still joyne with the Royall party against his Religion, Countrey, Liberties, Priviledges, believing their specious promises and pretences, before their reall contradictory actions, let him goe on and perish in his incredulity.'

<sup>471</sup> Ibid., p. 64: 'the Kings match with the Queen was both in design and event, the greatest means to advance Popery in England, to suspend the Laws & proceeding against Popish Priests and Monks; and to reduce both the King and Prince to the entertaining and professing of the Roman Catholike Faith'.

queen's 'arts'. Prynne concluded therefore that it would prove difficult to truly pacify the king as long as his wife and her political backers were lobbying against Protestantism.<sup>472</sup>

In sum, *The Popish Royall Favourite* is a work that, along with *Romes Master-Peece*, functions as a cornerstone of Prynne's Laudian Plot. In it, he established clear antipodes, eliminating completely from his mythography neutral entities or unaligned forces. All evil (including that of the prelates) was integrated into the Jesuit cause, while all good was circumscribed by the English Protestants, those who were faithful to the 'primitive' church and who rejected Arminian ritualism and theology. As in *Romes Master-Peece*, the Scottish and Irish uprisings were blamed as Jesuit subterfuge. Yet in contrast, *The Popish Royall Favourite* includes the names of several ex-convicts whom Charles or Windebank had freed illegally, and whom had gone on to become instigators of military or religious aggression. In these pages of high dramatic suspense, Prynne described the inner workings of the Jesuit plan as a deterministic and insurmountable mechanism. The Jesuits were behind the wars, they controlled the judiciary, they manipulated the sovereign and eliminated honest Protestants. Finally, through their Arminian stand-ins, they censored the press.

At variance with Jesuit superiority was Charles, who in both works is portrayed as a hapless ruler with suspect ambitions. Prynne felt that his letters of grace to recusants demonstrated his *mens rea*, and his constant disregard for legality.<sup>473</sup> Throughout the text, Prynne's rhetoric wavered between lamentation and jeremiad. He did not really propose concrete solutions (e.g. new legislation or policies); his only advice was that the faithful pledge their lives in 'defence' of Parliament and their 'Protestant English brethren'.<sup>474</sup> The

---

<sup>472</sup> Ibid., p. 59: 'We may hence assure our selves, that wee can never have any reall pacification with the King and his Popish party, without a toleration of their religion, and a suspension, or repeale of all Lawes against them, according to the preceeding Articles; and in case his Majestie should prevaile against the Parliament, we must expect an absolute establishing of Popery, and suppression both of the Protestant party and Religion. Yea, seeing His Maiestie is both by Oath and Articles, not to endeavour by any means at all, to withdraw the Queen from the profession of the Romish Religion; whereas she on the other side, is left free, by all meanes and arts that may be, to withdraw the King from the Protestant Religion to her owne, and his children too: Wee have great cause to feare (if Adams, Solomons, or Ahabs seducements by their wives be duly pondered) that his Majesty, (now wholly alienated from his Parliament, and best Protestant Subjects, by the Queen and popish Counsellors, and resigning himselfe up to the Councils, Armies, Forces, Guard of his Roman Catholike Subiects, who have the custody both of his person, and next heires apparant to his Crownes,) may ere long be seduced to their Religion, as well as to their party.'

<sup>473</sup> Ibid., p. 36: 'Letters and Articles of the Spanish Match, layd the foundation stone of all his Majesties ensuing favours to Romish Recusants, Priests, Iesuites, and most punctually discover his good affection and inclination to the Roman Party.' See also *ibid.*, p. 44: 'his Majesties and his Royall Fathers intended Popish match with Spaine, and the proceedings thereupon, have beene the Originall Fountaine, whence all the forementioned favours and suspensions of our Lawes against Papists Priests, Iesuits, together with the extraordinary increase of them and Popery, if not our present warres, have proceeded'.

<sup>474</sup> Ibid., p. 75: 'These short Queres, with the premises duely pondered, and digested, should then (methinkes) induce every ingenious English Protestant yet adhering to the Court Popish party, speedily to abandon, eternally

emotionalism of the text is impossible to ignore. It pervades the work and adds a spin to the events. In the end, this sensationalism served to further mythologize the Jesuits—they were in fact portrayed as something alien to genuine Englishmen. Typified by their aptitude for foresight and violence, as well as their practice of fishing ‘in troubled waters’, pursuing their objectives while their enemies were engrossed in war, they were for Prynne apex predators, the arch-strategists behind a near-invincible, international paramountcy.<sup>475</sup> As such, their vast crimes were only detectable by those who were *au fait* with ‘Politicks or Machivilian projects’.<sup>476</sup>

In the final analysis, *Canterburies Doome*, *Romes Master-Peece*, and *The Popish Royall Favourite* paint a detailed picture not only of Prynne’s imagination and narrative resourcefulness, but also of his eventual fixation on Jesuitism. As a result of our close reading of his polemics against Arminianism and Machiavellianism, we should now have a clearer understanding of how he expanded upon his initial intolerance and gave form to conspiratorial narratives to address what he understood to be the tyranny of Laud. Thus, the Laudian Plot represents a confluence in Prynne’s storytelling. By this I mean that all of his anti-Arminianism and anti-Machiavellianism was absorbed into the figurative sea of anti-Jesuitism. This doesn’t mean that the personas of Prynne’s erstwhile villains (e.g. Laud, Windebank, Cosin) disappeared. Rather, they—like Proteus—changed shape and resurfaced with new aliases as Jesuits. In this way, Campanella, Richelieu, and Parsons took on many of the characteristics of Prynne’s Laudian Plot antagonists. Still, as I previously mentioned, Prynne’s writings circa 1643 seem to attest to the fact that his articulation of Jesuitism was heavily influenced by his reading of Jesuit histories. My contention is that it would be difficult to truly contextualize Prynne’s anti-Jesuitism without reviewing some of his sources. Prynne’s mind was, in my opinion, saturated with Jesuit tropes and tales. He invariably described their apparently supernatural intelligence and empire-building abilities—and these descriptions clearly made their way into Prynne’s Ancient Plot. Thus, in the next chapter, I

---

to desert them, and now cordially to unite themselves to the Parliament, and their Protestant English brethren, and live or die together in the present defence of their endangered Religion, Lawes, Liberties, and dearest Country.’

<sup>475</sup> Ibid., p. 59: ‘in which booke [*The Jubilee of the Jesuits*] there was this observable Passage: That the Papists should fish in troubled waters, whilst the King was engaged in the wars with the Scots’. This book (now lost) was attested in the House of Commons on 14 November, 1640. As for the term ‘paramountcy’, I use it here to refer to Prynne’s concept of the supremacy of Catholic forces and their seemingly borderless powers.

<sup>476</sup> Ibid., p. 73: ‘the English, Irish, Scottish confederated Papists (who are still kept furthest off from danger [in the Irish Rebellion], being rather Spectators then Actors in the hottest services may by this their Romish stratagem, speedily become the strongest or most predominant party, and so easily conquer the Protestants (as well of the Kings as Parliaments side) and utterly extirpate them, with their Religion... those who have any skill in Politicks or Machivilian projects, may most clearely discern this detestable designe against the Protestants (and our English Nation too, now devoted as a prey to the barbarous Irish, and other forraigne Popelings)’.

will seek to unpack more of Prynne's anti-Jesuitism and demonstrate how he repurposed the information gleaned in his investigations.

## Chapter 6

### Prynne's Anti-Jesuit Stance

It will be useful, at the beginning of this chapter, to review Prynne's earliest references to the Jesuits. The first edition of the *Antithesis to Arminianism* marks the first time he uses the verb 'conspire' in association with the Jesuits. In an animated rant filled with allusions to Scripture, Prynne likened the struggle between the English Church and its Arminian factions to a climatic battle between Jerusalem and the Gentiles who beleaguered the city:

build up the walls of our spirituall Ierusalem with one hand, and holde a weapon alwayes in the other hand, to keepe offe Samballat, and Tobiah; those Arrabians, Ammonites, and Ashdodites, those Iesuites, Papists, and Arminians, who haue conspired together to fight against our blessed Ierusalem; to breake downe her walls, and lay her waste.<sup>477</sup>

Prynne also called the Jesuits hell-raisers, because they 'raised up from hell of late' the idea of Arminianism and exploited it as a diversionary tactic to eradicate Protestantism. Moreover, he assumed that they were making progress in their plans for world domination, a project which aimed to set up a universal monarchy. Later he noted that the Jesuits, along with 'Papists' and 'Priests', were proponents of an anti-Christian Religion, a belief system which had supported recent attacks on the English citizenry, such as the Spanish Armada of 1588 and the Gunpowder Plot.<sup>478</sup> To justify his opinions on the Jesuit danger, Prynne cited Queen Elizabeth's Public Act of 1584 against the 'Jesuits seminary priests, and such other like disobedient persons'.<sup>479</sup> The statute is an outright condemnation of all Jesuits, who are portrayed as dangerous enemies of England and its dominion. Here Elizabeth stated that the Jesuits wanted nothing less than its 'utter ruine' and had to be dealt with accordingly.<sup>480</sup>

---

<sup>477</sup> Prynne, *The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, sig. ¶¶4v.

<sup>478</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 139.

<sup>479</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 138. Compare with Prynne, *Substance of a Speech*, sig. Q3v: 'We all know, that the Jesuits and their popish confederats, ever since Queen Elizabeths Reign, when so many strict laws were made against, have had an aking tooth against Parliaments.'

<sup>480</sup> Daniel Pickering, *The Statutes at Large, from the First Year of Q. Mary, to the Thirty-fifth Year of Q. Elizabeth, Inclusive*, Cambridge 1763, p. 349: 'Whereas divers persons called or professed Jesuits, seminary priests, and other priests...do come and are sent, into this realm of England and other the queen's majesty's

While outlining the ways in which known Jesuits should be prosecuted, she also made consorting with and abetting known Jesuits a capital crime.<sup>481</sup>

The next noticeable development in Prynne's conception of the Jesuits occurred in the 1630s. In *Histrion-Mastix* (1633), in an attempt to defend his fellow 'Puritans' and 'Precisians', Prynne compared them favourably to 'Priests, Papists, or Iesuites'. Unlike the Protestants, who had never endeavoured to subvert the English state and church, the latter group represented a mutinous, conspiratorial faction whose aim had only ever been the destruction of Christendom.<sup>482</sup> In the margins, Prynne backed up this claim with references to the 5 November prayer, as well as to the works of clergymen Richard Crakanthorpe (1567-1624) and John White (1570-1615).<sup>483</sup> Echoing the sentiment of King James's Thanksgiving Act of 1605 (which specifically incriminated the 'Jesuits', among others), the prayer reiterated that the ill-fated Gunpowder Plot had been a popish conspiracy.<sup>484</sup> 'Popish Treacherie' had brought the royal family as 'sheepe to the slaughter', and it was due to the conjunction of providence that England emerged unscathed from the 'unnatural conspiracie'.<sup>485</sup> The prayer included pleas to God to extirpate a bloodthirsty sect—clearly implying the Church of Rome—bent on carnage and insurrection: 'roote out that Babylonish and Anti-Christian sect... (whose Religion is Rebellion, whose Faith is Faction, whose practise is murdering of soules and bodies)'.<sup>486</sup>

---

dominions, of purpose (as has appeared, as well by sundry of their own examinations and confessions, as by divers other manifest means and proofs) not only to withdraw her highness's subjects from their due obedience to her majesty, but also to stir up and move sedition, rebellion, and open hostility within the same her highness's realms and dominions, to the great endangering of the safety of her most royal person, and to the utter ruin, desolation, and overthrow of the whole realm.'

<sup>481</sup> Ibid., pp. 349-53.

<sup>482</sup> Prynne, *Histrion-Mastix*, pp. 825-6: 'And is it any wonder then that Puritans and Precisians should suffer the very selfesame calumnies now? Alas what powder treasons, what conspiracies have these poore Play-condemning Puritans and Precisians hatched against King or State? what rebellions have they raised? what publike uprores have they ever caused from the beginning of reformation till this present? what treacheries, what mutinies are they guilty of, that they are thus condemned, as if they were as bad or worse than Papists, Priests or Iesuites, (for so some affirme;) whose very faith is faction, whose doctrine rebellion, and their practise Treason?'

<sup>483</sup> The homiletical works of minister Richard Crakanthorpe were frequently cited by prominent anti-papists.

Richard Baxter, for instance, wrote that he was one of the 'great writers against popery'. See, Richard Baxter, *A search for the English schismatick*, London 1681, sig. A1r. Additional endorsements of Crakanthorpe and the cleric John White can be found in, Henry Burton, *For God, and the King*, London 1636, pp. 133-5.

<sup>484</sup> Pickering, *Statutes at Large*, p. 145: 'many malignant and devilish papists, Jesuits, and seminary priests much envying and fearing, conspired most horribly, when the king's most excellent majesty, the queen, the prince, and the lords spiritual and temporal, and commons, should have been assembled in the upper house of Parliament upon the fifth day of November in the year of our lord 1605 suddenly to have blown up the said house with gunpowder'.

<sup>485</sup> *Prayers and Thanksgiving to Be Used by All the Kings Maiesties Loving-Subjects*, London 1606, sig. D2r.

<sup>486</sup> Ibid., sig. D2v. See also *ibid.*, sig. D3r.

The chapter in John White's *A Defence of the Way* (1614) to which Prynne referred provides an insight into the kind of anti-Jesuit feelings circulating in England a decade after the Gun Powder plot. To White, all grudges against the Jesuits and 'masse-priests' stemmed from an explicit doctrine, defined by the Church of Rome, encouraging them to rebel against and kill kings.<sup>487</sup> For this reason, the subjects of every ruler who 'receives not the Popes religion' would always be obligated to disavow their ruler's supremacy and disobey the laws of the land.<sup>488</sup> According to White, once the pope had 'by reason of religion' designated a particular king as a heretic, that king and his kingdom would be dealt with like 'persecutors of the Church'. Catholic citizens of that kingdom would be bound to obey the pope who outranks the king as 'the true monarch of the world'. Thus, White asked, 'what securitie can he [the Papist] give to the [non-Catholic] State?' The brutal fact, he concluded, was that Catholics in Protestant countries cannot be trusted, as they will always be pressured into subverting the 'present State'.<sup>489</sup> Assassination, White stated, was not something which would be undertaken by any party; rather, it was exclusive to papists:

Let the reader here note, not onely that the Pope and his Church teach and command the murder of Gods annointed Kings ... but appropriate the doing thereof to Papists alone, challenging the right of committing so execrable wickednesse to appertaine to none but Romish Catholickes; and disdaining that any should haue a hand in doing this execrable mischiefe against the King, but onely a follower of the Popes religion.<sup>490</sup>

In concluding his chapter on Jesuit malice, White reminded his readership of the 'execreble deeds' carried out by the society and its adherents in the reigns of Elizabeth I and James I.

---

<sup>487</sup> John White, *A Defence of the Way*, London, 1614, p. 27: 'I say still, and here write it in capitall letters, that THE CHURCH OF ROME TEACHES DISLOYALTIE AND REBELLION AGAINST KINGS, AND LEADES HER PEOPLE INTO ALL CONSPIRACIES AND TREASONS AGAINST STATES AND KINGDOMES.'

<sup>488</sup> Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>489</sup> Ibid., pp. 31-2: 'For when the King, by reason of his religion, is made an heretick, and reputed a persecutor of the Church, and disobedient to the Pope: and the Pope not onely hath power, but is also bound by his place to excommunicate, depriue and depose such; and to absolve the subjects from their obedience to them... it being the dutie of all, and that vnder paine of damnation, and as they will be counted good Catholickes, to obey the Pope in all things against the King. Now may any Papist warrant his religion from the imputation? and what securitie can he giue to the State? what pawne to his Soueraigne for his loyaltie? that the King and his State may be certen he will neuer practise or stirre against them. For if the Pope, by right, may do all this; and he beleue, as his religion teaches, that he is bound in all things to obey the Pope, as the supreme Pastor of his soule, and monarch of the world; he must, whensoever occasion shall be offered, do his vttermost to subuert the present State, and to plant the Popes religion and iurisdiction.'

<sup>490</sup> Ibid., p. 33.

Elizabeth had been a victim of their malevolence ‘till her dying day’. On the extent of their evil deeds, White affirmed that ‘a whole declaration whereof would fill volumes’.<sup>491</sup> As for James, he maintained that he has also ‘tasted’ the same practices. White noted, however, that in James’s reign, the ‘Iesuites and Masse-Priests’ became the principal ‘executioners’ of the pope, and they were behind the Gun Powder plot.<sup>492</sup>

Another major work mentioned by Prynne is Richard Crakanthorpe’s *Defence of Constantine* (1621). The text recapitulated what had already been proven in the fifteenth century by the Italian humanist Lorenzo Valla (1407-1457): that the so-called Donation of Constantine was a forgery. A great deal of the discussion is also devoted to arguments which attempt to identify inconsistencies in the Catholic Church’s claim to temporal monarchy. The subject had already received extensive treatment by Protestant theologians in the previous century, but Crakanthorpe, mostly relying on Scripture (particularly the New Testament), attacked what he believed to be the Holy See’s ideological fixation on empire-building and absolutism. Among the many passages he cited to highlight the errors of the Roman Catholic Church was the Jesuit Martin Becan’s *Constroversia Anglicana* (1612), in which regicide was endorsed.

Quoting Becan, Crakanthorpe repeated the assertion that the pope had the right to ‘lawfully’ excommunicate and depose kings. The usual way to do this, he stated, was to absolve subjects from ‘their due bond of subjection’, that is, allegiance to their monarch. In 1643, Prynne also cited ‘Becanus’ in his work *The Sovereigne Powers of Parliament* as one of many ‘Spanish Iesuites and Writers’ who affirmed the Church’s right to exercise absolute power over all domains ‘by open force or secret treachery’.<sup>493</sup>

---

<sup>491</sup> Ibid., p. 40: ‘Queen Elizabeth of most happie memory, since the tenth yeare of her raigne, about which time [Pope] Pius Quintus excommunicated her, till her dying day was neuer free from their malice: the Popes and their Cleargie, by treasons, inuasions, rebellions, conspiracies, infamous writings, and all the furie that the diuell could suggest, assailing her: the whole declaration whereof would fill large volumes.’

<sup>492</sup> Ibid., pp. 40-1: ‘And now finally, his Majestie that is, succeeds her in the tasting of the same, and worse, practises: wherein the Iesuites and Masse-priests haue bene the Popes principall executioners: his alleagiance refused, the Popes omnipotencie maintained: his Person disgraced, reuiled, conspired against, the Powder-treason plotted, by these men.’

<sup>493</sup> Prynne, *The Sovereigne Power of Parliament and Kingdomes: Divided into Four Parts Together with an Appendix*, London 1646, sig. Gg4r-v: ‘Becanus, Bellarmine, with other Spanish Iesuites & Writers, who most heretically affirme, That even the Pope alone either with or without a Councell, for heresie (as they deem it) and obstinacy against the See of Rome, may excommunicate, censure, despose, kill, or murder any Christian Princes, depose them from their thrones, dispose of their Crownes to others at their pleasures, absolve their subjects wholly from their alleageance, and give subjects power to rise up in armes against and murder them by open force or secret treachery.’

To sum up, it should be apparent that some of Prynne's primary sources firmly believed that ordinary Catholics represented a clear and present danger to the body politic.<sup>494</sup> Their loyalty to papal hegemony made them potential insurrectionists. As foreign agents, they could never truly integrate into English society. That this type of superstition (which manifested in a number of different ways and was influenced by specific events) was rampant in Protestant circles in this period is well attested. For our purposes, Prynne's references reveal the way in which he built on a constantly metamorphosing, uniquely English tradition. His views were defined by an intolerance which stemmed from concerns over England's survival as a Protestant state. In this cultural landscape, the Jesuits became the universal vanguard of all Romanism—a semi-political force tasked with carrying out the mandate of the pope.

On the basis of what I have discussed so far, we can assume that by at least 1629, Prynne's writings were presenting the Jesuits as fomenting conspiracies. By 1642, he had concluded that the Jesuits were the Church of Rome's ten thousand-strong army, a marshalling force which used 'plots, wits, pens' to keep the Church's magisterium from 'tumbling downe'. They also had a duty to destroy all enemy states, kings and churches.<sup>495</sup> The Jesuits, of course, had developed this reputation many years before; but it was the formal censuring by Queen Elizabeth I and James I, as well as sensationalizing real events (such as the Marian persecutions and the Gunpowder Plot), that accelerated the spread of a broad anti-Jesuit sentiment in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. In addition to anti-Catholic invectives formally sanctioned by English monarchs, narratives also emerged which attempted to elaborate on the intricacies of Jesuit plotting. Some of these narratives were produced by individuals claiming to be insiders (converts, spies and adventurers), who purported to have intimate knowledge of Jesuit intrigues.<sup>496</sup> Three such persons were

---

<sup>494</sup>Further evidence of the prevalence of Elizabethan-era prejudice against Jesuits is a 1581 letter of Robert Parsons: 'the talk here is about the Jesuits. About them there are more fables than used to be told about monsters ... things various and at variance with each other and manifestly false are spread about not only in private conversation and in addresses but also in printed books.' Quoted in T. McCoog, *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England 1541-1588: Our Way of Proceeding?*, Leiden 1996, p. 149.

<sup>495</sup> Prynne, *Pleasant Purge*, pp. 82-3: 'No wonder if all Romes flock saved be, They have ten thousand Saviours more than we; So many that to keepe them from disorder She marshalls some into a distinct Order, Grac'd with the saving name of *Jesuites*, They are such active good, sweete, saving Sprits, *Saviours* no doubt to Romes Church, Popes, and Crowne, Which their plots, wits, pens keepe from tumbling downe... they disturbe, annoy Al States, Kings, Churches, & would them destroy'.

<sup>496</sup>Conversion and renegade (i.e. defector) narratives were a distinct part of English anti-Catholic propaganda in the seventeenth-century. Michael Questier has described the process whereby Protestant ecclesiastics recruited ex-Catholics who were struggling financially to speak out against institutional corruption within the Roman Church. These opportunists parroted 'Protestant views of Rome to secure their absorption into the national Church and to obtain a satisfactory standard of living within it'. See, M. C. Questier, *Conversion, Politics and*

explicitly cited by Prynne as primary sources: John Gee, Lewis Owen and James Wadsworth.<sup>497</sup>

### Anti-Jesuit Sentiment in English Spy Narratives

Gee's *Foot out of the Snare* (1624) is first mentioned in Prynne's *Looking-Glasse for Lordly Prelates*, but also appears in his *Popish Royall Favourite, The First and Second Seasonable Vindication* and the *Quakers Unmasked*. The text is a compendious exposé of narratives which illustrate the fraudulent means used by Catholic agents and clergy to proselytize and exploit laypeople. Before composing the treatise, Gee had experienced 'scruples in Religion' and had, out of curiosity, gone to see a celebrated Catholic preacher in Black Friars on 23 October 1623.<sup>498</sup> During the service, the entire building collapsed, and nearly all who attended died or sustained serious injuries. Gee, who had been standing in the 'midst of the Rouse', tumbled along with everyone else and was covered 'with heaps of rubbish and dead carcasses'. Astonishingly, he emerged from the chaos virtually unscathed, and he—like many others—went on to interpret the disaster and his miraculous escape as signs of divine providence. Like Noah and Lot, Gee felt that he had been plucked out of danger and delivered from sudden death.<sup>499</sup>

*Foot out of the Snare* is in some sense a redemptive work. Gee saw himself as a prodigal son returned to the Protestant fold and compelled, out of duty, to report the evils of Catholicism. Perhaps, as a result of this zeal, the book is unrelenting in its vilification of Catholics, who are portrayed as conniving charlatans using theatrics, legerdemain and various kinds of fraud to win converts and material possessions. Like Prynne, Gee feared that a lack of information about the *modus operandi* of Catholics would accelerate the gradual conquest of the Three Kingdoms. He lamented that England was becoming more and more like an

---

*Religion in England, 1580-1625*, Cambridge 1996, pp. 41-53. For a recent study on these kinds of narratives, refer to, A. Shinn, *Tales of Turning: Conversion Narratives in Early Modern England*, London 2018.

<sup>497</sup> These are all mentioned by Prynne in his works dating before the year 1645. In the 1650s, Prynne produced an aggregated list of his sources.

<sup>498</sup> John Gee, *Foot out of the Snare*, London 1624, sigs A2v-A3r. The epistle dedicatory contains multiple misnumbered pages. Widely read by Protestants, *Foot out of the Snare* was a formidable piece of propaganda, a document which in the 1620s both helped shape cultural depictions of and fuel parliamentary pressure on Catholics, as Thomas Cogswell and others have shown. See, T. Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624*, Cambridge 1989, p. 288; M. C. Questier, 'John Gee, Archbishop Abbot, and the Use of Converts from Rome in Jacobean Anti-Catholicism', *Recusant History*, 24, 1993, pp. 347-60.

<sup>499</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

‘arras’ (tapestry), a country full of ‘strange forms and colours’ and bereft of evenness and uniformity. Gee also believed that emissaries of Rome intended covertly to make Protestants ‘become retrograde’ by stealing away the ‘hearts of the weaker sort’ (that is, women and simple-minded persons).<sup>500</sup>

In the text, Gee mostly explained these Catholic strategies, all of which more or less involved manipulating people with stories. Earnest laymen were deceived with stories of saintly miracles; women were tricked by the clever acting and misdirection of prestidigitators; students and youths were lured away from university and pressured to enrol in Catholic seminaries with promises of an easier life beyond the seas; parishioners were talked into relinquishing their inheritances; all was accomplished, Gee maintained, by playing on the credulity of ordinary people. In his view, these practices, carried out by ‘Factors and Brokers for the Papacie’, constituted a kind of mass manipulation designed to keep laypeople in thrall:

The superstitions and tyrannies whereof, I marvell... they... entertaine and practise, for the keeping the poore Lay-people in awe, which I take to be one of the chiefest *Arcana Imperii*, secrets of State, for the maintenance of their religion.<sup>501</sup>

Out of the many tales of clerical improprieties and impostures in *Foot out of the Snare*, Prynne highlighted one in particular in his *Looking-Glasse for Lordly Prelates*; it concerned two ‘Maydes’ who had been seduced by papists skilled in the ‘blacke arte’.<sup>502</sup> Prynne does not provide the reader with a precise reference; nevertheless, by process of elimination, we can conjecture that the maids in question were two of four possible individuals. The first two maids described by Gee occur in a chapter entitled, ‘Of later dog-tricks, and forgeries, by subordinations, raptures, visions, etc.’ Here Gee recounts how in 1617, two maids named ‘Ayme’ and ‘Mary’ came under the influence of priests at the gate-house of Westminster. Claiming that the women ‘gained much benefit from the priests conversation with them’, Gee

---

<sup>500</sup> Ibid., pp. 2-3. Gee believed that superstition thrived among women, children, and the ‘vulgar’, that is, simple Protestants. This fact, he argued, was persistently exploited by Jesuits and papist forces. For Gee’s additional statements on who was predisposed to credulity, see sig. A4r, pp. 29, 40, 91.

<sup>501</sup> Ibid., p. 93. Compare with p. 89: ‘in all the rest of the whole pageant of Poperie, everything must bee theatricall *ad pompam*, else the gazing Vulgar would not bee so frequently and easily caught’. See also *ibid.*, p. 45: ‘it is the steme of their impious policy, *ad terrorem incutiendum, et fucum faciendum populo*; to gull, terrifie, and amaze the simple ignorant people, and for bringing them into admiration of their priesthood, the sanctity of their attire, and the divine potencie of their sacrifice; by this means to inchant and bewitch their innocent simple soules, and so to offer them up for a prey to their great idol at Rome’.

<sup>502</sup> Prynne, *Looking-Glasse for Lordly Prelates*, p. 41.

wrote that they shortly afterwards experienced bouts of ecstatic rapture during which they were possessed by Michael the Archangel and other ‘masculine and feminine saints’. Eventually, their behaviour was deemed scandalous, and one of the possessed relinquished her arts, while the other was mysteriously conveyed away.<sup>503</sup>

The other candidates for Prynne’s maids were twenty-three-year-old Mary Wiltshire and the unnamed daughter of a certain ‘Mistris Boucher’. Wiltshire, Gee alleged, had been the victim of a heinous plot which involved psychological deception and intimidation. He stated that Wiltshire was manipulated by several priests who seduced her and stimulated her obsessive tendencies. She eventually fixated on evading purgatory, a destination to which the priests often referred in order to terrify her. After the girl developed a feverish monomania, the priests (one of whom was not a confirmed ‘Iesuite’ but ‘Iesuitable’, that is, a Jesuit in all but name) capitalized on her unstable state by causing an apparition of the Virgin Mary to appear by her bedside.<sup>504</sup> Gee writes that he personally interviewed Wiltshire after the fact and surmised that the ‘phantasm’ had been the result of ‘meere juggling’ and a ‘fly-footed Actor’.<sup>505</sup> Wiltshire, however, was credulous and converted to Catholicism. Soon afterwards, she was forcibly imprisoned by a group of priests and Jesuits for unwittingly eavesdropping on their conversation.

Gee claimed that the priests had mentally tormented Wiltshire by repeatedly saying that they were going to send her to a nunnery. In addition, to gain further power over her, they used a forged Latin manuscript to convince her that two of them were going to be archbishops of York and Canterbury.<sup>506</sup> Eventually, Wiltshire managed to escape from her torturers, but Gee maintained that at the time of writing she was living in fear for her life. The other maid (the daughter of a woman named Boucher) mentioned by Gee had also suffered from a phantasmagorical vision. In this case, a ghost appeared by her bedside and claimed to

---

<sup>503</sup> Gee, *Foot out of the Snare*, pp. 59-60.

<sup>504</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 108-9. The ‘Iesuitable’ ring-leader of the priestly fraudsters was a secular priest named George Musket. For Gee’s justification of his claim about Musket’s Jesuitism see *ibid.*, p. 103: ‘if hee bee not already a Iesuite by obligation and profession, yet he is Iesuitable... being furnished with a smooth glib tounge, and encroaching carriage, to insinuate with unsettled people, especiall with back-sliding Dames: Having besides a seditious incendiary spirit to work upon discontents, to raise up or foment faction and garboile when occasion serves’. Compare with Gee’s other statements on the prototypical Jesuit: *ibid.*, pp. 50-1, 90.

<sup>505</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 110-11: ‘it may bee surmised, that this was onely a natural dreame, and idle phantasme of this sick distressed woman, in the heigh of some fit of her Ague; whereupon the Iesuites were willing to worke and take advantage... this was a mere iuggling feat of the Iesuites, who suborned som fly-footed Actor encase in this Pagent, with painted theatricall ornaments, flashing out light from a dark Lanthorne, and multiplying heat cast toward the bed by tunnels from a Stove.’

<sup>506</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 114: ‘Which commanding power they [the oppressing ecclesiatics] did the more easily inforce, by reading unto her a parcel of Latin in Paper or Parchment, wherby they said, the Popes Holines had made two of those Iesuites, Arch-Bishops, the one of Canterbury... the other of Yorke... which she [Mary Wiltshire] avouched upon her perfect remembrance, as having been a great motive unto her to obey them.’

be the girl's godmother. The spirit threatened the girl with hellfire, saying that the only way to avoid the infernal punishment was to become a 'Romane Catholick'.<sup>507</sup>

These references to supernaturalism are relevant because, while Gee used the preceding tales to give evidence of the lengths Catholics would go to use illusions to deceive people, Prynne saw them as evidence of black magic. For example, in *Quakers Unmasked*, Prynne mentioned Gee's *Foot out of the Snare* as proof that the 'black arts' were still being used by priests and Jesuits to 'win and seduce their Proselytes'.<sup>508</sup> It is, I think, not coincidental that Gee's caricature of a Jesuit as a highly magnetic, astute and crafty predator was taken over by Prynne. The rest of his reference made use of Gee's catalogues. In addition to a section listing current 'Popish Books', Gee's appendix contains biographical information on sellers and printers of popish books, London-based Jesuits, priests, as well as 'popish physicians', surgeons and apothecaries.<sup>509</sup> The database effectively amounted to a black-list. Naturally, to someone like Prynne, who treasured and strove to recover compromising information on papists, Gee's catalogue was a boon. In *Popish Royall Favourite* Prynne used Gee's figures, stating that London was currently harbouring 261 priests, monks, Jesuits and physicians. There were 'four times' that number in other parts of England, and 'well nigh 300' in at least one other county.<sup>510</sup>

Prynne also used Gee's section on the child procuring practices of Catholic agents to argue that citizens of the Three Kingdoms were being sent overseas in droves to be trained at papal seminaries and colleges. He did not go into particulars, so we will need to rely on Gee's text to understand the ways in which these alleged practices functioned. Gee said that every priest was assigned two subservient persons termed 'laicks' whose 'office' was to 'straggle abroad for the bringing-in of game' (that is, 'weak wavering Protestants' and 'yong Youths').<sup>511</sup> To illustrate his point, he narrated the stories of three preyed-upon youths (one of whom was deceived and conveyed to school in Ireland, while the other two were saved at the last minute). They had fallen victim to the machinations of these operatives. Gee also noted that students were often lured to pursue studies at St Omers, Seville, Rome, Louvain, Lisbon and Douai with descriptions of the schools' 'beautiful' architecture, financial endowments

---

<sup>507</sup> Ibid., p. 111.

<sup>508</sup> Prynne, *Quakers Unmasked*, pp. 8-9.

<sup>509</sup> Gee, *Foot out of the Snare*, sigs R3r-X2v.

<sup>510</sup> Prynne, *Popish Royall Favourite*, p. 54. See Gee, *Foot out of the Snare*, pp. 7, 80, sig. V4v.

<sup>511</sup> Gee, *Foot out of the Snare*, pp. 68-9.

and convivial, pious atmosphere.<sup>512</sup> Lastly, he added that he knew of ‘scouts’ who operated at the University of Oxford.<sup>513</sup>

The alleged intricate networks by which Jesuits, nuns, monks, priests and novitiate collegians were conveyed into the British Isles and evaded detection, received further elaboration in Lewis Owen’s 1626 *The Running Register*. As he did with Gee, Prynne utilized Owen’s conjectures that Jesuits were being trained in Catholic institutions, plied with misleading identity documents and trafficked across the Three Kingdoms to support his own belief in an ‘infinite’ and undetected population of Jesuit expatriates. In the first part of his *Seasonable and Historical Vindication*, Prynne maintains that ‘of late yeers many hundreds, if not thousands, of this Society, have crept into England, Scotland and Ireland, lurking under several disguises’.<sup>514</sup> For our purposes, Owen’s work is useful not only for its purported first-hand knowledge of Jesuit transcontinental collusion (Owen says his information derives from what he has personally heard or seen), but also for its profiling of ‘typical’ Jesuit behaviour and characteristics.

As an adventurer and intelligencer who had spent a great deal of time in Spanish cities and who had written an introductory guide to the ‘Spanish tongue’, Owen framed *The Running Register* as the result of multiple years’ of personal research acquired while living in close quarters with lay and ordained Catholics. In the work, Owen attempted to reveal the state of Catholicism as it then existed in collegiate and academic institutions in various Western European countries. Overall, he espoused the alarmist perception of Catholicism and its attendant ecclesiastical and monastic systems. He did this by underscoring individual cases which, he argued, evinced the systemic corruption prevalent in all Catholic organizations.

In short, Owen stressed that Catholics could not be trusted because of their axiomatic fealty to monarchs of their own faith. To him, the focal point around which all English Catholic sentiment orbited and to which all protocol and policies were adapted was the Spanish sovereign. Almost every recusant, Jesuit, seminarian, monk and priest was both a spy who listened to and reported on every conversation and a propagandist who was employed to ‘dismay the courage’ of Englishmen.<sup>515</sup> Entry into the various monastic orders or seminaries

---

<sup>512</sup> Ibid., pp. 69-70.

<sup>513</sup> Ibid., 70.

<sup>514</sup> Prynne, *The Second Part of a Seasonable Legal and Historical Vindication*, sig. Ar.

<sup>515</sup> Lewis Owen, *The Running Register, Recording a True Relation of the State of the English Colledges, Seminaries and Cloysters in All Forraine Parts*, London 1626, pp. 111-12: ‘all the English Iesuites, Monks, and Seminarie Priests, year, I feare me, most of our English Popish Recusants, are Espies and Intelligencers for the King of Spaine and his Confederates... they have one insinuating fellow or other (hired of purpose to listen and

was given only after postulants had pledged their lives to their provincial superior. By ‘consequence’, they agreed to commit insurrectionary acts on behalf of Spain. This contributed to their ultimate aim of making a cultural ‘bridge’, preparing the way for a Spanish invasion:

This Superiour is always one that absolutely depends on the K. Of Spain... & so by consequence are all the inferiours, of which, as soone as any groweth to greater perfection then his fellowes, so is he chosen soonest to be sent into England, there to perturbe the quiet of the Realme, to sowe sedition, to practise revolts, and to alienate the minde of the subjects from obedience to his Maiestie, thereby to prepare a Bridge for him, whereby hee might make his entry into this Realme.<sup>516</sup>

Owen voiced a diffused sentiment which helps us to understand the English reception of Campanella’s political philosophy and the fears related to the expansion of the Spanish empire, as I have detailed in Chapters 1 and 2. In Owen’s opinion, the Jesuits and other papist operatives planned to cripple England by appropriating its financial and intellectual capital. They were forcing businesses into bankruptcy, circumventing immigration laws and conning numerous persons by persuading them either to donate vast sums of money or to join seminaries. Owens described these many schemes in remarkable detail; but I shall emphasize those which provided the source material for Prynne’s claims. Owen’s most provocative assertion concerned the method through which, as Prynne stated, ‘infinite’ numbers of people were smuggled in and out of the Three Kingdoms.

Towards the end of his section entitled ‘Of the English Iesuitesses’, Owen said several orders of monks, Jesuits and nuns kept an ‘agent’ in London, a trusted go-between who was paid to ‘solicite their affiares’. This official, apparently to boost his persuasiveness, would dress luxuriantly (in a satin suit or cloak lined with velvet) and act the part of a patriotic gallant when making his case to the Privy Council. He then would ask for a travel pass for the professed purposes of convalescence (such as a trip to a spa town) or education (for instance, to learn a foreign language abroad). Having obtained the licence, the intermediary would

---

hearken to every mans discourse, and learne what news he can... they will very impudently extol the King of Spaines greatnesse, his power and forces; and disgrace the King of Englands power, and laugh and scoff at it; and by all means possible, they do endeavour to dismay the courage of his Maiesties subjects’.

<sup>516</sup> Ibid., p. 115.

distribute it to his clerical or monastic patron, who in turn would use it to smuggle as many people as he saw fit without ‘any examination at all’.<sup>517</sup>

Owens stated that these passes were ‘commonly good’ for three years, which meant that during that period papists and their allies had no restrictions whatever on international travel. To bring home the ramifications of this loophole, Owens said that he had heard reports of papists smuggling over sixty (‘threescore’) compatriots with a single pass. After a year, the pass would become the exclusive instrument of Jesuits and priests who would pose as masters and servants when immigrating to England. Upon arrival, they would pass it on to other companions and the cycle would repeat itself *ad infinitum*.<sup>518</sup>

Other methods employed by illegal aliens to evade capture included using off-course sailing routes (for example, embarking from Calais, landing in Zealand and then returning to England) and forcing ambassadors to become unwitting traffickers. According to Owens, rerouted passages were effective because ‘those that come into England out of the States Dominions’ were never suspected of being papists. As for manipulating ambassadors, Owens affirmed that their ignorance was often ‘made use of’. Papists, in addition to ‘other Popish merchandise’, were mixed in with the cargo of ambassadorial ships and smuggled abroad. Owens added, to stress the difficulty of policing smugglers, that he knew men who were ‘set ashore in the nighttime’ near Margate on the Kentish coast. After hiring a small boat, the papists disembarked from Dunkirk and landed stealthily at place called ‘Starregate’.<sup>519</sup>

From these elaborate descriptions, which claimed to reveal the ingenuity of papist operators in transporting their companions, we can see how offensive the entire situation would have appeared to Prynne. The actions which occurred prior to transport, however, that is, the grooming of potential candidates for ordination, was also an integral part of the total conspiracy, one that should not be overlooked. Owen believed that the Jesuits had a special role in this regard, singling out England’s best and brightest, the scions of noble families. To be considered for the order, a postulant had to be a good scholar (‘well read in Nicholas Machiavell’) and have ‘pregnant wit’ and a ‘turbulent spirit’.<sup>520</sup>

Owen’s investigations into the depravity of the Catholic system of recruitment are of ampler proportions in *The Unmasking of all Popish Monks, Friars, and Jesuits*, published in 1628. In this tract, which is thought to have been written before *Running Register*, Owen calls

---

<sup>517</sup> Ibid., pp. 109-10.

<sup>518</sup> Ibid., pp. 110-11.

<sup>519</sup> Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>520</sup> Ibid., pp. 4-5, 22,

the Jesuit novitiate a ‘Machavillian Schoole’.<sup>521</sup> It is governed by a rector and ‘two or three professed Machiavells’.<sup>522</sup> He asserts that the Jesuits are the ‘greatest intelligencers and statesmen in the world’. In this capacity, they have been the main instigators of wars in European states. Elsewhere, he describes them as a ‘company of cunning magicians’ and sorcerers, whose central aim is to use fox-like stratagems to increase the power and influence of the Spanish monarch.<sup>523</sup> Thus, the personality and aptitude of prospective novices must match the exceptional cunning and duplicity of their superiors, whose ‘Grand-master’ was the devil himself.<sup>524</sup>

Once recruiters were satisfied that the applicants had met all the required conditions, they were then persuaded to enrol at a seminary with various incentives such as fame and money. Disaffected or ambitious students were given the same line: as Catholics they would ‘come to greater preferments than ever they shall in England attaine unto’.<sup>525</sup> Upon matriculating into their chosen school, they were ‘imprisoned and mewed up’, forced to change their names and banned from freely engaging with their friends and relatives. They then endured years of indoctrination during which they became as capable of relentlessly furthering Jesuit interests as their elders. All in all, the end result of the Catholic educational system was a self-replenishing elite force of propagandists and spies. Aided by immigration loopholes and honed by a long, Continental tradition of warmongering, graduates (as portrayed by Owen) possessed the resources to destroy the Three Kingdoms from the inside.

This brings us to our next key source, James Wadsworth. He had entered the Jesuit College of Saint Omers in 1618, but later renounced popery in 1625. Afterwards, he found employment as a pursuivant, and a number of his reported exploits in hunting Jesuits and papists were included in the *Popish Royal Favourite*.<sup>526</sup> Later, in the trial of Archbishop Laud, he testified that Laud had helped to enable popish fugitives. Laud, however, questioned Wadsworth’s motives and personal history, saying that his story was ‘hearsay’.<sup>527</sup>

Whereas Owen was a fellow traveller of the Spanish Jesuits and a witness to their stratagems, Wadsworth was a *bona fide* insider, one who had first-person knowledge of the kind of activities Owen had initially described. Moreover, Wadsworth had brushed shoulders

---

<sup>521</sup> Lewis Owen, *The Unmasking of All Popish Monks, Friars, and Iesuits. Or, A Treatise of Their Genealogie, Beginnings, Proceedings, and Present State*, London 1628, p. 129.

<sup>522</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 130.

<sup>523</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 159-61.

<sup>524</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 101.

<sup>525</sup> Owen, *The Running Register*, p. 4. See also *ibid.*, pp. 29, 77.

<sup>526</sup> Prynne, *Popish Royall Favourite*, pp. 32, 43, 54.

<sup>527</sup> Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, sig. Cccc2v.

with Catholic nobility. His father, Prynne noted, was ‘tutor to Donna Maria’, the princess considered as a potential English consort to Charles in the Spanish Match. Wadsworth’s *Spanish English Pilgrime* (1629) was therefore an invaluable source to Prynne. It is from Wadsworth that he acquired the story that Jesuit agents had proposed a binding clause to be included in the Spanish Match which allegedly stated that it would only go ahead if the English king agreed to establish a college of Jesuits at every university in the Three Kingdoms.<sup>528</sup> Wadsworth had also been one of the men present at the capture of the pseudonymous Jesuit Francis Smith in Norfolk, who had reportedly boasted that a change of religion in England would be brought about by military force.<sup>529</sup>

As for the Jesuits *in toto*, Wadsworth was in agreement with Gee and Owen. After describing a number of circumstances which involved Jesuit superiors taking advantage (both psychologically and physically) of their students, Wadsworth summed up his general opinion of the Jesuit mentality. Most of them were atheists, Machiavellians and ‘very bad Christians’. They did ‘nothing but imploy themselues in matters of State, and insinuate themselues into the secrets of great ones’. They provided intelligence only to ‘the Pope and his Catholike Maiesty, whose sworne vassals they are’. The Jesuits’ ‘ten commandments’, as set out by Wadsworth, included, *inter alia*, a pledge to govern the world; their religion, according to him, was merely a ‘cloak for wickedness’, and their motto was ‘all for me, none for thee’.<sup>530</sup>

In sum, there are some characteristics shared by Gee, Owen and Wadsworth which suggest their appeal to Prynne. Firstly, he could relate to all three of them, to some degree: Gee had suffered at the hands of papists and undergone a spiritual renewal; Owen had lived as an expatriate and allegedly had seen Jesuit cruelty in action; and Wadsworth had been privy to corruption in royal courts and Jesuit colleges. They had all drawn on their personal experiences to militate against Catholicism and had a particular *animus* against the Jesuits. Secondly, each of them as an English national—no doubt influenced by the Anglo-Spanish conflicts and intrigues of the 1620s—understood the global Catholic-Protestant conflict as a central issue for the Three Kingdoms. England and its provinces were seen as the stronghold of the all the ‘Reformed Churches in the world’. As such, the British Isles were the primary theatre of war.<sup>531</sup>

---

<sup>528</sup> Ibid., p. 43. Prynne erroneously cites pp. 30-1, but the story appears elsewhere in Wadsworth’s work. For Wadsworth’s account of the Hugh Simple tale see James Wadsworth, *English Spanish Pilgrime*, London 1629, pp. 64-5.

<sup>529</sup> Prynne, *Popish Royall Favourite*, p. 31. See also Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, sig. Nn1r.

<sup>530</sup> Wadsworth, *English Spanish Pilgrime*, pp. 28-9.

<sup>531</sup> William Prynne, *Sad and Serious Political Considerations Touching the Invasive War Against our Protestant Brethren in Scotland*, London 1650, p. 1: ‘the Kingdoms of England and Scotland make up the greatest Body of

The works of these men served both to inform the general public and to illustrate the corruption of the most prestigious elements of Catholic society. At the same time, they offered extreme, caricatured portraits of the prototypical Jesuit, who, as we have seen in Prynne's writings, often took on a Machiavellian and duplicitous persona. These profiles certainly resonated with Prynne and seem to have contributed to the more zealous stance he took against the Jesuits from 1643 onwards. Indeed, Prynne's *Hidden Workes of Darkness* and *Canterburies Doome* indicate that by 1645, his conspiratorial ideology had deepened considerably. Both texts contain numerous Jesuit truisms and fables, all of which bear a resemblance to the anti-Jesuit narratives of Gee, Owen and Wadsworth.

As we have seen in Chapter 5, *Hidden Workes of Darkness* and *Canterburies Doome* are explanatory texts which serve to provide a legal and religious background to the events which led up to the trial of Archbishop Laud. It was Prynne's intent that these works would be used for future reference. Each text therefore includes numerous primary source material (parliamentary declarations, private letters, depositions and so on). They provided readers with concrete information on the political controversies in which the government had been entangled since the early 1600s. To assist readers, Prynne also included a 'Table of Principal Matters' listing the most pressing subjects alphabetically. Among the most important topics were the Jesuits.

In *Hidden Workes of Darkness*, Prynne drew on his old claim that Arminianism was a Jesuit ploy. This time, however, he alleged that Arminianism was a 'soveraigne Drugge', which had originally been planted by the order to 'purge the Protestants from their Heresie'.<sup>532</sup> He knew this because of what he had read in a 'Iesuits letter to the Recter at Bruxels', a secret document which had purportedly been retrieved in the wake of the government seizure of Jesuit paraphernalia in a mansion belonging to the Earl of Shrewsbury at Clerkenwell in 1628, as I mentioned in the previous chapter. In the letter, the unnamed Jesuit outlined his conspiratorial outlook, explaining that 'our foundation is

---

the Protestant Religion in Christendom, being best able to defend themselves, and succour other Reformed Churches...And therefore the ruine of the Protestant Party in these Kingdoms, is the readiest way to indanger, conquer, ruine all other Reformed Churches in the world, and extirpate the Protestant Religion in all other Countries.'

<sup>532</sup> Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darknes*, p. 89. See also, *Canterburies Doome*, pp. 159-60. Compare with Prynne, *The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme*, sig. c3r-v: 'Certainly, Arminianisme (whateuer some men vainely dreame) is but an olde condemned Heresie, raised up from hell of late, by some Iesuits and infernall spirits, to kindle a combustion in all Protestant States and Churches; to trample vnder feete the soueraigntie and kingdome of Gods grace, and true Religion in all places where they raigne or flourish; that so Romes grand Impostors might possesse their throne.'

Arminianisme'.<sup>533</sup> Among other things, the author revealed that Arminianism was the Jesuit's main engine for effecting mutation in the English realm. His view was that Arminianism encouraged factionalism, and factionalism in turn would weaken Parliament over time. Factions, therefore, were meant to be 'direct mediums and instruments' to their end: 'the universall Catholike Monarchy'.<sup>534</sup> Prynne had found a copy of the letter in Laud's study. To him, it served as further evidence of Laud's complicity and guilt. In his trial, Laud rebuffed Prynne's accusations and maintained that it was lawful for him to 'read and keep' it, as it contained 'many strange vile things in it against the Parliament'.<sup>535</sup> The letter itself is certainly a forgery. Throughout the seventeenth century, it appeared in multiple iterations and—much like Prynne's Campanella narrative—it was repeatedly flaunted as epistolary proof of the Jesuits' secret plans.

The most consequential element of the *Hidden Workes of Darknesse* for the present exposition pertains to Prynne's account of the Jesuits and their influence. It is in this work that Prynne's hyperboles take on a much more Baroque tinge. He named the Jesuits as transcontinental *agents provocateurs* who had instigated all recent wars in Western and Eastern Europe. In Russia, they facilitated the deposition of 'King Demetrius and his queen'; in Sweden and Poland, they incited the populace to rebel against King Sigismund III; in Germany, they initiated the Thirty Years War on the orders of 'The Generall of their Order' Mutio Vitelleschi ('Vicelescus'); in France, they plunged the kingdom into civil wars, murdered King Henri IV and prompted the Siege of La Rochelle. In the Three Kingdoms, they were responsible for executing conspiracies like the Gunpowder Plot in order to destabilize the nation. Only the 'wise state of Venice' had foreseen their 'jugling' and had decided to banish them 'forever' from their dominions.<sup>536</sup>

As was his wont, Prynne did not cite any additional sources to support the claims he made in this extended passage; but a closer look suggests that he had borrowed material from a chapter entitled 'Of the Jesuites' in Lewis Owen's *The Unmasking of All Popish Monks*,

---

<sup>533</sup> Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darknes*, p. 90.

<sup>534</sup> Ibid.

<sup>535</sup> In his diary, Laud noted how it was common knowledge that Prynne tampered with witnesses. He personally believed that Prynne retained a 'school of instruction', in which he taught them to 'speak home' to his purposes. Furthermore, Laud observed that Prynne appeared to only select as witnesses shifty or roguish persons, such as pillory-men, religious converts, pursuivants, and people with criminal records. See *The History of the Troubles and Tryal of the Most Reverend Father in God and Blessed Martyr, William Laud, Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury*, 2 vols, London 1695, I, pp. 219, 414-15, 417.

<sup>536</sup> Ibid., pp. 202, 204. Here Prynne is repeating the oft-mentioned legend that the Jesuit ban was effected in response to a papal interdict proclaimed in 1605, which sanctioned the Venetian clergy. The ban lasted from 1606 to 1657. For a full explanation as to why the Jesuits were expelled from the Republic of Venice, see P. Grendler, *The Jesuits and Italian Universities 1558-1773*, Washington DC 2017, pp. 150-2.

*Friers, and Iesuits*. In the chapter, Owen had made repeated use of exclamations and rhetorical questions to express his indignation at the Jesuits' supposed crimes in Europe. Like Prynne, Owen had characterized them as hawkish insurgents who had provoked civil wars and popular revolts in Russia, Poland, France and 'Swetland'.<sup>537</sup> He claimed that they had been responsible for extensive turmoil across Europe for at least the past forty or fifty years:

Have not the Iesuites beene the cause of the losse of Voltalin, the upper and lower Palatinate? And have they not beene the cause of all these Wars, Bloudshed, Commotions, Dearth, Famine, Persecutions, Rapine, Miseries, Calamities and Destructions that have hapned in Italy, France, Germany, Bohemia, Netherlands, the seventeene Prouinces, and other neighbouring Countries, Cities, Townes, and Common wealths, these forty or fifty yeeres and upwards?<sup>538</sup>

Owen, too, had praised the 'Signory of Venice' for its foresight in expelling them: 'they have beene these twenty yeeres banished out of all the territories of the Signory of Venice, for their impostures and lewd practises, and for being common disturbers of the peace and tranquillity of the common wealth'.<sup>539</sup>

Since we know that Prynne read and endorsed significant portions of Owen's works, it makes sense that Prynne would recycle some of Owen's claims without crediting him. Indeed, further clues suggest that this was the case for Prynne's explanations of the business practices of Jesuits merchants and their colleagues. Specifically, he identified the Jesuits as monopolists and corporatists who had dominated various industries, such as the production of soap and the packaging of butter. According to Prynne, 'all the Parties were Partners, and Confederates of the Iesuits.' Apparently, 'lay-brethren' ran all the day-to-day operations, helping to promote trade amongst themselves: 'They have their Lay Brethren which collect duely their Annuities and Rents, and play the Merchants, transporting Cloth & other Merchandizes of great value.'<sup>540</sup> Such claims, in which the Jesuits were blamed for dominating the market and making civilian tradesmen redundant, also appear in Owen's chapter 'Of the Jesuits':

---

<sup>537</sup> Owen, *The Unmasking of All Popish Monks*, pp. 121-2.

<sup>538</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 122.

<sup>539</sup> *Ibid.* Compare with Owen, *The Running Register*, p. 116: 'Have not the Venetians banished their Iesuites out of all their Dominions, being of their owne Religion; because that they were dangerous men to their Commonwealth, and cozening their wives of their costly Iewels?'

<sup>540</sup> Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darknes*, p. 203.

others, who are Lay-brethren, have imployments enough either at home or abroad; for some of them are Tailors, and are euer making of new Habits, or else mending of old for the other Fathers and Lay-brethren. They haue Physicians, Apothecaries, Chirurgians, Barbers, Printers, Tailors, Shoemakers, Cookes, Washers, Bakers and Brewers (if they live in a beere Country) of their owne order and society. And so have all (or the most part) of the other Orders of Monks and Friers in all popish Countries, especially in Spaine and Italy, and therefore poore Trades-men get little or nothing by the Iesuites, or any other Monks, Friers or Nuns whatsoever.<sup>541</sup>

Prynne supported these statements with personal knowledge. Through certain contacts, he knew that the Jesuits' commercial holdings included prime real estate in London. One of their 'agents', Captain Read (the same 'Reade' mentioned in *Romes Master-Peece* as the main proprietor of the *de facto* Jesuit command centre on Long Acre street) had apparently designated 'faire buildings' in Lincoln's Inn fields and other parts of London exclusively for the Jesuits.<sup>542</sup> Moreover, Prynne suggested that all the 'faire houses in Queenes-street' were maintained and commissioned as Jesuit enterprises.

Prynne never tired of attacking the Jesuit collegiate system and the corrupt practices which had created its wealth and influence. He particularly lashed out at St Omers, writing that students there were persuaded to pay exorbitant tuition fees and donate hundreds of pounds. Because Englishmen were being singled out, Prynne insisted that these practices constituted extortion, as 'great sums of money from this Kingdome' are taken 'to the great prejudice of the State'.<sup>543</sup>

In conclusion, it is clear that, by 1645, Prynne's anti-Jesuit hostility had reached a kind of zenith: virtually all troubles in King Charles's dominions, as well as in the principalities and kingdoms of Europe, could be attributed to the malefic influence of Jesuit intermeddling. As bogeymen, they had certainly factored strategically into Prynne's evidence against Laud—indeed, Prynne had accused Laud of using Arminianism to undermine the Protestant religion like a commander would use tunnelling to lay undetected siege to a fortress. Using Contzen's method of making 'approaches by insensible degrees', Laud had apparently intended to secretly 'blow up' the establishment by press censorship, bureaucratic

---

<sup>541</sup> Owen, *The Unmasking of All Popish Monks*, p. 123.

<sup>542</sup> Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darkness*, p. 203. See also, *Romes Master-Peece*, pp. 20-1, 24-5.

<sup>543</sup> Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darkness*, p. 204.

favouritism, purges of religious undesirables (that is, Puritans) and manipulation of the legal and parliamentary systems.<sup>544</sup>

---

<sup>544</sup> Ibid., p. 86.

## Chapter 7

### Prynne and the Ancient Plot

After the execution of Laud, Prynne gradually turned his attention elsewhere and set his sights on the Independent party. As he had done with Laud, and previously with the Gunpowder conspirators, Prynne began to consider this faction of the Long Parliament as a new alliance of Machiavellian malefactors who were aiming to ‘blow up’ the Three Kingdoms, starting with Parliament, then moving on to the monarchy and aristocracy.<sup>545</sup> A true paranoid, he needed a new target to fuel his delusions of persecution and his organized system of distrustful beliefs about the surrounding world. At first, he attacked a number of tracts produced by Independent pamphleteers as devices of ‘underhand plots’ by ‘jesuitical spirits’ to divide Parliament and incite new civil wars.<sup>546</sup> Among other things, the major problem with their publications was that they—not unlike the Arminian innovators—advocated unreasonable reform in the Church of England’s governance and orthopraxy. Such novel proposals, comparable to the reforms and actions advocated and instituted by the Anabaptists in the German states, threatened to thrust the Three Kingdoms into ‘popular tyranny’. As a result, the country would be exposed to religious mayhem and civil unrest, ‘like German popular Seditions, Devastations, and bloody Massacres’.<sup>547</sup>

For Prynne, who called himself a defender of ‘Old England’, the ‘tolerant’ proposals of the Independents (which apparently involved freedom of religion and greater religious rights for women) simply did not fit with the status quo and, as such, were detrimental to the sovereign state, ‘opposite to all publike government, order, authority’.<sup>548</sup> In his view, by promoting new-fangled opinions, requiring ‘popish’ (that is, blind) obedience and attempting to distribute ecclesiastical powers to local polities, the Independents were increasing sectarian behaviour and pursuing an impossible utopia:

they lead their followers by *a meere implicite faith*; impose upon them *a Popish blind Obedience*; exercise a meere *Papall Authority and unlymited dangerous Arbytrary*

---

<sup>545</sup> William Prynne, *A Fresh Discovery of Some Prodigious New Wandring-Blasing-Stars, & Firebrands, Stiling Themselves New-Lights, Firing Our Church and State into New Combustions*, London 1645, pp. 46-7; id., *Truth Triumphant over Falshood, Antiquity over Novelty*, London 1645, sig. A3v.

<sup>546</sup> Prynne, *A Fresh Discovery*, sig. E1r.

<sup>547</sup> Ibid., sig. A2v.

<sup>548</sup> Ibid., sigs A1r, A2r-v.

*power over them and others; pretending an Utopian Government after the mind of Christ, which is no where written in his word.*<sup>549</sup>

These were the beginnings of the Ancient Plot in Prynne's obsessive mind. Over the years, he would refer to these projects using different names: anarchy, tyranny, 'polarchy', 'Helvetian Commonwealth', 'headless Free-State'—each signified a forcibly imposed topsy-turvy, inverted government, in which traditional hierarchy was abolished.<sup>550</sup> In addition, as the New Model Army and its supporters in Parliament gained in power, Prynne quickly accepted the fact that the Army's apparent egalitarian ideas (some of which had been lifted from the Levellers) were merely the latest Machiavellian screen for a resurgent campaign of Jesuit belligerency. Prynne expanded on this thesis in 1647 in his pamphlet *New Presbyterian Light Springing out of Independent Darkness*.

Released in response to the New Model Army's forced suspension of eleven hard-line Presbyterian MPs from Parliament (the details of which will be discussed below), Prynne speculated that 'Armies and Independents' desired to create a 'popular anarchy for the future'.<sup>551</sup> Specifically, he pointed to instances in which the Army suddenly repealed or revoked Parliament's ordinances, such as its veto of the Militia Ordinance of 4 May, 1647. He saw this action as a 'jesuitical device', designed to weaken the faith of the people of London in the parliamentary system. By overriding the dictates of Parliament, the 'Independents and Armies' strove to 'enslave and command the City at their pleasure'.<sup>552</sup> But this was not Prynne's major grievance. He also criticized the way in which the army had abused its power in seizing the king and placing him in the custody of Independent-aligned soldiers.

---

<sup>549</sup> Ibid., sig. A4r. For further details on Prynne's likening of 'Independent Ministers' to 'meer Papists', see *ibid.*, pp. 46-8. On this topsy-turvy world of radical ideas, see Christopher Hill's *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution*, London 1991 [1972]; D. Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion*, Oxford 1984; J. Walter, 'Authority and Protest', in *A Social History of England 1500-1750*, ed. by K. Wrightson, Cambridge 2017, pp. 221-41.

<sup>550</sup> On Prynne's belief that the Jesuits were planning to establish an anarchical state or faux utopia, see Prynne, *A Plea for the Lords, and House of Peers, or, A Full, Necessary, Seasonable Enlarged Vindication of the Just, Antient Hereditary Right of the Earls, Lords, Peers, and Barons of This Realm to Sit, Vote, Judge, in All the Parliaments of England*, London 1658, sig. A1r, p. 1; *Ten Quaeres upon the Ten New Commandements of the General Council of the Officers of the Armies*, London 1659, p. 2; *A Legal Vindication of the Liberties of England*, p. 53; *A Seasonable, Historical, Legal Vindication and Chronological Collection of the Good Old Fundamental Liberties, Franchises, Rights, Laws of All English Freemen*, London 1654, p. 25; *Conscientious, Serious Theological and Legal Quaeres, Propounded to the Twice-Dissipated, Self-Created Anti-Parliamentary Westminster Juncto, and Its Members*, London 1660, p. 20.

<sup>551</sup> William Prynne, *New Presbyterian Light Springing out of Independent Darkness, or VI. Important New Queries Proposed to the Army*, London, 1647, p. 4.

<sup>552</sup> Ibid., p. 5.

In June 1647, Cornet George Joyce and a throng of soldiers strong-armed their way into Holmby House in Northampton where Charles was being kept under surveillance by Presbyterian guardsmen. Joyce and his men then marched the king, first to Newmarket and then to Hampton Court. To Prynne, such aggression was an ominous sign of what could become part and parcel of daily life if the New Model Army and its promoters attained complete authority. By 1649, he had concluded that Cromwell's 'Oath of Engagement', which effectively nullified the 'antient and late Oathes of Supremacy and Allegiance', amounted to a new Gunpowder Plot that was far worse than the first 'gunpowder-treason'. By 'blowing up the King and his Posteritie, Monarchy, the House of Lords, the Constitution and Priviledges of our English Parliaments, our ancient fundamentall Government, Lawes, Liberties, and our three Kingdomes at one crack', Cromwell and his confederates had plunged the body politic into utter chaos. Indeed, Prynne was convinced that the transformation of the kingdom into a commonwealth of 'new selfe created States' was not only illegal and tyrannical, but also scandalous to religion and dishonourable to the 'English Nation'. His reasons were as follows: 1) the commonwealth would perpetually sever all its link with nobles and royals who had ties to the crown; 2) Ireland and Scotland would become hostile to England, necessitating the creation of a permanent standing army; 3) the new governors of the commonwealth would seize private property and redistribute it indiscriminately; 4) foreign nations would no longer appreciate England's reputation and would suspend their diplomatic relations, possibly initiating hostilities; 5) all laws, legal proceedings and charters would be nullified; 6) all citizens, finally, would be subject to the usurpers', 'lawlesse wills, courts, acts, seizures & disposals'.<sup>553</sup>

At the end of his tract on the so-called *Westministerian-Juncto*, Prynne summed up his views of a legitimate English monarchy. First, the right kind of government was a hereditary monarchy functioning without a standing army. Second, in such a monarchy, the sovereign's powers were balanced and demarcated by laws. Third, the sovereign could only execute and enforce his mandates with the full consent of Parliament. Contrariwise, a republic (what Prynne termed 'a low-country free state') was 'an Ignoble Servitude under the Militarie Command of many selfe-Created new States'.<sup>554</sup> Maintained and ruled solely by a standing army, this kind of government imposed its power without the consent of Parliament, the laity and the clergy, levying taxes at the 'will and pleasure' of the junta.

---

<sup>553</sup> William Prynne, *The Arraignment, Conviction and Condemnation of the Westministerian-Juncto's Engagement*, London, 1649, pp. 13-15.

<sup>554</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

Before delving further into Prynne's interpretation of the final years leading up to Charles I's execution in January 1649, it will be helpful to provide a brief recapitulation of the state of affairs in England from 1647 to 1649. As we have seen, these years were a pivotal period for Prynne, who, by at least 1645, had done quite a bit of detective work and had outlined a distinct map, so to speak, of the Jesuits and their alleged crimes. This conceptual map was heavily influenced by the characterizations put forward by Gee, Owen and Wadsworth, as outlined in the previous chapter. Further information about the Jesuits' ultimate agenda, as I have shown in Chapter 3, was drawn from sections of Contzen's *Politicorum libri decem*. Additional details, such as those which were developed in *Romes Master-Peece* and the *Popes Royal Favourite*, were vouchsafed by Prynne's own investigations and private communications.

This conceptual map (or model) and the evil-doers it was supposed to expose evolved in complexity during the first (1642-1646) and second (1648-1649) English Civil Wars, when Prynne was forced to return to the drawing-board and reassess the Jesuit invasion. He appears to have come to the conclusion that the Jesuits had regrouped and disguised themselves as reformers. Under the auspices of the New Model Army, Agitators, Levellers and Independents, the Jesuits had resurfaced to redouble their efforts to demoralize the English. As Prynne came to grips with the possible consequences of the Army's aggression, his Ancient Plot diversified and expanded accordingly, eventually coalescing into one of the most prominent royalist propagandistic narratives of the 1650s. Prynne added new material, such as Campanella's *De monarchia Hispanica* and the *Historie* by Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato (1606–1678), to what I would describe as his 'ocean' of tropes. By drawing on this repository and by reworking subjects from his previous repertoires, he was better able to illustrate and contextualize the spiritual and political threat posed by the New Model Army and the proponents of Republicanism.

Prynne believed that, as had Laud and the Arminians, the Jesuits were still attempting to 'scruce in popery by degrees'. The only difference was that instead of implementing or amalgamating ecclesiastical practices, Prynne's Jesuits hoped to destabilize established institutions (such as the monarchy) by supporting secularism, sectarian movements and equal representation. All these innovations would cripple England, which had been built on an

exclusivist tradition and had been uniquely preserved by God himself (who, Prynne argued, favoured kingship as opposed to republicanism as the legitimate form of earthly rule).<sup>555</sup>

As for Prynne's views, their significance and relevance become more intelligible if seen against the backdrop of the strife between the king, the army and Parliament. Troubles had initially come to a head in January of 1642, when the king—after losing a tug of war with Parliament over control of county-wide militias—fled from London. In the meantime, the queen and her entourage—their reputations suffering from popular suspicion as a result of Parliament's assiduous investigations into and proclamations against court popery—escaped to Holland. For roughly four years, the king conducted all operations, military and otherwise, from Oxford. He was forced to abandon his post in 1646, however, when the New Model Army, which had been created the previous year by an ordinance of Parliament, defeated his forces at Naseby and Oxford. Charles slipped away in disguise and surrendered himself to the Scottish garrison in Newark. After nine months of imprisonment, the Scots accepted an offer of £400,000 from Parliament and delivered him into the custody of Presbyterian officers on 30 January 1647. Charles was eventually detained the following month at Holmby Castle in Northamptonshire.<sup>556</sup>

Meanwhile, in London, measures were swiftly being taken to check the power of the New Model Army, which had increased its numbers by subsuming other Parliamentary troops. Petitions for the Army's disbandment were first circulated in February and March, and in May Parliament formally ordered the Army to disband. Officers were not uniformly against the idea that the Army should decrease its ranks; notwithstanding, many were concerned about the motive behind Parliament's orders. There was talk of plans to use the Army to secure the Irish borderlands, and there were rumours that Presbyterian MPs were planning to neutralize the Army in order to reinstall the king. Several military revolts (provoked in part by 'agitators' appointed to lobby for the soldiers' grievances) ensued, and the Army—in open defiance of Parliamentary commissioners—temporarily withdrew to Newmarket.<sup>557</sup>

In June 1647, Cornet Joyce, probably acting on the orders of Cromwell, rode up to Holmby House and grabbed the king from his Presbyterian watchmen. The Army then

---

<sup>555</sup> Ibid., p. 4. See also Prynne, *Plea for the Lords*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>556</sup> On these particular phases in the Civil War, see B. Donogon, *War in England 1642-1649*, Oxford 2008; M. Braddick, *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars*, London 2008; P. Baker, 'The Regicide', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. M. J. Braddick, Oxford 2015, pp. 154-69.

<sup>557</sup> On the relationship between radical ideas and the army, see R. Foxley, *The Levellers: Radical Political Thought in the English Revolution*, Manchester 2013, pp. 150-92.

employed another strong-arm tactic and impeached eleven Presbyterian MPs who were suspected of spearheading legislation to restrict the Army's authority. In July, a London mob, incensed by the Army's audacity, forced its way into Parliament and called for the king's return and the Army's banishment. Terrified, Independent MPs vacated the premises and escaped to the Army's encampment. They returned to London in August, bringing the Army with them. This 'Machivilian' (as Prynne noted) moment marked the beginning of a year-and-a-half-long struggle during which the Army drafted and released its own manifestos and sequestered non-compliant MPs, such as Prynne, who had been elected to the House in November of 1648, as a member for Newport in Cornwall.<sup>558</sup> Prynne barely lasted a month in his new role before he and other vociferous MPs were seized and remanded, first at Queens court, then at the King's Head on the Strand. Other recalcitrant members were later purged *en masse* from Parliament by Colonel Thomas Pride. Remaining members (collectively the Rump Parliament), acting in accordance with the will of the Army, then proceeded to set in motion the king's impeachment and trial. Ironically, the Army's six articles of impeachment against the king were derived from Prynne's *Romes Master-Peece*.<sup>559</sup>

Having provided a sketch of the internecine troubles of the civil wars, I shall now quickly review the specific Army declarations and manifestoes which demonstrably influenced Prynne's rhetoric concerning the alleged role of the Jesuits. The first document I want to highlight is *The Agreement of the People*. Originally produced by Agitators and Levellers as a collaborative effort in 1647, this proto-constitution was edited and finalized by the Army in January 1649. *Inter alia*, it proposed greater representation (to safeguard the state against war and subjugation), extended powers for elected representatives over the courts and 'all natural or civil things, but not concerning things spirituall or evangelicall', and the right to exercise one's Christian faith in accordance with one's own conscience (the liberty however did not extend to 'prelacy and popery'). Anyone who opposed or resisted the orders of the representatives would be deemed an 'enemy or traitour of the nation' and liable to suffer the death penalty.<sup>560</sup>

To Prynne, the *Agreement* was 'high treason', a perjurious document produced by sectarians who aimed, like the former Archbishop of Canterbury, to 'subvert the Liberties and

---

<sup>558</sup>William Prynne, *The Petition of Right of the Free-Holders and Free-Men of the Kingdom of England*, London 1648, p. 10.

<sup>559</sup>*The Resolution of His Excellency the Lord General Fairfax, and His Generall Councill of Officers*, London 1648, pp. 1-3.

<sup>560</sup>John Rushworth, *A Petition from His Excellency Thomas Lord Fairfax and the General Council of Officers of the Army, to the Honourable the Commons of England in Parliament Assembled, Concerning the Draught of an Agreement of the People*, London 1649, pp. 8, 24-8.

Freedom of Parliaments, and the fundamentall Government of the Kingdom'. Its architects were superimposing an alternative government by force; for this reason, they were 'meer arbitrary tyrants, usurpers'. In *Substance of a Speech*, Prynne called it 'new Bable', alluding to the biblical tale in which the antediluvian peoples of the earth united in a hubristic project to challenge the authority of God.<sup>561</sup> Elsewhere in the text he called the plan for new representatives a 'cursed monopoly', which would place 'Rights, Liberties, priviledges of election' into the hands of those 'who never had a right unto them, the people'. Most significantly, however, he also called the *Agreement* a Jesuit document. Jesuits, or some other 'ill-affected persons', had encouraged the Agitators to draft it.<sup>562</sup> There had been a 'Jesuit at the front and reare end of it', and its authors were 'discontented Gentlemen and Souldiers' just like the chief actors in the Gunpowder Plot.<sup>563</sup> In the main, Prynne believed that the document provided for a system in which a corrupt 'majority of voices' would overrule the minority. It laid the foundation for tyranny because anyone with views contrary to the majority would be penalized and suppressed. Moreover, its extreme emphasis on equality meant that any individual or government body (such as the king, the House of Lords and the City of London Corporation) which became 'too potent' would be forcibly levelled and eventually destroyed. This, of course, was perfectly in line with the Jesuit agenda for England. In Prynne's perception of events and logic of the causal order, the *Agreement* indicated, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that they were involved.

The other document I shall mention here is *A Remonstrance or Declaration of the Army*. Printed in November 1648, it names the king as the 'Capitall and grand Author' of all the civil wars and commands that he be brought to justice. It also demands that Prince Charles and the Duke of York must surrender or face death or exile. In addition, it makes several ultimatums, the defiance of which will result in death 'without mercy' or exile. These terms include: the exclusion of 'delinquents' (that is, all critics of the Army) from public service for a period of time, the bestowal of arrears and reparations for the soldiery, the promotion of the House of Commons as the prime representative body of the people and the awarding of supreme executive powers to the representatives. Prynne, predictably, thought that the stipulations were 'a mere plot of the Jesuites to defame and destroy us'.<sup>564</sup> It was further evidence of the Jesuit's machinations; indeed, Prynne had caught them, so to speak, red-handed:

---

<sup>561</sup> Prynne, *Substance of a Speech*, sig. B2v.

<sup>562</sup> Ibid., sig. Q4v.

<sup>563</sup> Ibid., sig. Q3v.

<sup>564</sup> Ibid., sig. A1r.

such clear visible Characters of a Jesuites pensill, hand and head in this Remonstrance, so abounding with their bloody disloyall Tenents & practises of killing and deposing Christian Kings...none but Jesuits and Jesuited Papists could possibly invent, or spur on the Generall, Officers and Army so violently and madly to prosecute them.<sup>565</sup>

Calling the document a ‘solecisme’, Prynne railed against its authors as infidels and monsters of impiety and, worse, ‘of men or divells’. Acting under a pretext of peace, the writers had, in fact, aimed ‘point-blank’ at the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy.<sup>566</sup> Prynne also pointed out the faultiness of their reasoning by arguing that the overthrow of the king would bring further wars, not peace to the kingdom.<sup>567</sup> For all these reasons, the Remonstrance was no more than a ‘Jesuiticall’ contrivance, a vehicle by means of which ‘Statists’ and the Army could ruin the country.

It is, above all, in *The Machavilian Cromwellist*, released by Prynne in the midst of the conflicts of 1648, that we get a perfect synchronization of the Jesuit and Machiavellian bogeymen. Here the ‘Cromwellists and Independent Confederacy’ are charged with having ‘ambitious ends’ and the intent to ‘engross all power into their own hands, by wicked, unjust, and most diabolical means’.<sup>568</sup> Prynne, highlighting Cromwell’s deception, reviled him as a ‘Subtil Fox’.<sup>569</sup> He then proceeded to refer to the events described above: the capturing of the king at Holdenby by Colonel Joyce, the impeaching of the eleven Presbyterian members, the Army’s ‘warlike’ occupation of London, their ‘treasonable and Expressions against’ certain MPs and their general avariciousness with regard to requesting compensation.<sup>570</sup>

Overall, it is clear that Prynne believed that the Army and its enablers were ‘Machavilian’ not merely on account of the force they exerted over the citizenry, but because of their ‘hypocrisie’ and ‘dissimulation’ in asserting that their actions were motivated by

---

<sup>565</sup> Ibid., sig. R2r.

<sup>566</sup> Ibid., sig. N2v.

<sup>567</sup> Ibid., sig. M4r.

<sup>568</sup> William Prynne, *The Machavilian Cromwellist and Hypocritical Perfidious New Statist Discovering the Most Detestable Falshood, Dissimulation and Machavilian Practices of L. G. Cromwel and His Confederates*, London 1648, sig. A2r.

<sup>569</sup> Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>570</sup> Ibid., pp. 4-7.

selfless affection for the kingdom's *eudaimonia*.<sup>571</sup> The real truth, Prynne argued, was that the realm and its institutions were at stake, and the 'Cromwellists and Machivilian Saints' sought to 'blow up Parliaments' and make use of 'any Jesuitical Policies' to achieve their own ends. And it was this very tendency, this hubristic ambition, which Prynne suspected had been hijacked or stoked by Jesuit malefactors.<sup>572</sup>

---

<sup>571</sup> Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>572</sup> Ibid., p. 11.

## Chapter 8

### The Ancient Plot and Its Metamorphosis during the Interregnum

Prynne's other works of the same period reveal how he quickly became convinced that the Jesuits were involved in the Army crises. On 28 December, he wrote that the Remonstrance and the 'new-modeled representative' were 'nothing else but the designs and projects of Iesuits, Popish Priests, & Recusants'.<sup>573</sup> In *A Brief Memento to the Present Unparliamentary Juncto*, released the first week of January 1649, he inveighed against Cromwell, Ireton, Pride, and Peters, for imposing on the 'whole kingdome' by the 'Jesuites principles and practises'.<sup>574</sup> He also assured that should parliamentarians force their peers to take the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy, they would 'presently discover a whole Conclave of Jesuits, Popish Priests, and Iesuited Papists amongst them'.<sup>575</sup> As noted previously, this tract also included the first mention of Campanella's *Monarchia* in the margins.

Part of what contributed to Prynne's opinion was (in addition to the already mentioned hostilities and escalations) a curious letter which had fatefully fallen into Prynne's hands sometime after its composition on 28 November 1648. It is important for a few reasons. Firstly, it was used by Prynne to corroborate his belief in a Jesuit-backed conspiracy against the English nation. Secondly, it is a notable and hitherto unexamined example of Prynne's continuing usage of political storytelling to interpret current affairs.<sup>576</sup> As such, it is very important to this study as an additional artefact that bolstered Prynne's mythmaking.

We first read of this document in his 1648 *True and Ful Relation*. The text described the events leading up to and the conditions of the Army's imprisonment of a number of

---

<sup>573</sup> William Prynne, *Demand of His Liberty to the Generall, December 26, 1648*, London 1648, p. 1.

<sup>574</sup> William Prynne, *A Brief Memento to the Present Unparliamentary Juncto*, London 1649, p. 13.

<sup>575</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16. Prynne was indubitably one of the foremost propagandists (and probably the most effective) to popularise the idea that the Jesuits had infiltrated the New Model Army. He was not, however, the earliest to do so. First propounded in 1646, the rumour of a Jesuit-manipulated Army had by 1650, become a matter of discussion and debate. See, for example, George Smith, *An Alarum: To the Last Warning Peece of London*, London 1646, p. 12; William Levitt, *The Samaritans Box Newly Opened*, London 1647, p. 9; *England's Ichabod, Glory Departed, Discoursed by Two Christian Men*, London 1650, p. 11; Henry Hall, *Digitus Testium, or A Dreadful Alarm to the Whole Kingdom*, London 1650, p. 15.

<sup>576</sup> To my knowledge, the letter in question has never been discussed in relation to William Prynne's use of anti-Jesuit propaganda. The letter is briefly cited in J. Collins, *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*, Oxford 2005, pp. 136-7. Collins links the letter to an English spy associated with the Blackloist movement. Among other things, the Blackloists were anti-papal Catholics who, during the civil wars, made overtures to Cromwell for the toleration of the Catholic religion in England. For a recent study on the Blackloists, see S. Tutino, *Thomas White and the Blackloists: Between Politics and Theology during the English Civil War*, New York 2016.

‘eminent’ MPs on December 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> of 1648. Initiated in response to the decision by the Parliament to continue negotiating with the king, the purge was ordered by General Henry Ireton and executed by Colonel Pride, Sir Hardress Waller, and a number of other officers and infantry. As stated previously, Prynne and his fellow ‘secluded’ members were remanded, first at the Queens Court, and then at The King’s Head, a pub on the Strand. Prynne’s hellish portrait of their confinement is evocative of martyrdom, and this effect was perhaps not unintended.<sup>577</sup>

Shortly after describing Pride’s purge, Prynne claimed that ‘divers understanding men of great experience’ believed the Jesuits to be the cause of the ongoing uprisings. It was a conspiracy that had been masterminded by them, fomented by Army Agitators, and bought into—upon pretences of justice—by ‘honest-minded and plain-hearted Christians’.<sup>578</sup> He later supported this statement by presenting a copy of a letter of ‘an Independent Agent for the Army, from Paris in France, to an Independent Member of the House of Commons’.

In the letter, the writer, Leonard Watson (spymaster or ‘scoutmaster’ to Cromwell) addresses an ‘M. Westrow’ and makes mention of a ‘Mrs Westrow’. Here ‘M. Westrow’ is the Independent MP Thomas Westrow, a noted Cromwellian. Watson claims to have made the acquaintance of ‘three or foure *Catholikes* of very great ingenuity’. These men relate that they are against the king and have placed their faith in the Army, through which they hope to be granted leave to remain as members of the Commonwealth.<sup>579</sup> From this letter, Prynne drew several conclusions: that the ‘Jesuited Papists in France’ despised the king for his intolerance of Catholicism and were therefore plotting ‘to depose and bring him to execution’; that the papists had placed their hope in the Army to dissolve Parliament and to execute their ‘revenge’ on the king; that the Independents were ‘more likely to favour, and close with Roman Catholikes, then English Protestants’; finally, that Jesuits and Roman Catholics were ‘extremely distasted with Regall hereditary power throughout the world’ and were hoping to use the Army’s uprising to make the English nation a vassal of Rome.<sup>580</sup>

In the appendix at the end of *Substance of a Speech*, Prynne referred to the same letter and used it to support his conclusion that it constituted ‘cleere evidence to every rational mans conscience’ that the Army and its ‘new Representative’ were ‘but the Jesuits and

---

<sup>577</sup> William Prynne, *True and Ful Relation*, pp. 5-6.

<sup>578</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9: ‘It is believed by divers understanding men of great experience, that the Jesuits have laid this plot, and fomented these distempers in the Army, by the Agitators, some of them being Jesuits, others Anabaptists, leavened with Jesuiticall principles; who over-reach the honest-minded and plain-hearted Christians in the Army by their speciall pretences of Justice.’

<sup>579</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

<sup>580</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

Roman Catholicks Brats Impostures and undermining Projects'.<sup>581</sup> With their ears deafened and their 'brains intoxicated by Jesuticall Enchantments', Army officers, Prynne believed, were on a sure-fire path to ruin.<sup>582</sup> The rest of *Substance of a Speech* can be viewed as Prynne's earliest thesis on events following the execution of Charles I. As such, it laid the thematic groundwork for the incorporation of newly discovered plots (like the Campanella conspiracy). Taking the Jesuits' intent to divide the kingdom as a given, Prynne would soon go on to use passages of Campanella's *De monarchia Hispanica* to show that his advice to the Spanish monarch proved (as in Prynne's case against Laud and the Arminians) the antecedence of the Jesuits' premeditated *mens rea* in transforming England into a commonwealth. However, before we discuss Prynne's textual use of Campanella, Richelieu, and Parsons, it will be helpful to pause and review the statements Prynne puts forth in three of his tracts: *Substance of a Speech*, *Sad and Serious Political Considerations* (published about a year later, in 1650), and *A Gospel Plea* (published 1653). These works contain multiple references to Jesuits and show how Prynne's narratives mutated and expanded in the years leading up to the publication of *Jus Patronatus* in 1654. Although *Brief Memento* contains Prynne's earliest mention of Campanella's *De monarchia Hispanica*, *Jus Patronatus* includes Prynne's first expository comments on Campanella's supposed plot.

*Substance of a Speech* was the first major work of Prynne's since 1646 to resurrect his major anti-Catholic arguments of the 1630s and 1640s. He specifically listed *Romes Master-Peece*, *The Popish Royal Favourite*, *The Antipathy of the Lordly Prelacie*, and *Canterburies Doome* as singular works in which he gave an 'exact account' of Jesuit plots as no one else had ever done.<sup>583</sup> These tracts, he added, were ground-breaking and had made known information that, at the time, was scarcely known.<sup>584</sup> Seeing himself as a veteran discoverer of earlier plots, he thought he was uniquely qualified to be the one to explicate the plot at hand.<sup>585</sup> Prynne was both a propagandist and a paranoid spokesman who was constantly drawing on his 'ocean' of ideas to support his conspiracy theories, as a way to make sense of reality and diagnose current affairs. In this sense, what he brought forth in the Ancient Plot

---

<sup>581</sup> Prynne, *Substance of a Speech*, sig. S4r.

<sup>582</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>583</sup> *Ibid.*, sig. P3v: 'I have in my Romes Master-Piece, The Royal Popish Favourite Hidden Workes of Darknesse Brought to Publick Light, The Antipathy of the Lord's Prelacy to Unity and Monarchy, and The History of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Tryall, and other Writings, given the World such an exact account of the Iesuites and Papists plots and influences...as none else before or since mee have done.'

<sup>584</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>585</sup> *Ibid.*, sigs P3v-P4r. For a vivid picture of Prynne's personal attachment to this investigative role, see *ibid.*, sig. D3v: 'I... neglecting my own private calling and affairs employed most of my time, studies, and expended many hundred pounds out of my purse, since my enlargement, to maintain your cause against the King, his Popish and Prelaticall party.'

can be understood as the return of obsessive iterations and leitmotifs. Throughout this study I have argued and been at pains to show that these can be traced to the mythical *schema* Prynne had initially started developing in the 1620s, a sort of *Ur*-plot.

Prynne was particularly vocal in criticising what he thought were the Army's pretensions of benevolence. He saw their 'plea of necessity for publick good' as a typical instantiation of Jesuit casuistry. In Prynne's mechanical way of inferring from imagined causes to allegedly inevitable effects, just as the Jesuits had covered their many putative and unproven homicides by invoking the necessity of public good to 'promote the Catholike cause and Popes authority', so the Army had used the 'argument to justifie their laste Iesuiticall force and powder-plot upon the Houses'.<sup>586</sup> Prynne also vented his apocalyptic premonitions and predicted that the way in which the Jesuits had orchestrated the king's deposition would result in an international war. The king's son, he argued, would be so enraged that a Protestant Parliament had exiled him and killed his father that he would become a Catholic and ally himself with other Catholic princes. Finally, the popish coalition would then initiate a doomsday scenario by invading the Three Kingdoms and massacring all remaining English Protestants as well as the entire Army. This act would then trigger the utter destruction of all Christendom.<sup>587</sup>

In 1650, with the publication of *Serious and Sad Politicall Considerations*, a pamphlet detailing the new Council of State's skirmishes with the Scots, Prynne introduced Richelieu into the Ancient Plot. As I have shown in Chapter 2, Prynne was familiar with Richelieu, who in the Laudian Plat appeared as an ancillary or supporting character. In *Serious and Sad Politicall Considerations*, however, Prynne gave Richelieu new significance as one of the contrivers of the English civil wars.<sup>588</sup> Indulging in his usual propensity for nebulous insinuations, in the final sections of the tract Prynne mentioned a grand plan of

---

<sup>586</sup> Ibid., sig. B4v.

<sup>587</sup> Ibid., sigs R3v-R4r: 'the Prince being now beyond Seas... will be so intraged against all professors of our religion that he will probably professe himself a Roman Catholique (and his brother too) match with a Catholique Princes, & then ingage all the Papists in forraign parts, England, Scotland and Ireland, to unite their forces, purses & counsels by way of revenge, to cut all the Protestantsthroats in all three Kingdome, who have adhered to the Parliament, and hew the Army it selfe in peeces, when they have thus accomplished their designs: which will render them and the Parliament execrable and infamous to all posterity, and then farewell all Parliaments, and our Protestant religion for ever, not onely here, but throughout all Christendome'.

<sup>588</sup> Prynne would later take a revisionist approach to Richelieu and portray him in the same way he had formerly portrayed Laud. See, for example, Prynne, *True and Perfect Narrative*, p. 19: 'Cardinall Richlieu of France, the great Incendiary of Christendome, and fomenter of all our Domestick wars in his life'. Compare with William Prynne, *A Breviate of the Life of William Laud, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury*, London 1644, p. 34: 'What a great favorite and Instrument he [Laud] was to the Queene and Popish faction, and how grand an Enemy, a Persecuter of the zealous Protestant partie, under the name of Puritans... What an Arch-Incendiary he hath shewed himselfe, betweene his Majesty and his people, both in England and Scotland.'

Cardinal Richelieu which had been recorded by an ‘Italian of good note’.<sup>589</sup> The technique is strikingly similar to what he was to do with Campanella’s *De monarchia Hispanica* and it subsequently appeared in his works throughout the 1650s.

According to one of the sources used by Prynne, Priorato’s *Historie* mentioned above, Richelieu wanted France to foment the differences between the English king and the Parliament. The resulting factionalism, it was hoped, would force the British kingdom to mutate into a republic. Afterwards, the republic would get embroiled in civil wars and effectively self-destruct, thus benefiting France and the ‘Catholike Religion’ at large.<sup>590</sup> In this case, too, Prynne was reformulating material to build persuasive political narratives. He was now claiming that French Catholic forces (in reality Blackloist affiliates) were clandestinely campaigning for the Parliament and the king’s eradication by supporting the Army. Prynne would later go on to explicitly link these two events to confirm the authenticity of the Ancient Plot.<sup>591</sup>

To add to the Richelieu strand, in *Gospel Plea*, Prynne revealed yet another snippet of incriminating information to support his overarching contention. Prynne stated that the pope himself (then Innocent X) told some ‘English Gentlemen of quality in Rome’ that he had sent Jesuits, priests, and friars into the Army in order to carry out his wishes of ‘reducing England to her former obedience’.<sup>592</sup> In the margins, Prynne commented that one of the persons present at the event related the pope’s remarks ‘to a friend of mine’.<sup>593</sup> While again

---

<sup>589</sup> Prynne, *Sad and Serious Politicall Considerations*, p. 10.

<sup>590</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10. Prynne’s source is the third part of *Dell’historia* by Italian writer Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato. See, Galeazzo Priorato, *Dell’historia*, Venice 1648, pp. 175-6: ‘che sopra ogn’altra cosa procurase di tener il Reggimento della Gran Brettagna discorde, e disunito, col mantener il più debole partito acciò l’altro non si facesse di Soverchio potente, riducendo li tre Regni d’Inghilterra, Scotia, & Irlanda separati o con forma di Republica, avvertendo però bene quando si riducese in Republica di far che non sia una sola; ma separate, perché le Republiche inimiche sempre, de vicini potenti, e gelose della libertà devono essere in sospetto alla Francia.’ Compare with Prynne’s translation in Prynne, *Jus Patronatus*, sigs A3v-A4r: ‘That above All Other Things, He (the French King) should endeavour to keep the Government of Great Britain divided and disunited, by upholding the weakest party, that the other might not make it selfe over powerful, Reducing the three Kingdomes of England, Scotland and Ireland, to be divided; either, by nominating other kings; or, by reducing it to a commonwealth; yet with this Caution, that when it is reduced to a commonwealth, so to order it, that it may not be entirely one, but divide. For Republicques, ever enemies to potent Neighbours, ought to be suspected by the State of France.’

<sup>591</sup> Prynne, *Second Part of a Seasonable Vindication*, sigs E4r-E4v: ‘[The Jesuits] originally laid the Plots; as is clear by Campanella’s Book De Monarchia, Hisp. c. 25. and Cardinal Richelieu, his Instructions at his death, to the King of France... after all their former Plots had miscarried, they had found out a sure way to subvert and ruine the Church of England (which was most formidable to them of all others) BY THE INDEPENDENTS; who immediately after infinitely increased, supplanted the Presbyterians by degrees, got the whole power of the Army, (and by it, of the Kingdom) into their hands, and then subverted both the Parliament, King and his Posterity’. See also, *First and Second Part of a Seasonable Vindication*, sig. D3r.

<sup>592</sup> Prynne, *A Gospel Plea*, sig. b1r.

<sup>593</sup> *Ibid.* For similar rumours and tales concerning pacts made between Independents and Jesuits against the English king, see Prynne, *The First and Second Part of a Seasonable, Legal, and Historical Vindication*, sig. D2r-v.

plugging his books and reciting his credentials as a debunker of Jesuit conspiracies, Prynne was articulating his belief in the confluence of what I have defined as the Laudian and Ancient Plots. Specifically, he asserted that he had been ‘credibly informed’ of the continuing existence of the London Jesuit secret society.<sup>594</sup>

Once again, it is obvious how Prynne’s political storytelling was characterized by the use of monotonously recurring patterns, for the narrative scheme of a veritable conspiracy theorist tends to be facile, predictable and banal, while shunning complexity and detail. Specific elements from his campaigns against Arminianism and prelacy, as well as information from his first descriptions of Jesuit international intrigue resurfaced in his new pamphleteering war against Cromwell, the Army and the Commonwealth. His conspiratorial thinking was persistently dotted with caricatural representations of Machiavellianism and Jesuitism. In order to make his narratives more credible, he selectively shared, interpreted, and emphasized circumstantial evidence and oral testimonies that linked Jesuit masterminds with high-ranking state actors.

Given this pattern, it should come as no surprise that Prynne saw Campanella’s *Demonarchia Hispanica* as a valuable source. The text was a real handbook on how to expand the temporal dominion of the Catholic hegemony. In Prynne’s mind, Campanella could be portrayed as a prototypical, politique Jesuit. Not only was he a dabbler in magic (like the Jesuits described by Gee, Owen and Wadsworth), but he was also a Machiavellian political agent, one who dared to advise the monarch of the then greatest empire on Earth. For Prynne he was a kind of evil genius, and the ramifications of his long-planned plot needed to be explicated. Many of the stock characteristics of Prynne’s ‘model’ were thus transferred to Campanella, and the friar became the heir of two legacies: the ‘Second Machivel’.

In the distorted reality created by Prynne’s fertile imagination, the Jesuits — inevitably—were also behind his arrest. Prynne was imprisoned by the Cromwell administration from June 1650 to February 1653, ostensibly for his fervent attempts to sway public opinion in favour of Charles II and the monarchy.<sup>595</sup> As Prynne recounted in his 1655 work, *A New Discovery of Free-State Tyranny* (certainly an allusion to Prynne’s pamphlet of the 1641 *New Discovery of the Prelates Tyranny*), he was dealt with in a manner comparable

---

<sup>594</sup> Prynne, *A Gospel Plea*, sig. b2v: ‘all we have or hope for, are in danger of such a sad, sodain, and destructive Convulsion and concussion (if not Subversion) as I long since by Authority of Parliament discovered in Romes Master-piece, (well worth perusall now) when so many known Jesuits under a new Provinciaall (which Hugh Peters himself reported as I have been credibly informed) are now even in London it selfe, acting as busily and sitting there in Councell as duely, as when the reclaimed Author of that discovery (purposely sent from Rome for the purposes therein discovered) was resident amongst them’.

<sup>595</sup> Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, pp. 188-9.

to his prior confinement. On 26 June 1650, his study at Lincoln's Inn was ransacked (on the orders of John Bradshaw) by soldiers who confiscated all his papers, letters, records, trunks, and printed books. Then, four days later, troopers broke into his house in Swainswick and forcibly searched both his and his sister's belongings.<sup>596</sup> He was taken through Bristol by his captors, who marched into the city sounding trumpets as if Prynne were, in his words, a 'transcendent malefactor'. He was then jailed in the nearby Dunster Castle. A year later, he was transferred to Taunton Castle and from here to Pendennis Castle, where he spent the remaining years of his imprisonment. Since Prynne was never formally charged with a crime nor given the opportunity to defend himself in trial, he couldn't help but think that the Jesuits were the real cause of his unfair treatment. This view was seconded by Prynne's friends:

they believe the chief reason of my long close Restraints was, to hinder me from writing any thing against their [the Jesuits'] late proceedings, and publique Alterations, Lawes, Liberties.<sup>597</sup>

Prynne complained that his captors used his banishment to effectively obstruct his reporting activities and gave themselves free rein to conduct their preaching and publishing activities without detection.<sup>598</sup> After his release from prison, he prudently moderated his attacks on the Protectorate by refraining from criticising Cromwell himself. In fact, he even cited one of Cromwell's speeches in which the Protector averred that Jesuits had come to England in 'swarms'. And so, in matter of Jesuit transgressions, Cromwell had become in Prynne's mind a 'witness beyond all exception', that is, beyond all criticism.<sup>599</sup>

---

<sup>596</sup> William Prynne, *A New Discovery of Free-State Tyranny: Containing Four Letters, Together with a Subsequent Remonstrance of Several Grievances and Demand of Common Right*, London 1655, sig. A3r.

<sup>597</sup> Ibid.

<sup>598</sup> Prynne, *A New Discovery of Some Romish Emissaries, Quakers and Others*, London 1656, p. 6: 'Bradshaw and his Whitehall Associats... shut me up close Prisoner under strictest armed Guards, in 3. remote Castles, near 3. whole years, without any particular cause then or since expressed, or the least hearing or examination of me, only to hinder my Discoveries and publications...whiles these Romish Emissaries, in the mean time, wandred freely up and down throughout our Dominions without restraint.' Compare with Prynne, *Gospel Plea*, sig. a2v: 'the Jesuits and Popish Priests, who marched freely abroad, not only preaching, but printing and dispersing... grosse Popish Books in defence of their Religion, and condemning ours for Heresie, whiles I (their chief oppugner) was shut up so close in three remote Castles, that I could neither write against, nor discover their Plots against our Church, State, Religion'.

<sup>599</sup> Ibid, sig. B2v: 'those Jesuits, & Franciscan Capucin Friers... we may doublese conclude, that they are the original erectors, the principal Ring-leaders, Fomentors of these encreasing New Sects throughout our Dominions...Yea, O. Cromwell himself (a witness beyond all exception) in his printed Speech in the Painted Chamber (before the last Assembly there) Sept. 4. 1654. p. 16'. For the major passage cited by Prynne from Cromwell's speech, see *His Highnesse the Lord Protector's Speeches to the Parliament in the Painted Chamber*, London, 1654, p. 17: 'We know very well, that emissaries of the Jesuits never came, in these swarms, as they have done since these things were set on foot. And I can tell you that divers gentlemen here can bear witness

In the later stages of the Commonwealth (1658-1660), Prynne's writings display a semantic shift with regard to the way in which the republican regime was aspersed. These years coincided with several upheavals in the government, namely the death of Oliver Cromwell, the ousting of his son Richard Cromwell, and the Army's recall of the Long Parliament. Importantly, these years were, in the words of Elyn Williams Kirby, 'the climax of his [Prynne's] activities as a publicist and parliamentarian'.<sup>600</sup>

Seeing the political chaos as an opportunity, Prynne fearlessly resumed his pamphleteering efforts to extol Charles II and the monarchy. He also denounced 'the Good Old Cause', a kind of political founding myth lauded and broadcasted by detractors of Oliver Cromwell and his monarch-like role in the Protectorate. As already discussed, the Good Old Cause was an idealisation of the early Commonwealth, a fantasy about its role as an instrument for egalitarian rule. Citizens had gradually become disillusioned about Cromwell's autocratic tendencies, and many desired the reinstatement of republican Parliamentarians and 'Army saints'. Cromwell's motives as regards the future of the republic were first called into question shortly after the establishment of the Protectorate in 1653.

The heavy-handed and absolutist way in which Cromwell had dissolved the Rump Parliament was problematic for some Parliamentarians such as Henry Vane (1613-1662), who was an advocate of what some have described as 'godly republicanism'.<sup>601</sup> In a *Healing Question* (1656), Vane thought that the Protectorate accommodated 'private and selfish interest' rather than the 'common good and concern' of the body politic.<sup>602</sup> Warning of the 'private lust and will' of conquering rulers, he proposed a kind of enlightened rule by a wise general, faithful officers, and a 'party of honest men'.<sup>603</sup> In the same year, the anonymous

---

with me, how that they have had a Consistory abroad that rules all the affairs of things in England, from an Archbishop with other dependents upon him: and, they had fixed in England—of which, we are able to produce the particular Instrument, in most of the limits of the cathedrals—an Episcopal power, with Archdeacons, etc.; and, had persons authorised to exercise and distribute those things, who pervert and deceive the people.'

<sup>600</sup> Kirby, *William Prynne*, p. 121.

<sup>601</sup> R. E. Mayers, 'Real and Practicable, not Imaginary and Notional: Sir Henry Vane, A Healing Question and the Problems of the Protectorate', *Albion*, 27, 1996, pp. 37-72, at pp. 43, 47, 72. See also N. Greenspan, *Selling Cromwell's Wars: Media, Empire and Godly Warfare, 1650-1658*, New York 2016, pp. 116-17; F. Mohamed, 'Milton, Sir Henry Vane, and the Brief but Significant Life of Godly Republicanism', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76, 1, 2013, pp. 83-104, at pp. 85-7, 104-5.

<sup>602</sup> Henry Vane, *A Healing Question Propounded and Resolved*, London 1656, p. 3.

<sup>603</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12: 'The army, considered as it is in the hands of an honest and wise general, and sober, faithful officers, embodied with the rest of the party of honest men, and espousing still the same cause, and acting in their primitive simplicity, humility, and trust, in reference to the welfare and safety of the whole body, is the only justifiable and most advantageous posture and capacity that the good party at present can find themselves in, in order to the obtaining that true freedom they have fought for, and possessing of it in the establishment thereof upon the true basis and foundation, as hath been showed, of right government.'

author of *A Copy of a Letter from an Officer of the Army in Ireland, to His Highness the Lord Protector* insisted that the rulers should be a chosen ‘general council, or convention of faithful, honest, and discerning men’. Regarding the Protectorate, the author stated that it ‘appears plainly to be a Monarchy bottomed in the sword’. He cautioned Cromwell against ‘subtil grandees’ who wanted him to become a prince so they might increase their own wealth by flattering him.<sup>604</sup> These same grandees, that is, senior officers of the Army, were in love with ‘monarchy’, not the republic.<sup>605</sup> The author also decried the fact that the Protectorate was entirely a creature of Cromwell’s will. As such, it was typified by his paramount position, and this went clearly against the original aims of the Commonwealth.<sup>606</sup> Extolling the Protector to take up the ‘Common Cause against the Common Enemy’ (i.e. the ‘cause of justice and liberty’), the author then warned him against governing like a ‘native king’.<sup>607</sup> Instead, he should summon a ‘free unlimited Parliament’, neither bound by Cromwell’s prerogative, nor inferior to the Army. In this way, ‘the Nation would either enjoy their liberty, or have the choice & imposition of their own yoke’.<sup>608</sup>

Like the writers of the mid-1650s, the apologists for the Good Old Cause in 1659 voiced their support of a free, popular government. For example, the pro-Commonwealth writer Henry Stubbe, whom I introduced at the beginning of this dissertation, wrote that ‘liberty, civill and spirituall, were the good old cause’. To him this meant asserting ‘property sovereignty to the people’. Elsewhere, Stubbe was explicit about the anti-monarchist aspects of the Cause: ‘it destroyes King, Queen, Prince, Lords and Kingdom in their political capacity, and that is all that is intended by it’.<sup>609</sup> John Rogers, a Fifth-Monarchy Man and apologist for the The Good Old Cause, hailed its practical dimension. As Rogers expressed it, the ‘Cause’ was the traditional kingly rule; the ‘Good Old Cause’, however, was maintaining whatever could be salvaged from the former regime and tailoring it to the benefit of the people.<sup>610</sup>

---

<sup>604</sup> *A Copy of a Letter from an Officer of the Army in Ireland, to his Highness the Lord Protector*, London 1656, p. 6.

<sup>605</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>606</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15: ‘it is understood to be a creature of your will and power, the definition of the places, the qualification of the persons, the summons, and all other incidents belonging unto it, deriving themselves wholly from you, and your assumed office... Another thing which renders the whole scrupellous is, that your Highness should think the people fit to have a share in Government, and give Laws, and yet should make your selfe so far Paramount to them at the same time’.

<sup>607</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 23.

<sup>608</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 20-1.

<sup>609</sup> Henry Stubbe, *The Common-Wealth of Israel, or A Brief Account of Mr. Prynne’s Anatomy of the Good Old Cause*, London 1659, p. 2.

<sup>610</sup> John Rogers, *Mr. Pryn’s Good Old Cause Stated and Stunted 10 Years Ago*, London 1659 p. 8: ‘To maintain Religion, the Kings Person and Authority, both Houses of Parliament, the Laws and Liberties of the people,

Prynne, of course, disagreed with all these interpretations. Having peered into its ‘intrals’, he concluded that the Good Old Cause was a decade-old plot which had been hatched by the Jesuits and ‘old Gunpowder-traytors’ and executed by a confederacy of sectarians and Republicans in the Army and in Parliament.<sup>611</sup> Among its aims was the dissemination of heresies and blasphemies such as libertinism, atheism, and ‘marshal-government’. With these, proponents of the Good Old Cause planned to bring Protestants under the ‘iron yoke’ of France, Spain, and Rome ‘for the future’. Therefore, it was the ‘blackest, horridst’ cause ever advocated by Christians since the creation.<sup>612</sup> In commenting on and aspersing the republican ideal, Prynne provided a final chronology to his Jesuit conspiracy, with a timeline of their countless crimes from the late sixteenth century to 1659. The way in which Prynne appropriated the public discourse on the Good Old Cause is therefore especially important for this study. His account is not just a confirmation of his long-lived antiquarianism and capability to extract meaning from divergent *collectanea*. It is also a consolidation of what can be reasonably conceived as a fluid *magnum opus*: his myth of Jesuit shadow government. The full details of Prynne’s final conspectus will be discussed below in the closing remarks of this chapter.

As we return to our textual analysis, we should note that the two works in the early 1650s which deal closely with Campanella (rather than simply mentioning him) are *Jus Patronatus* (1654) and *First and Second Part of a Seasonable Historical Vindication* (1655). Campanella is only mentioned once in *Quakers Unmasked* (1655). I will however rely on this tract, too, to provide additional evidence that Prynne continued to use provocative miscellaneous material to expand his mythic universe. I will also refer to *True and Perfect Narrative, Brief Vindication, The Re-Republicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause*, and *Legal Vindication of the Liberties of England*. My goal in this analysis is twofold. First, these texts show how Prynne utilized specific passages from Campanella, Parsons, and Richelieu to

---

i.e. so farre as they could consist, or be kept together, was the CAUSE: but when that was impossible, and could not be effected; no, not by all the Remonstrances, Intreaties, Messages, Treaties, or Means used (day and night) for that purpose; Then their Work was to maintain what they could of it, viz. the Liberties of the people and their Representatives: and this was the Good Old Cause.’

<sup>611</sup> Prynne, *The Re-Republicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause*, p. 1: ‘When I had not only superficially viewed the outside, but considerately penetrated into the true original, seminal sourse, and intrals of it, I discovered it to be in truth the Jesuits & old Gunpowder-Traytors, most execrable Plot and Cause, principally projected and secretly promoted by Popish Cardinals, Jesuites, Priests, Agents of all sorts, but visibly carried on and effected, by Apostate Republican, and Sectarian Members of the late long Parliament, Army, and their confederates.’

<sup>612</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2: ‘to set up... Libertinisme, Marshal-Government, and all kind of Heresies, Blasphemies, Religions, Sects, yea Atheisme...to bring our Kingdoms, Churches, Nations, Religion to inevitable desolation, and subject them to the Iron yokes of Rome, France, and Spain, for the future, the blackest, horridst infernall cause ever yet owned by any Christians, or treacherous perfidious Sons of Adam since the Creation.’ For Prynne’s principal criticisms of policies of the Good Old Cause see *ibid.*, pp 4-5.

finalize his Jesuit myth. Second, they show us how Prynne's fable retained its narrative power and achieved new relevance by drawing on previous exposés and by reinterpreting current affairs.

As I have already suggested in Chapter 1, one figure who influenced Prynne's portrayal of Campanella in the first period, and whose role in the Ancient Plot remains to be examined, is Robert Parsons, or rather, his sensational caricature provided by William Watson (1559?–1603) in the work *Quodlibets* (1602). Given Parsons' primacy in Prynne's late myth, we cannot overlook his thematic role as the progenitor of the plot designed to secularize and debilitate the English state. As I mentioned in Chapter 2, Prynne had known about and written against Dolman (Parsons' alias) since at least 1641.<sup>613</sup> In 1645, he had blamed 'Father Parsons' for being the one who had encouraged the pope to send papal briefs to England in order to obstruct the Oath of Allegiance and allow the Jesuits to proselytize the English.<sup>614</sup> Furthermore, in 1649, Prynne rightly pointed out that a work authored by Parsons had been purposely reprinted, misattributed, and translated into English in order to arouse antimonarchical sentiment.<sup>615</sup> Nevertheless, Parsons—perhaps due to Prynne's focus on his case against Laud—did not become a central character in Prynne's Ancient Plot until after the execution of King Charles. It is at this point that we can unequivocally say that Parson assumed the role of the epitomic Jesuit arch-villain of Prynne's mythos of the 1650s.

In his treatise *The Second Part of A Seasonable Legal and Historical Vindication* (1655), Prynne, after acknowledging Watson's 'prophetical' part in first making public the details of Parsons' plot, repeated Watson's affirmation that Parsons wanted to see 'strange metamorphoses' occur amongst England's royalty, politicians, academicians, public servants, and clergy.<sup>616</sup> He also reiterated Watson's claims that Parsons and a 'deep Jesuitical court'

---

<sup>613</sup> William Prynne, *The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie, both to Regall Monarchy, and Civill Unity: or, An Historicall Collection of the Severall Execrable Treasons, Conspiracies, Rebellions, Seditions, State-Schismes, Contumacies, Oppressions, & Anti-Monarchicall Practices, of Our English, Brittish, French, Scottish, & Irish Lordly Prelates, against Our Kings, Kingdomes, Laws, Liberties*, London 1641, p. 151.

<sup>614</sup> Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darknesse*, p. 202.

<sup>615</sup> Prynne, *Substance of a Speech*, sigs R2v-R3r. The work in question, *Several Speeches delivered at a Conference, concerning the power of Parliaments to proceed against their Kings for misgovernment*, was popularly attributed to the New Model Army propagandist Henry Walker and published in London by Robert Ibbotson in 1648. This text was a near word-for-word copy of Parsons' *A conference about the next succession to the crown of England*, which was written in the 1590s. Jason Peacey and Paulina Kewes have noted that extracts of *Several Speeches* were circulated by grandees and appeared in official Army news publications. See, J. Peacey, 'Reporting a Revolution: a Failed Propaganda Campaign', in *The Regicides and Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason Peacey, London 2001, pp. 161-80 (163-4); P. Kewes, "'The Idol of State Innovators and Republicans": Robert Persons's *A Conference About the Next Succession* (1594/5) in Stuart England', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. Paulina Kewes and Andrew McRae, Oxford 2018, pp. 149-85 (156-59).

<sup>616</sup> Prynne had first named Watson as the discoverer of the plot in Prynne, *Jus Patronatus*, sig. A2v. For Prynne's acknowledgment of his debt to Watson's 'prophetical' work, see Prynne, *The Second Part of A*

had planned to abolish the common laws of charters of ‘the realm of England’.<sup>617</sup> Believing that their plan was divinely sanctioned, Parsons and his ‘Jesuitical society’ had aimed to institute a ‘dismal change’ of society, an alteration of state never before seen in the history of the world.<sup>618</sup> It was their hope to bring ‘Christendom into uprore’ by encouraging insubordination in the soldiery and questioning the succession and inheritance of the English monarchy. Fatefully, the Jesuit plotters wanted a ‘Publick State or Helvetian Commonwealth’. Naturally, Prynne could not ignore the similarities between Parsons’ plan and the political developments which had resulted from the death of King Charles. He charged the Jesuites with instructing the New Model Army to disregard Parliament exactly ‘upon this pretext’.

A year later, in *A Summary Collection of the Principal Fundamental Rights, Liberties, Proprieties of All English Freemen* (1656), Prynne spoke of an ‘antient Plot, and long agitated design of Robert Parsons, and other Jesuites’ to completely reform England’s mores and laws.<sup>619</sup> In *The Re-Republicans and Others Spurious Good Cause* (1659) he came up with the thesis that the republican government was ‘in truth the old pernicious project of Father Parsons the Jesuit, & his confederats’.<sup>620</sup> Similarly, in *True and Perfect Narrative* (1659), Prynne explicitly denounced Parsons as ‘the most active professed enemie to our English Kingship, Kings Realm, Church, Religion’.<sup>621</sup> Thus, in Prynne’s reconstruction, Parsons was the chief architect of policies which led to and sustained England’s republican upheavals. He was the one who had designed the blueprint which was eventually put into action by a confederacy of intersectional political agents associated with or members of the Independent party and the New Model Army. In this regard, the instructions of Campanella

---

*Seasonable Legal and Historical Vindication, and Chronological Collection of the Good Old Fundamental Liberties, Franchises, Rights, Lawes, Government of All English Freemen*, London 1655, sig. E2v: ‘when I seriously consider the late great Revolutions, Changes both of our Government, Parliaments, Laws, and the manifold extravagant publick *Innovations, changes, Proceedings*, originally contrived by the *Jesuites*, but visibly acted, avowed, by *Anabaptists, Independents*, and some *Pseudo-Presbyterians* in the *Army* and elsewhere formerly reputed *Puritans*; it puts me in minde of... memorable, *Prophetical Passages* of *William Watson* in his *Quodlibets*, printed 52 yeers since, (Anno 1602.) which I have frequently thought on of late years’. Compare with Prynne, *True and Perfect Narrative*, p. 40: ‘William Watson... (then best acquainted with the Jesuites designs against England of all others) did in precise terms publish [Parson’s plot] to the English Nation’. For Prynne’s comment on Parsons’ plan for ‘strange metamorphoses’ in the English state see *ibid.*, sig. K3r-v.

<sup>617</sup> *Ibid.*, sigs D2v-D3r.

<sup>618</sup> *Ibid.*, sig. K3r: ‘Father Parsons... and his Jesuitical society... have it by revelation... to work a dismal change amongst us... wherein all laws, customs and orders must be altered, and all things turned upside down... this marvellous change & alteration shall be wrought in such sort, as from the beginning of the world was the like never heard of before, to this present.’

<sup>619</sup> Prynne, *A Summary Collection of the Principal Fundamental Rights*, p. 47.

<sup>620</sup> Prynne, *The Re-Republicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause*, p. 5.

<sup>621</sup> Prynne, *True and Perfect Narrative*, p. 40.

and Richelieu were, by Prynne's assessment, derivations of Parsons' original proposal. But here it is worth noting that this original proposal was nothing like what was imagined and asserted by Watson.

A myth in its own right (indeed, a remarkably effective piece of propaganda which helped to popularize the 'Black Legend' of a Jesuit-Spanish axis of power), Watson's Jesuit plot was a grossly exaggerated canard produced to discredit Parsons as a religious leader during the Appellant Controversy. In brief, this cause célèbre first developed in the Elizabethan fin de siècle as an internal power struggle between what some have termed 'conservative' members of the secular clergy in England and 'progressive' Jesuits and priests in Rome.<sup>622</sup> In March 1598, the Cardinal Protector of England, Enrico Caetani, mulled the idea of creating an archpriest office over all the English Catholic clergy. When George Blackwell (c.1545–1613) was appointed in October, groups of secular priests such as Watson and William Clerk, who saw the move as an affront to the traditional authority of local priests, pleaded their case before Pope Clement VIII and voiced their dissent in a series of publications.

Parsons, already infamous for co-leading the first Jesuit mission to England in 1580, took the brunt of the abuse, as the Appellant faction (so named for their impassioned appeals against Caetani's order) was convinced that Blackwell's rise to power was a bid by the elite and exclusivist Jesuits to obtain supremacy in the British Isles. Indeed, Watson contended that Blackwell was an opportunistic Jesuit stooge. To smear Parsons, Watson and his fellows called attention to many of Parsons' suggestions for re-asserting Catholic dominance in the region, selectively distorting extracts from Parsons' unpublished memoranda and published treatises on the question of the succession to the English throne and the hypothesized Catholic reformation of England after regime change. Watson certainly took things to an extreme, heaping insult after insult onto his adversary as part of his attempt to demonize the Jesuit as a seditious Hispanophile. Christopher Bagshow (1552–1625?) and William Bishop (c.1553–1624), for example, outspoken critics of Parsons and leading figures in the Appellant

---

<sup>622</sup> Recent scholarship has tended to frame the Appellant-Jesuit fracas as a clash of 'conservative', or traditionalist and 'progressive' interests, the first typified by resistance to innovations in ecclesiastical administration, the second open to reform. See, for example, T. Ridgedell, 'The Archpriest Controversy: The Conservative Appellants against the Progressive Jesuits', *British Catholic History*, 33, 2017, pp. 561-82; P. Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, Cambridge 2013, pp. 186-8; S. Tutino, *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570-1625*, Aldershot 2007, pp. 65-73; V. Houlston, *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Parsons's Jesuit Polemic, 1580–1610*, Aldershot 2007, pp. 121-3.

controversy, warned Watson that his ‘bitterness’ of style ‘dothe not good’.<sup>623</sup> Watson’s prose was undeniably acerbic. At one point, for instance, he accused Parsons and his brood of surpassing Machiavelli in dissimulation and general corruption. He launched into hyperbolic diatribes in which he harangued the Jesuits for being more obscene and evil than Pietro Aretino, Lucian, and ‘Don Lucifer’ himself.<sup>624</sup>

Despite their clear exaggerations, Watson’s claims were not entirely unfounded. In fact, Parsons’s political, and—at times—militant objectives have been generally acknowledged by contemporary scholarship. Parsons had all the makings of a spy: skilled in cryptography (not unlike other recusants), he helped run a secret Catholic press in the forest at Stonor. He lobbied and received copious amounts of money from the Spanish government, and he maintained an expansive network of international informants. He was also, as Michael Carrafiello and others have shown, a frequent evoker of the language of holy war and one of few persons to have previous (albeit limited) knowledge of what would later materialize as the Gunpowder Plot.<sup>625</sup>

Yet Parsons was very much a product of the times, and his activities were fine-tuned by crisis. His behaviour was, at least in part, a response to situational pressures (ultimately deriving from Christendom’s state of emergency) exerting themselves on him and England’s Catholic community. As Parsons saw it, Elizabeth’s government was uncompromisingly intolerant, so much so that negotiations for religious concessions were, to all intents and purposes, futile. There could be no real middle ground; life for Catholics in England was typified by fears of exposure by pursuivants and disenfranchisement by government officials. In his opinion, England had reverted into a place of heathenish sentiments; its persecution of Catholics hearkened back to the time prior to its conversion. For these reasons, Parsons and

---

<sup>623</sup> T. G. Law, ed., *The Archpriest Controversy: Documents Relating to the Dissensions of the Roman Catholic Clergy, 1597-1602: From the Petyt MSS of the Inner Temple*, 2 vols, London 1896-1898, II, pp. 183, 194.

<sup>624</sup> William Watson, *A Decacordon of Ten Quodlibeticall Questions Concerning Religion and State Wherein the Authour Framing Himselfe a Quilibet to Every Quodlibet, Decides an Hundred Crosse Interrogatorie Doubts, about the Generall Contentions betwixt the Seminarie Priests and Iesuits at this present*, London 1602: ‘their course of life doth shew what their study is: and that howsoever they boast of their perfections, holinesse, meditations and exercises (whereof we will talke anone) yet their platforme is heathenish, tyrannicall, Sathanicall, and able to set Aretine, Lucian, Machiauell, yea and Don Lucifer in a sort to schoole.’ Prynne reproduced this denunciation verbatim in Prynne, *The First and Second Seasonable Vindication*, sig. H1r.

<sup>625</sup> For descriptions of the extent of Parsons’ intelligencing and covert activities (including his dealings with plotters and tacit approval of drastic but concerted actions against the Elizabethan government), see M. Carrafiello, *Robert Parsons and English Catholicism, 1580-1610*, Cranbury 1998, pp. 103-18; id., ‘English Catholicism and the Jesuit Mission of 1580-1581’, *The Historical Journal*, 37, 1994, pp. 761-74; Houliston, *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England*, pp. 71-92. Despite Carrafiello’s and others’ contentions, archivist Thomas McGog has denied that Parsons’ original intentions were mainly political. See McCoog, *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England 1541-158*, p. 266.

other Catholics who favoured Spanish involvement in English affairs worked to affiliate with and raise the profile of Mary of Scots and her coterie, who—they hoped—would, upon regaining power, clear the quagmire as it were and rectify England’s Catholic allegiances.

Given their own prejudices, Watson and Prynne were incapable of seeing Parsons’ actions in this light. Ironically, despite the fact that Watson was a Catholic, he was very much Prynne’s trusted source, and it is doubtful whether Prynne ever bothered to read Parsons’s texts without the assistance of Watson’s vitriolic commentary. Indeed, it would be reasonable to say that Protestants living in the first half of the seventeenth century first formed their opinion of Parsons from secondary literature, especially from Watson’s *Quodlibets*. With regard to Prynne’s use of Watson, it is also worth noting that Prynne refrained from mentioning that Watson had actively conspired against the English throne. Unlike Parsons, Watson was actually charged with perpetrating a plot against a sitting English monarch. He paid for this crime with his life, and was, along with a co-conspirator, William Clerk, executed at Winchester the winter of 1603.

At the end of his career as a political agitator, Prynne connected all the various dangling threads into a final overview. Predictably, as already detailed in Chapters 1 and 2, Campanella took centre stage. Prynne first cited Campanella’s *De monarchia Hispanica* in his tract *Brief Memento*. In *Jus Patronatus*, he referred to several chapters from that work, in particular 18 (‘On Preachers and Prophecies’), 19 (‘Of such kingdoms are properly belonging to the King of Spain’), 23 (‘Of Germany’), and 27 (‘Of Flanders and Lower Germany’). In his address to the reader, Prynne enjoined his readers to ‘justly fear, expect changes in our Church, State, and prepare to prevent all Plots and Designs for the ruine of both’. These plots, he affirmed, had been ‘long since layd’ by Campanella, Parsons, and Richelieu and have been prosecuted by foreign agents ‘under a pretext of friendship, and other specious ends’.<sup>626</sup>

Unfortunately, Prynne did not direct his readers to specific pages or passages. He did however give us a list of the ‘particulars’, some of which can be identified with Campanella’s own proposals. First, Prynne mentioned a plan to ‘erect Itinerary Predicants fixed to no certain places, instead of Parochial Ministers’. These would be chosen by select committees with no regard for traditional patrons. Furthermore, they would ‘broach old Heresies and new Opinions in Religion by Jesuitical Emissaries and Seminaries in all places’. Finally, they would promote sectarianism, religious intolerance, and astrology to alienate ‘men’s minds’

---

<sup>626</sup> Prynne, *Jus Patronatus*, sig. A2v. See also *ibid.*, A3v.

and sow civil discord.<sup>627</sup> As regards the ‘itinerant predicants’, they certainly refer to the preaching and advisory assemblies from Chapters 15 and 18 of the *De monarchia Hispanica*. As we have seen in Chapter 1, Campanella had in fact proposed instituting certain ‘religious congregations of wise men and also of the laity’ (*congregations religiosum, sapientum itidem laicorum*) to deliberate on issues pertaining to the state.<sup>628</sup> Prynne’s ‘Jesuitical Emissaries and Seminaries’ apparently corresponds to Campanella’s ‘royal’ preachers (*Praedicatores regii*). Campanella suggested that this team of evangelists could be trained in various colleges (*collegia*) and then sent abroad into Germany and England.<sup>629</sup> Prynne seems to also have in mind the ‘seminaries of apostolic soldiers’ (*seminaria militum apostolicorum*) mentioned by Campanella in Chapter 15. Working from the principle that religion is the ‘chain of souls’ (*animorum vinculum est*), Campanella argued that orders like the Franciscans and Dominicans function as forces of the pope who propagate the faith without weapons. ‘Conquering the world’ (*mundum domant*) with power of ‘the tongue’ (*linguam*), they serve as the ‘nerves of the ecclesiastical dominion’ (*nervus domini ecclesiastici*)<sup>630</sup>

As for Prynne’s comments on sectarianism, astrology, and religious intolerance, these seem to derive from certain passages in Chapters 23 and 27, where Campanella advised the king of Spain to keep his enemies in Germany divided amongst themselves and hostile to each other. To do this, Campanella suggested that the king should degrade and divide Germans by opening schools of philosophy and mathematics. Heretical students, immersed in the study of various mechanical sciences, would then mellow as a result of their focus on speculative things. In addition, gifted students would be given stipends to study astrology.<sup>631</sup> In all these cases, Campanella assumed that the allure of innovation could be used as a means of subduing troublesome subjects. Campanella called it the ‘poison’ emanating from the

---

<sup>627</sup> Ibid., sig. A3r: ‘To sow the seeds of Schisms and Divisions not only in Divinity but likewise in Philosophy and all other Arts and Sciences, to distract and divide us: To promote and cry up the study of Astrology, to alienate mens minds from Religion and Piety. To set up new Orders, Sects, Religions, and procure a general toleration of all Religions.’ Compare with Prynne, *Quakers Unmasked*, p. 7: ‘the Popes and these his Emissaries chief endeavours are, to draw the people from our Churches, publique Congregations, ordinances, Ministers, Religion and to divide & trumble us into as many Sects, Separate Conventicles as they have Popish orders; and thereby into as many civill parties, factions, as possibly they can, to ruine us thereby’. Here Prynne explicitly directed his readers to confirm his claims by looking at ‘Thomas Campanella *De monarchia hispanica* c. 25, 27’.

<sup>628</sup> MH, p. 146.

<sup>629</sup> MH, pp. 147-8.

<sup>630</sup> MH, pp. 96-7.

<sup>631</sup> MH, pp. 185-6: ‘Dico igitur... regno Hispanico esse utile, ut amici eius sint uniti, inimici vero, praesertim in Germania, disjuncti & sibi mutuo adversi; idque ut fiat, omnem lapidem esse movendum. Egregia vero via ad humiliandos haereticos, eosque distrahendos, etiam haec est, nimirum aperire scholas philosophicas, & mathematicas in Germania, ut eiusmodi speculationibus juvenus immergatur potius, quam haereticis studiis vacet. Caeteri occupati reddantur in fabricandis machinis bellicis... aliisque mechanicis: ingeniaque praestantia lauris stipendiis ad astrologiam.’

‘desire’ for ‘new things’ and further knowledge.<sup>632</sup> Taking the above as a guideline, he instructed the king to erect schools of mathematics and astrology and re-open ‘the schools of the ancient philosophers’, such as those of the Platonists and the Stoics, adding the Telesians to the list. Alluding to the tactics of the mythological conqueror Cadmus, Campanella reasoned that the most passionate of the heretics would see the new sciences as being very convenient and useful. Consequently, they would turn from their heresy and become the vanguard leaders of the philosophical and astrological arts.<sup>633</sup> In *De monarchia Hispanica*, Campanella also instructed the king to establish workshops and factories dealing with mechanical arts. His strategy hinged on the assumption that heretics, after engaging in various tasks which required mental abstraction, would become more dissolute and more prone to disagreement amongst themselves. Ultimately, they would turn from their religion and be transformed into loyal subjects.<sup>634</sup> Prynne was obviously disturbed by this programme.

Like Contzen, Campanella expressed his interest in the gradual conversion of Protestants. He proposed effecting mass behavioural change by establishing divisive innovations to pacify—and eventually to evangelize the most zealous Protestants. Moreover, like the Jesuits mentioned by Gee, Wadsworth, and Owen, Campanella promoted strategic use of college-building and illusory arts (e.g. astrology) to win converts. Prynne later expanded on Campanella’s methods in the second edition of *A Seasonable, Legal, and Historical Vindication*. In a way, this book can be described as kind of reference book of Jesuit *maleficia*. Out of all Prynne’s works, it is the most comprehensive catalogue of the Jesuits’ evils. Indeed, Prynne’s excursus on the Jesuit problem accounts for roughly (50%) of the entire 203-page treatise. As an ‘impartial discovery of Jesuitical Plotes’, it was supposed to justify Prynne’s assertions ‘against all malicious Enemies, Accusers, Maligners whatsoever, before all the Tribunals of God or Men’.<sup>635</sup>

One aspect of the treatise which is of particular interest for the purposes of this study is Prynne’s emphasis on the Jesuits’ military prowess. As previously discussed, at least since 1642 Prynne had thought of the Jesuits as highly skilled and efficient in the arts of war. In the *Seasonable and Historical Vindication*, however, Prynne highlighted the militarism of the

---

<sup>632</sup> Ibid, p. 229: ‘sparsit venenum cupidinis rerum novarum, atque studium certatim addiscendi literas’.

<sup>633</sup> Ibid., pp. 236-7: ‘Erigendae sunt etiam scholae Mathematicae & Astrologicae... Revocandae itidem sunt scholae antiquissimorum Philosophorum Platoniorum & Stoicorum, & Telesianorum... Cadmum qui novas scientias secum in Boetiam importavit, & beneficio illarum princeps regionis illius evasit. Atque hoc modo haeresiarcae, videntes plus commode & utilitatis illic esse quam hic, repudiantes haeresibus antesignanos se philosophicarum & astrologicarum atrium facerent’.

<sup>634</sup> Ibid., p. 237: ‘Erigenda sunt etiam passim ergasteria & officinae mechanicarum atrium... Per haec talia quasi media homines a falsa religione avocantur, & a se invicem segregantur.’ See also *ibid.*, p. 149.

<sup>635</sup> Prynne, *The First and Second Part of a Seasonable, Legal, and Historical Vindication*, sig. N3r.

order's founder, Ignatius of Loyola (1491–1556), whom he portrayed as a warlike incendiary whose actions had inspired his followers to gain a mastery over all the elements of siege and naval warfare, such as the 'Ars Pyrotechnica', the art of making fireballs, fireworks, and wildfire. The Jesuits had then gone on to establish their own martial university at Madrid.<sup>636</sup> Afterwards, as 'bloody incendiaries and delighters in war', the Jesuits had 'set the whole Christian world in combustions and open warres against each other'.<sup>637</sup>

In Prynne's garbled and misrepresented account, the Jesuits had originally planned to throw the Three Kingdoms into disarray by inciting war with the Scots (the first Bishops' War). As was usual with him, Prynne (who included the story in his *Popish Royal Favourite*) based his thesis on dubious circumstantial evidence, in this case by the claims of a Jesuit encountered in Norfolk by the pursuivant James Wadsworth. As stated above, the Jesuit had affirmed that the Catholic religion would be spread by armed violence by provoking England into making war with the Scots.<sup>638</sup> In the meantime (and as described in *Romes Master-Peece*) a secret 'Parliament' of Jesuits convened on Queen Street in London to raise monies and other resources for the war effort. The president of the conclave was George Con, and its patron was Queen Henrietta Marie herself.<sup>639</sup> While the war was underway, the conspirators devised a back-up plan which would eventually be described as the Habernfeld Plot. The plot

---

<sup>636</sup> Ibid., sig. E1r: 'He would be named Ignatius, to signifie what office he should obtain in the Church and world, even to cast abroad fire in them, and set them all in a flame. Hereupon his Disciples the Jesuites, considering that this their founder was by his name A firebrand, and a Souldier by his profession, professed publikely to the King of Spain, his council and the world, that it was no less consonant to the mind, institution and statutes, then to the name of their warlike Father Ignatius, that they should not onely exercise, but Publikely profess and teach to others, Artem Pyrotechnisam, &c. the art how to make and cast abroad fire-balls, fire-works and wild-fire, to fire and burn houses and Cities: and likewise the art of warre, of setting Armies in battel array, of Assaulting cities, the maner of making Gun-powder, bullets, fire-bals; of casting Guns, and the maner and wayes of making all other Military works, Engines, together with rules and precepts belonging to Navigation... and all duties and incidents belonging to Sea-fights. Upon which they perswaded the King of Spain (notwithstanding the opposition of all the Universities of Spain against it) to erect a publike University for their fiery martial order at Madrid'. Prynne's source here is Kaspar Schoppe, *Stratagematis & sophismatis politicis societatis Iesu*, s.l. 1636, pp. 29, 30, 45-6.

<sup>637</sup> Prynne, *First and Second Part*, sig. E1v.

<sup>638</sup> Ibid., sig. E3r: 'one Francis Smith an English Jesuite, openly affirmed to Mr. Waddesworth and Mr. Yaxly, That it was not now a time to bring their Religion by disputing or Books of controversie, but it must be done by an Army, and By the Sword... the Jesuites Spanish and Romish Agents had engaged the King and English Protestants against their Protestant Brethren of Scotland, 1639, to cut one anothers throats'. The reference is to Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darknesse*, sig. Aa3r.

<sup>639</sup> Prynne, *First and Second Part*, sig. E3v: 'the Popes Nuncio, with the Colledge of Jesuites then in Queenstreet, secretly summoned a kind of Parliament of Roman Catholicks and Jesuites in London, out of every County of England and Wales, in which Conne the Popes Nuncio sate President, by the Queens commission and direction, in April, 1639. Who granted and collected an extraordinary large Contribution, by way of Subsidy, from the Papists, to carry on this war against our Protestant Brethren of Scotland, and raise forces to joyne with the Spainards, whom they then expected, to cut the English Protestants throats.'

was straightforward: the king was to be poisoned if he denied free exercise and toleration of the Catholic religion.<sup>640</sup>

When the war with the Scots ended, Prynne, continued, the Jesuits received support from Cardinal Richelieu and other foreign powers and instigated conflicts with the Irish. The direct result of their meddling culminated in the Irish Rebellion of 1641, which, in Prynne's report, saw the massacre of more than two thousand Protestants.<sup>641</sup> After this success, the same Jesuit cabal orchestrated the English Civil Wars.<sup>642</sup> Using their knowledge of armed conflicts, they infiltrated the Parliament's army (i.e.the New Model Army). These soldiers then tricked their peers by acting 'their parts, as extraordinary illuminates, gifted brethren, and grand States-men'. Over time their efforts succeeded in arousing the soldiery to 'to new-mould the old Monarchical Government, Parliaments, Church, Ministers, Laws of England'.<sup>643</sup>

The plot, however, didn't end here, for Prynne charged the Jesuit with vilifying and disenfranchising all those who had remained loyal to the old order, such as eleven Presbyterian MPs in 1647 and additional parliamentarians in 1648 after Pride's Purge.<sup>644</sup> Meanwhile, Jesuits abroad eagerly expressed their contentment with England's chaos and their hope the New Model Army's ascendance. Prynne confirms this by referring to the letter sent to the Independent politician Thomas Westrow, who, too, unveils new information which he had 'heard from persons of honour'. We know Prynne's argumentative technique, by now. It serves yet another example of Prynne's aptitude in using anecdotes to further his narrative. The Jesuits had apparently sent a letter from Paris directly to King Charles, three days before he was transferred to Hurst Castle in 1648. According to Prynne, the French Jesuits had decided to behead the king because he had settled with Parliament, abolished the 'Episcopacy', and enacted new laws against 'Jesuites, Popish Priests, Mass, Popery, and all Popish Ceremonies'.<sup>645</sup> A version of this tale, I argue, also appears in Prynne's *Brief*

---

<sup>640</sup> Ibid., sig. D2v.

<sup>641</sup> Ibid., sigs E4v-F1r: 'theIrish Popish Rebels, by the Jesuites Plots and instigations, seconded with secret encouragements, and promises of assistance with Arms and Moneys from Cardinal Richliou, the King of Spain, Pope, and other forraign Popish Princes, undertook the late horrid bloody Massacre of all the Protestants in Ireland...it took effect in most other parts of Ireland, to the slaughter of neer two hundred thousand Protestants there, in few months space; seconded with a bloody Warre, for sundry years; to the losse of many thousands more lives'.

<sup>642</sup> Ibid., sig. F1r.

<sup>643</sup> Ibid., sig. B3r.

<sup>644</sup> Ibid.

<sup>645</sup> Ibid., sig. D3r: 'And an Express sent from *Paris* to the King himself, some three dayes before his seisure and translation from *Weight*, to this effect, (as I have heard from persons of Honour) *That the Jesuites at a general meeting in France, had resolved, by the power of their friends in England, to seise on his Majesty, bring him to justice, and cut off his head, because he had, contrary to their expectation, closed with the Parliament,*

*Vindication*. I will discuss its significance below in my survey of the supplementary fables appended to Prynne's *Ancient Plot*.

The final part of what we have already described as the timeline of Prynne's Jesuit conspiracy covers the period between 1649 and 1655. In his account, Prynne assumes that the Jesuits—after beheading the king—fomented another war with the Scots, first, and then with the Netherlands. From the way in which Prynne is construing his interpretation of the events, it is clear that his narrative, among other things, was a means to put together disparate historical facts, a key whereby he could explain and visualize the extended causes of and sustaining forces behind England's political turmoil. What is particularly noteworthy is that what I would call Prynne's mythical landscape expanded in space and complexity with each passing year.

In 1643, to give an example, the minutiae of Prynne's theories largely pertained to the unchecked liberties and privileges of court Catholics and the concomitant abuses of Laud and other Arminian bishops. By 1648, however, the scope of Jesuit manoeuvring in the British Isles had broadened, and Prynne was articulating his concerns that the Jesuits were taking a more militaristic role in overturning Britain and its monarchy. Seven years later, Prynne went so far as to construct a timeframe which spanned decades and which outlined the genesis of all the wars in the Three Kingdoms since 1640. By continuously compounding his information into a set narrative, Prynne therefore strove to eliminate causal randomness and historical contingency. There is a level of stringent and consistent determinism in Prynne's imaginary universe. The degree of order and stability he could not find in the real world is transferred in the world of his own daily creation and recreation. By this I mean that, for Prynne, each troubling event had to be explained and described with precedents. These precedents became the foundation of his continental Jesuit myth.

In the introduction to the *Seasonal and Historical Vindication*, Prynne again (as he did in *Romes Master-Peece* and *The Popish Royall Favourite*) brought up the issue of the growing numbers of international Jesuit colleges. This time, however, he names Campanella as the original mastermind behind their construction and proliferation. In doing so, Prynne's conspiracy tales come full circle. He declares that colleges had been established to advance the Jesuits' plans for a 'universal monarchy'.<sup>646</sup> In the margins, he substantiates this claim by

---

*consented to the abolishing of Episcopacy, and) to five new Bills against Jesuites, Popish Priests, Mass, Popery, and all Popish Ceremonies, in the last Treaty; and advising Him, to prepare for this new storm, which within few days after fell upon him.'*

<sup>646</sup> Prynne, *The First and Second Part*, sig. B2v: 'Pope and Spaniard too, having long since (by Campanella's advice) erected many Colledges in Rome, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, and elsewhere,

citing ‘De Monarchia Hispanica, p. 146, 147, 148, 149, 204, 234, 235, 236, 185, 186’. Pages 146 to 148 of the *Monarchia* encompasses some material we have already covered in Chapter 1 while setting the scene of Prynne’s master narrative. A few additional points, however, are worth mentioning.

As already discussed, these pages detail the practicalities of evangelisation. In the New World, the religious are viewed as more effective than soldiers in bringing people to the Christian faith. Noting that only one monk had been necessary to convert all England, Campanella then goes on to describe the need for various Catholic schools and colleges which would instruct students in the ‘sects of natural philosophers’ (*sectae Physicorum*), Arabic, mathematics, and grammar.<sup>647</sup> He also declares that no heretics deviate further from the truth than the Calvinists.<sup>648</sup> Prynne, as a professed follower of Calvin, would have undoubtedly taken issue with this.

Pages 185 to 186 mostly contain Campanella’s ideas concerning the kind of schools we examined earlier. However, a section of page 186, which has nothing to do with colleges, is relevant for Prynne’s general perception of Campanella. The sentences in question highlight some of Campanella’s more Machiavellian proposals. In order for the king of Spain to keep his German subjects weak, Campanella says he should foment suspicion and jealousy among them so that no one would be able to trust their neighbours with their secrets. Furthermore, the king should safeguard the state by keeping powerful persons disconnected and disenfranchised.

College-planning, according to Prynne, was still only one of many evils apparently undertaken by Campanella. The rest of *Seasonal and Historical Vindication* contains a farrago of other accusations against him—all of which serve to retrospectively identify his advice as one of the root causes of the English revolution and one of the bases for the Protectorate’s injustices. Thus, Prynne wrote that all recent wars (including the war with ‘Protestant allies of the Netherlands’) had been pre-contrived by Campanella, who by now had become in Prynne’s mind the quintessential Jesuit. They were all ‘effected by the Spaniards Gold and Agents’. Since Campanella had suggested ‘the sowing, and continual nourishing of *Divisions, Dissentions, Discords, Sects and Schisms*’, he was the one who served as the model for republican ambition and sentiment. His programme of ‘Machiavilan

---

for English, Scottish, Irish Jesuites (as well as for such secular Priests, Friars, Nuns) of purpose to promote their designs against the Protestant Princes, Realms, Churches, Parliaments of England, Scotland, Ireland, & to reduce them under their long prosecuted universal monarchy.’

<sup>647</sup> MH, pp. 146-7. As for Campanella’s statement about the monk who converted England, it is unclear whether he means Pelagius or Augustine of Canterbury.

<sup>648</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 148: ‘Nam inter haereticos, nulli a veritate longius abeunt quam cuiusdam Calvinii discipuli.’

plots and policies' was exactly that which was implemented 'by the power of the Army-officers' to establish an 'elective kingdom' without 'legal right'.<sup>649</sup> In this way, Campanella and 'Spanish agents' was directly responsible for 'oceans of Protestants Christians blood', one of the greatest massacres the world had ever seen.<sup>650</sup> In a dense passage in which Prynne surveyed the Jesuits' international crimes seriatim, Prynne also lambasted Campanella for calling for the death of Maurice, Prince of Orange. He saw this as direct evidence of the Jesuits' involvement in the assassination of Maurice's father, William I, Prince of Orange. For Prynne, Campanella's advice in this context served as a precedent, an indication that Spain had already used similar subversive tactics to reclaim a formerly Catholic dominion.<sup>651</sup>

To sum up, we have seen that by 1655 Prynne had shaped the Ancient Plot into an explanatory paradigm to solve what he understood to be the quandary of England's republican misrule. In this way, this template performed the same function as the Laudian Plot in 1645-46. He discarded none of his previous research; all of it was retained, and all of it was utilized to substantiate his additional findings. As I originally mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, Prynne expressed what I have called a final chronology in several works after 1658. This chronology revised much of what Prynne had first outlined in 1655 and theorized in the 1640s and provided a broad map of the interweaving Laudian and Ancient Plots. As I have shown, Prynne increasingly came to see English Protestants and the Jesuits as two antipodal powers engaged in an enduring struggle for the future of religion in

---

<sup>649</sup> Prynne, *The First and Second Part*, sig. G3v: 'It is worthy observation, that Thomas Campanella prescribed the sowing, and continual nourishing of Divisions, Dissentions, Discords, Sects and Schisms among us, both in State and Church (by the Machivilian Plots and Policies he suggests, punctually prosecuted among us of late years) as the principal means to weaken, ruine both our Nation and Religion...which our *Republicans* lately did by the power of the Army-Officers; or, by sowing the seeds of an inexplicable war, between England and Scotland; By making it an Elective Kingdom... without Legal Right.'

<sup>650</sup> Ibid., sig. F1r: 'they engaged the Protestants of England and Scotland... to war upon, invade and destroy each other by land; and soon after that (by the Spanish Agents Assistance) raised a most dangerous bloody Warre between our Protestant old Allies of the Netherlands and the English by Sea; to the infinite dammage, prejudice of both, and the effusions of whole Oceans of the Gallantest Christian Protestant blood, that ever yet was shed'. A similar passage appears in Prynne's *Hidden Workes of Darkness*, sigs Cc3v-4r. See also Prynne, *True and Perfect Narrative*, pp. 49, 51; id., *A Brief Necessary Vindication of the Old and New Secluded Members, from the False Malicious Calumnies; and of the Fundamental Rights, Liberties, Privileges, Government, Interest of the Freemen, Parliaments, People of England, from the Late Avowed Subversions 1. Of John Rogers, in His Un-Christian Concertation with Mr. Prynne, and Others. 2. Of M. Nedham, in His Interest Will not Lie. Wherein the True Good Old Cause is Asserted, the False Routed*, London 1659, pp. 40-1. For the source of these accusations see MH, pp. 206-8.

<sup>651</sup> Prynne, *Seasonal and Historical Vindication*, sig. C4v: 'By their [the Jesuits'] suborning, instigating sundry bloody instruments one after another, to murder William Prince of Orange... Thomas Campanella (a Jesuited Italian Frier) prescribed this as a principal means to the King of Spain of reducing the Netherlands under his Monarchy again, to sow emulation and discords amongst their Nobles, States.'

the British Isles. This war, according to Prynne, had lasted nearly a hundred years, and had initially been planned and triggered by Robert Parsons and other Jesuits in 1590.<sup>652</sup>

Their ultimate goal was to eradicate English Protestantism by replacing the British ‘hereditary monarchy’ with a commonwealth or republic. In Prynne’s reconstruction Campanella had recovered and strengthened Parsons’ project to the King of Spain as a means to ‘sow the seeds of Divisions and Dissentions amongst the English themselves’.<sup>653</sup> Parsons and a rogues’ gallery of Catholic agents had hired in 1605 the ‘Gunpowder traitors’ to destroy the royal family and Parliament.<sup>654</sup> After the Gunpowder Plot was thwarted, a second group led by Cardinal Richelieu and the King of Spain ‘vigorously prosecuted’ a new version of the conspiracy ‘to a T’ (*ad unguem*) in 1639 and 1640 by provoking armed uprisings and battles across the Three Kingdoms.<sup>655</sup>

As already stated, Prynne maintained that their plans had received clandestine assistance from the pope via Cardinal Barberini (head of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith) and the papal nuncio George Conn. These men presided over the London-based secret society of Jesuit spies and laypersons responsible for, among other things, funding intelligencing efforts and conceiving a plan to poison King Charles.<sup>656</sup> Later, ‘Spanish and French agents’ seduced the Army and manipulated sectarians ‘of all sorts’ to overthrow the king and the monarchy from 1646 to 1649’.<sup>657</sup> After the king’s death, new

---

<sup>652</sup> Prynne, *The Re-Republicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause*, p. 5; id., *A Legal Vindication of the Liberties of England*, London, p. 53.

<sup>653</sup> Ibid.

<sup>654</sup> Prynne, *The Re-Republicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause*, pp. 5, 6, 8.

<sup>655</sup> Prynne, *Legal Vindication of the Liberties of England*, p. 53: ‘It was again set on foot and vigorously prosecuted by the Jesuites and Cardinal Richelieu of France, in the years 1639, & 1640.’ See also id., *A Gospel Plea*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, London 1660, sig. T3r: ‘other plots lately prosecuted *ad unguem* to subvert our Religion, Laws, Government, Monarchy, and enslave us to the Iesuits, Popes, Spaniards Tyranny and Vassalage in conclusion; first laid by Parsons and other pragmatistical Jesuites, then seconded by Thomas Campanella, in his Treatise *De Monarchia Hispanica* c. 25.27. and elsewhere: prosecuted of late years by the Jesuites and Spanish Agents on the one hand; and Cardinal Richilieu and his Instruments on the other hand; who at his death in the begining of our late Warrs (which he was very instrumental to rayse)’.

<sup>656</sup> Prynne, *True and Perfect Narrative*, p. 43

<sup>657</sup> Prynne, *The Re-Republicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause*, p. 6. See also *ibid.*, pp. 45-6: ‘all the Rebellions in the Army since 1646 against the King, Parliament, Members, and all the late Changes, Revolutions of our Government ever since, proceeded originally from the Jesuites, and Romish Agents powerfull influences upon the seduced Army-Officers, Souldiers, Sectaries, and Republican Members. And long since taking special notice, that during the Armies & Republicans proceedings against the King, & in hammering out their new Common-wealth; all the most eminent, zealous, religious Members of the Commons House, most opposite to Jesuites, Papists, Popery, were totally seclued, secured by the Army, and their Votes, Protestations, Advices, with the Addresses, Disswasions of all the Godly Ministers of London and other parts, yea (William Sedgwicks, their own Chaplains,) totally rejected with highest contempt; and the Counsels of the most desperate Jesuites, and popish Agents (flocking to London from all forein parts, and walking freely in the Streets whiles the Members were under strictest restraints) vigorously pursued: So all their subsequent Actions demonstrated to him and all considerate Protestants, whose Creature their New Republick originally was’. Compare with Prynne, *Legal Vindication*, pp. 54-5; id., *Brief Necessary Vindication*, p. 57.

domestic escalations and international conflicts ensued, such as wars with Scotland, Spain, and Holland. These were pursued with recourse to the instructions of Machivellian trickery provided by Parsons, Richelieu and Campanella.<sup>658</sup> In the meantime, Charles II was calumniated in the press by Jesuit-sponsored writers (such as Marchamont Nedham), popish books were permitted to be ‘freely imported’ to England, and ‘prognosticators’ such as William Lilly and Nicholas Culpeper were allowed to defame Presbyterian ministers and asperse the monarchy.<sup>659</sup>

In other words, Prynne considered the Commonwealth, Protectorate, and any model of government which was not a hereditary monarchy to be both contrary to Scripture and against the cultural and social prosperity of the English people.<sup>660</sup> In this sense, the Interregnum regime was a ‘meer Chaos’, a fleeting fancy dreamed up by ‘pseudo politicians’ who could not reach a consensus on an ideal government model.<sup>661</sup> Prynne saw the Jesuits’ nearly seventy years of activity in the British Isles as an extension of the alternating imperial tendencies of pagan Rome. The Roman pontiff was naturally the successor to the Roman Emperor, and the Catholic Church’s near 1700-year existence was an indication of its heathen heritage and power base.<sup>662</sup> This underlying component of Prynne’s thought must be stressed and should not be disregarded. England for Prynne was interchangeable with Zion and Israel. As I have already pointed out, from the days of his anti-Arminian polemics, he believed that Calvinism, the ‘true Religion’, could not exist without the support of the national Church of England. Prynne’s hyperbolic statements about the endless evil and resolve of the Jesuits and their allies (e.g. his denunciations that they were the worst monsters beyond the creation)

---

<sup>658</sup> SM, sig. A2r-A4v. See also *A Letter to General Monk, Expressing the Sense of Many Thousands of the Well Affected People of England, Old Parliamenters, and Old Puritanes*, London 1659; *Gospel Plea*, pp. 147-8.

<sup>659</sup> Prynne condemned Nedham’s propaganda and the anti-royalist polemic of other writers as ‘the very quintessence of Jesuitism and Jesuitical policy’. See Prynne, *Brief Vindication*, pp. 36-8, 43. For Prynne’s interpretation of Lilly and Culpeper as ‘Jesuitical Prognosticators’, see Prynne, *True and Perfect Narrative*, pp. 49, 60-1. See Nicholas Culpeper *Catastrophe Magnatum, or the Fall of Monarchie, a Caveat to Magistrates, Deduced from the Eclipse of the Sunne, March 29, 1652, with a Probable Conjecture of the Determination of the Effects*, London, 1652. In 1651, Lilly brought out *Monarchy or no Monarchy*, in which he recounted the execution of Charles and suggested that he knew the identity of the king’s executioner. Lilly’s remarks apparently did not go unnoticed by Prynne, for in 1660 he was summoned to testify before a committee chaired by Prynne, Sir Richard Weston, and Colonel Edward King. Lilly reported that Prynne interrogated harshly him but later made a report of the proceedings in the House of Commons ‘with much civility’. See, A. Matthews, ‘Joyce Junior Once More’, *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, 11, 1907, pp. 280-94. Prynne had initially attacked the astrologers in 1655 as the ‘Jesuits Grand factors to cry down our laws, Tythes and Ministers’, in *A Second Part of Historical Vindication*, sig. E2r.

<sup>660</sup> Prynne, *Brief Necessary Vindication*, pp. 60-1.

<sup>661</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 57-8.

<sup>662</sup> *Ibid.*: ‘Consider, that you cannot derive the Pattern of your New Commonwealth from the Scripture, Gospel, Church, or presidents of God and Jesus Christ; but only from the Old Heathen, bloudie Romans...who were alwaies altering their Government from one new form to another, continuing not long in anie one condition, till settled in an Emperor, and Empire; and at last in a Regal Roman Pontiff; in which state it hath continued allmost 1700. Years’.

were therefore consistent with the *telos* of his religious and historical narrative.<sup>663</sup> This foundational myth can be considered as an extension of ongoing Manichean, that is dualistic, struggles; the onset of which could be traced to Biblical times. By casting the English Protestants as the chosen people of God and the Catholics as the phalanxes of Satan, Prynne—like many of his fellow pamphleteers—produced a story of the politics of the English state in which the Bible and Christian theology function as narrative fuel and structure.

---

<sup>663</sup> Prynne, *The Re-Republicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause*, p. 8.

## Conclusion: Conspiratorial Likelihood and the Limits of Prynne's Narrative Inquiry

In the previous chapters, we have seen how Prynne's efforts to eliminate random and chance events from his accounts had the effect of making those accounts more convoluted and less plausible. In other words, as Prynne dispensed with ideas of coincidence and happenstance, framing events into his ever-growing plot template, the role of these events grew in significance and proportion. A few choice words privately spoken in support of the pope or Rome by a man of good repute (as we observed in Prynne's anecdotes about John Cosin in *Quench-Coale*) could be taken as proof of an ongoing plot. In Prynne's deterministic worldview, he could make sense of each event only by drawing on his assumed proposition since the mid-1640s: that the Jesuits had the means and the resolve to effect the deleterious religious and cultural transformation of English society.

Some of Prynne's peers accepted this model; others did not. In 1650, for instance, John Blackleach in his *Endevors Aiming at the Glory of God, that Peace & Truth May Meet Together*, expressed scepticism in the Ancient Plot by questioning Prynne's claims that the Jesuits had infiltrated the New Model Army. For the purposes of this study, Blackleach's critique is particularly useful because it appears to be an attempt at objectively examining Prynne's theories. Blackleach admitted that he had nothing against Prynne, whom he diagnosed as 'zealously affected'. Precisely because Prynne was 'so zealous, so ingenuous' Blackleach was sure that Prynne—like Paul—would make amends for his ideas after being shown the error of his ways.<sup>664</sup> Prynne's motivations, he stated, were clearly 'to obtain peace and safety'.<sup>665</sup> Blackleach pointed out that the 'root or Ground' of Prynne's argument against the Commonwealth was that the Jesuits expedited King's Charles trial to prevent him from reclaiming the throne.<sup>666</sup> To counter Prynne's assertions, he offered two arguments. First, he maintained that to the best of his knowledge, the officers 'held no correspondency with the Jesuits'. Nor did they 'favour the Jesuits so much as other men'. Second, Blackleach noted that it would be impractical and 'directly contrary' to the Jesuits' principles, prosperity, and

---

<sup>664</sup> John Blackleach, *Endevors Aiming at the Glory of God, that Peace & Truth May Meet Together*, London 1650, p. 20.

<sup>665</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23.

<sup>666</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41: 'Mr Prynne maketh this the Root or Ground, That the Army laboured to bring the late King to a just Tryal for the breach of Gods Laws, who is the King of Kings; he saith, That this was plotted by Jesuites, to the end they might hinder the re-establishing the late King in his Throne.'

religion to depose Parliament and prevent the king from having a fair trial.<sup>667</sup> To support his first claim, Blackleach wrote that the Jesuits had four main characteristics: they still worshipped idols; they were teaching that ‘ignorance is the mother of devotion’; they did not allow lay people to read ‘scriptures in their own language’, nor could lay people ‘dispute religious matters’.<sup>668</sup> The New Model Army, on the other hand, as pointed out by Blackleach, were ‘both in their profession and practice’ directly opposite to ‘these matters’. He then suggested that the Jesuits would most likely be supporters or members of the ‘Kings party’. This was evident, he explained, ‘by Letters and writing, discovered and intercepted’.<sup>669</sup> He expanded on this statement by referring to the culture of court Catholicism that had helped bring about Charles’ Personal Rule.<sup>670</sup> For this reason, Blackleach concluded that it would have been more advantageous for the Catholics to keep the king in power.

A far less objective critique of Prynne’s Ancient Plot thesis came from Fifth-Monarchy man John Rogers (1627-1665?) in his work *Diapoliteia* (1659). Rogers’s sardonic review is especially informative because it provides us with insight into the ways in which at least one of Prynne’s contemporaries was rejecting his storytelling. The work is certainly one of the most thorough and careful criticisms of Prynne’s Jesuit narratives in existence. Throughout his book, Rogers was keen to demonstrate that Prynne’s version of the state differed from the reality of the status quo. He enlivened the text with numerous epithets for and witticisms about Prynne, each one apparently designed to forward the view that it was Prynne, not Parliament, who was a danger to society. Initially Rogers described Prynne in terms which conjure up images of body snatchers, surgical quacks and witches. In his opinion, Prynne was acting like a soothsayer, striving to proclaim his knowledge of the true state of things by gazing into ‘intrals’, which ‘he *rips* open most inhumanely’.<sup>671</sup> Moreover, he

---

<sup>667</sup> Ibid.

<sup>668</sup> Ibid., pp. 41-2.

<sup>669</sup> Ibid., p. 42.

<sup>670</sup> Ibid.: ‘the Romish Catholiques were chiefest men to help the King to get into his Throne, upon his own terms’.

<sup>671</sup> John Rogers, *Diapoliteia. A Christian Concertation with Mr. Prin, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Harrington, for the True Cause of the Commonwealth. Or, An Answer to Mr. Prin's (Perditory) Anatomy of the Republick, and His True and Perfect Narrative, &c. To Mr. Baxter's (Purgatory) Pills for the Army, and His Wounding Answer to the Healing Question. With Some Soft reflections upon his Catholick (or Rather Cathulactick) Key; and an Examen of the Late Petition of the Sixth of July to this Parliament*, London 1659, pp. 3-4: ‘those INTRALS; which he *rips* open most inhumanely to the VIEW of the *Beholders*, and then reads his *Lectures* (like NERO) upon the very *Womb* wherein himself once lay. But could he have come (with the *Art* or *Honesty* of an *Anatomist*) to the *Intrals* FIRST; yet how by them Mr. PRYNNE (or his PRIN—*cipl*ed ones) can presume, or pretend to find it out, that our *Free-State* is the *Jesuites Project*, without a professed *Witchcraft* or *Sooth-saying*; I profess I cannot see, nor they (I think) very rationally suggest.’ Here Rogers pokes fun at a section from Prynne, *The Good Old Republican Cause*, p. 1.

was a ‘perditory’ anatomist. He cut, he wounded, he butchered, but most significantly, he sought to revive that ‘rotted’ thing which had long perished from the world, the monarchy:

My Arguments are all firm and untouch’d, which have proved Mr. *Prynne’s* Cause to be the very CORPSE and *stump* so long since defunct, buried and *rotted* (though he would have it *rise* again, or the *Ghost* of it).<sup>672</sup>

Prynne, he claimed, employed abrasive and injurious techniques to give life to an obsolete institution. Rogers also portrayed Prynne’s defence of the secluded members as an irrational attempt to integrate two different regimes: neither was compatible with the other, and anyone who maintained otherwise was forced to justify his position with fallacious axioms. According to Rogers, this was the trap that Prynne has fallen into, as was apparent from the narratives he constructed. Rogers aimed to show that Prynne was in no position to provide an accurate diagnosis of the Commonwealth’s ill. Prynne, in Rogers’ view, was averse to thoughtful debate, and his propositions amounted to ‘wrangling, rather than a reasoning with any sobriety’.<sup>673</sup>

To correct Prynne’s faulty suppositions, Rogers first analysed the state of Parliament. The main issue was the question of whether Prynne and the other secluded members had a right to sit in the current House of Commons. Rogers refuted the contention that their exclusion was unjust by employing Prynne’s own arguments against him. Prynne, he claimed, was no longer entitled to parliamentary members’ rights, because his membership ceased after the king had been executed.<sup>674</sup> This traditional principle—that Parliament’s existence was dependent on the king—also meant that Prynne did not have a place in the new Parliament, for this was associated with the Commonwealth, not to the monarchy. Furthermore, when in 1659 an invitation was made to previous members, it was extended to

---

<sup>672</sup> Rogers, *Diapoliteia*, p. 3. See also *ibid.*, p. 39: ‘he hath raised up (as a man in *much torture*) amongst other *stuff*, the veriest *Trash*, rubbidge, *stones*, straws, *gravel*, iron, *nails*, that can be, and what not? And seeing nothing will serve him, but that the *Rotten Corpse* of the *old constitution* might be raised to life...’

<sup>673</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>674</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7: ‘Their SECLUSION and *expulsion* was from the *House of Commons* indeed; or that PART OF THE PARLIAMENT, which were called and convened by the *King’s Writ* (of *Caroli 17. An. 1640.*) which *Parliament* Mr. *P.* himself determines, and hath resolved to have been actually *Dissolved* at the Death and *Decollation* of the *late King*, according to *Law* and REASON.’ See also *ibid.*, p. 8: ‘Mr. *P.* confesses, that had he been admitted to sit (with the rest of the Secluded members) their design was... propounded, to resummon the long since defunct House of COMMONS, which hath been buried and out of mind almost eleven years. Notwithstanding (by his own words) there was no such thing in being since the Kings Death; and how these could be the Antecedent, without the Relative of King or House of Peers, or made demonstrable and practicable by his own LAW, or responsible to the Writ & Summons of a Parliament as he accounts LEGAL, I understand not.’

those who had served on the Rump from 1648 to 1653, not those who had been excluded in Pride's Purge.<sup>675</sup>

Rogers also sought to contextualize Pride's Purge by stating that it had been a strictly political move executed without malcontent. He saw the issue as one of compatibility. Prynne and the other excluded members as members of the previous regime had a natural aversion to the new order and could not, without great difficulty, be made to conform to its ideology:

They were first measured in their *Affections* and *intentions*, and so found *oblique* to the *Publick*; (yea, professed and avowed enemies to the *Free-State* and GOOD CAUSE;) by such as have infinitely more *skill* in that *Art* (of true *Anatomy*) then either Mr. *P.* or I can pretend to.<sup>676</sup>

Rogers claimed to understand Prynne's true allegiances, stating (rightly) that he was for 'kingly government' not 'rejunction' to the current order.<sup>677</sup> As such, Prynne and his kind could never be 'faithful to the Commonwealth', and his proposals to change the government were 'real impossibilities both to *Reason*, Art and Nature'.<sup>678</sup>

Rogers then passed to dissect Prynne's conspiracy theories, starting with his Jesuit mythography. Throughout, the central aspect of Rogers's hermeneutics was a commitment to setting the historical record straight. With regard to Campanella, Rogers maintained (like Edmund Chilmead, Campanella's English translator) that 'all his *Politicks* were calculated and suited to the State of the nation at the time':

For CAMPANELLA the *Italian Frier* (in his *Monarch. Hisp.*) his *Project* was to promote an interest for the *King of Spain* against Q. *Elizabeth* and K. *James*; and all his *Politicks* were calculated and suited to the *state* of the *Nation* at that time, and in those days (far different from what it was or is in *ours*, which was not made for the *interest of Spain*, but our own).<sup>679</sup>

---

<sup>675</sup> Ibid., p. 9: 'Mr. *P.* knows (as well as we) that the *Parliament* recalled to their Trust (by the *Declaration of the Army*) is expressly denominated that *Parliament* that sat from *Anno 1648.*<sup>\*</sup> till *Anno 1653.* viz. the *Commonwealth-Parliament*, whereof they were never members.'

<sup>676</sup> Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>677</sup> Ibid., p. 26: 'had they been Members of this *Commonwealth-Parliament* (which they never were) yet seeing (*ex concessis*) they are all for *Kingly Government*, and against the *Free-State*, they could never have been rejoyn'd (by any rules that I can find)... andso are not capable of a *Rejunction* (as Mr. *P.* and *B.* press it) till we see a *REJUNCTION* in them also'.

<sup>678</sup> Ibid., pp. 26-7.

<sup>679</sup> Ibid., p. 28.

Rogers admitted that Campanella had suggested using diversionary tactics to weaken Elizabethan England. Campanella's ultimate goal, however, was to prepare England for its annexation by Spain. For this reason, Rogers concluded that the present Commonwealth could certainly not be the model government proposed by Campanella.<sup>680</sup> On the contrary, his 'design' was a monarchist stratagem to return the state's power back into the hands of a 'single person', the king of Spain:

*Campanella and the Papists never intended a Commonwealth as the ULTIMATE, but upon a design, and to turn it back to a Single Person: his own words are, Tandem in Democratiam, & fine Rursus in Statum Regium revolvuntur. So that THEY carry on the Jesuites Plot, that would Revert us again to a Single Person.*<sup>681</sup>

Along these lines, Rogers took apart Prynne's assertions regarding Parsons' plot. He denied that Parsons plotted aimed to establish the English Commonwealth. Rather, Parsons' commonwealth was described as a 'revelation' from God. In this way, it differed from the present regime, which—Rogers maintained—was built on 'reason and righteousness'. He was well aware that Watson believed Parsons' plot would involve an alliance between Puritans, Anabaptists and Jesuits, but, unlike Prynne, Rogers denied that this version of the commonwealth had any relation to the current regime.<sup>682</sup> To take his invective a step further, Rogers declared that the Jesuit fable was a figment of Prynne's imagination. Prynne, he asserted, was full of melancholic, imagination-producing 'natural heats' which enabled him to create wonders and 'bring out monsters':

I am apt to think it a BRAT of Mr. Prynne's own Brain, to make the Jesuite the *Father of this Commonwealth*, seeing he hath such a... faculty of *Pro-creating*, yea, of *Creating something out of NOTHING*, as we all know. Being a man of *Ability* to do

---

<sup>680</sup> Ibid., pp. 28-9: 'The *Friers ENDS* were such as did as well correspond with a *Kingdom Elective*, or any thing, so that Q. *Elizabeth*, King *James* and that *Family* were (but routed, or) totally amoved; but our ends in this *Commonwealth* are not such as can consist with, or be answered in a *Single Person*, or a *Kingdom Elective*, and therefore cannot be the same which the *Jesuites* plotted (if they plotted any) for us. But that is the *thing* which these *Gent.*\* must prove, viz. that *This*, this is *The Commonwealth* which *Campanella* plotted.'

<sup>681</sup> Ibid., p. 29. The quotation of Campanella's comes from MH, p. 414.

<sup>682</sup> Rogers, *Diapoliteia*, p. 41: 'PARSONS The Jesuite...pretended a Revelation from God: But this Commonwealth was laid upon Reason, Righteousness, and not on Revelation... Nor could it [the Commonwealth] be that which Watson would have had, for he shews plainly that HIS must be effected by a Conjunction of Puritans, Anabaptists, and Jesuites together, in the principles and Theorems, wherein they agree to carry it on'. Rogers' reference comes from Watson, *Quodlibets*, pp. 27-8, 169.

it... full of *Spumy*, frothy, and (errant) *excrementitious* Spirits! through his own *Natural heats and temper*, (as well as *praeter-Natural*) boyling up in him to *bring out* to others *Monsters...*<sup>683</sup>

This, according to Rogers, was the origin of Prynne's 'legend of lies', by which he attempted to lend credibility to what 'we cannot believe practicable or possible', the 'rotten corpse' of the 'old constitution'.<sup>684</sup> Rogers also believed that these tales did more harm than good in that they fostered an atmosphere of amusement and distraction which could be of use to potential plotters:

I fear it might be a *Plot* on purpose to amuze us, and to make our *Joult-Heads*, (as they call us) believe *Strange things*, to deter us from our *Duty...* this, I think, may be rather the *Plot* of the *Jesuites* and *Papists* (or at least the *Porch* of it) who fear us more as a *Commonwealth*, then as a *Kingdom* by far.<sup>685</sup>

Overall, Rogers thought that he could demonstrate that the Commonwealth was not of Jesuit origin by enquiring into the teleology of the purported conspiracy. In the end, he concluded that there was no convincing evidence to corroborate the existence of the Jesuit Commonwealth.<sup>686</sup>

Despite the fact that the particulars of Prynne's Ancient Plot were contested by commentators like Blackleach and Rogers, there is no indication that there was a consensus of opinion with regard to the thesis and its appendant supporting tales. What we do know, however, is that Prynne's interpretation was persuasive enough to be discussed; in this sense, its narrative exercised some influence. One of the most prominent supporters of Prynne's

---

<sup>683</sup> Rogers, *Diapoliteia*, p. 35. Compare with p. 3: 'you might think him [Prynne] a most profound and *Accomplisht Artist*, he begins his *Anatomy*, at the *Spermatick* parts of it... affirming that *Parsons* the Jesuite, *Watson* the Priest, &c. were the fathers of our *Commonwealth*, and had the *Prolifical* part, or *Art* of procreating it'. Elsewhere, when describing the convoluted nature of Prynne's Ancient Plot, Rogers lamented: 'His first designe, is to insinuate to the world, that our English Commonwealth-Government, is but a Conspiracy hatched and egged by the Jesuites and Romish Gibeonites... No rational man can question what he means.' See Rogers, *Mr. Pryn's Good Old Cause Stated*, p. 2.

<sup>684</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>685</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>686</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33: 'the Jesuites could not be or give the principal cause of it, as I have proved, for then they should have had some principal effects, and some principal benefits of it by a necessary consequence; nor were they the Assistant cause, for then there should have been a Permixtion and Conjunction of principles directly or indirectly, (but that I have proved to the contrary:) Nor are they the cause (sine qua non) without which we could not or cannot be a Commonwealth; and this (I presume) is undenyable by all, that we may be a Commonwealth without them. Therefore they were not the chief prolificall cause, nor had they the chief projecting Hand or Head in the procreation of this Commonwealth'.

thesis was the controversialist pastor, Richard Baxter (1615-1691).<sup>687</sup> Baxter's *Key for Catholicks* (which Rogers likened to Thomas Edward's *Gangraena*) included numerous references to and endorsements of Prynne's plotting narratives. Notably, Baxter's commentary shows that he understood that the crises of the new republic had arisen from Arminian and papist interventions in the 1630s and 1640s.

Baxter declared that it was 'too evident' that the papists had a hand in the spread of 'innovations' in Ireland, England, and Scotland.<sup>688</sup> They had instigated the 'Court and Prelates to silence, and suspend, and banish Godly Ministers'; encouraging them to 'ensnare' the public by 'bowing to altars, by the Book for dancing on the Lords dayes, and many such things'.<sup>689</sup> Baxter directed his readers to Prynne's works, stating that he would rather they hear it from him than 'hear it from me'.<sup>690</sup> He cited Prynne's works when bringing up other elements of the Laudian Plot, such as the Spanish Match, the Habernfeld relation, and the correspondence of Francis Windebank.<sup>691</sup> In addition, Baxter reiterated Prynne's claims about the Jesuits' usage of Arminianism as opiate for the masses.<sup>692</sup> As Baxter understood it, the 'episcopal party' ('Arminian in doctrine') was for 'reconciliation with Rome'. Prynne, Baxter stated, had provided 'copious proofs' of the influence the papists had exercised on the Arminian proceedings.<sup>693</sup>

Furthermore, Baxter was fully convinced that the Jesuits had co-opted the New Model Army.<sup>694</sup> Citing Prynne and the fact that the issue had been 'opened by so many already in print', he maintained that the grievances of the Army had also seeped into the Nonconformists and Independents.<sup>695</sup> Protestants and Puritans had been the 'enemies' of the new regime—not the 'actors' of it.<sup>696</sup> Baxter's statements of course, should not be understood as representing the whole gamut of arguments in favour of Prynne's Ancient Plot. However,

---

<sup>687</sup> For Baxter's comments on the plots of Campanella and Contzen, see Richard Baxter, *A Holy Commonwealth*, ed. W. Lamont, Cambridge 1994, pp. 41-7.

<sup>688</sup> Richard Baxter, *A Key for Catholicks, to Open the Jugling of the Jesuits, and Satisfie All that Are but Truly Willing to Understand, whether the Cause of the Roman or Reformed Churches Be of God*, London 1659, p. 316.

<sup>689</sup> Ibid.

<sup>690</sup> Ibid.: 'I had rather you would read in Mr. Prins *Works of Darkness brought to Light*, and *Canterburies Tryall*, and his *Romes Master piece*, and his *Royall Favorite*, then hear it from me...'

<sup>691</sup> Ibid., pp. 315-17, 328, 359. See also Baxter, *A Holy Commonwealth*, pp. 16, 218-19.

<sup>692</sup> Baxter, *Key for Catholicks*, p. 326: 'The Jesuites Letter cited by Prin, ib. pag. 89. saith (Now we have planted that Sovereign drugg Arminianism, which we hope will purge the Protestants from their heresie, and it flourisheth and bears fruit in due season)'. Baxter's reference is Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darkness*, p. 89.

<sup>693</sup> Baxter, *Key for Catholicks*, p. 326.

<sup>694</sup> Ibid., p. 322: 'it was known that the Army was quite altered (not only by a new modelling, but) by an intestine Jesuitical corrupting of multitudes of the Souldiers... And it was known, that the corrupted part of the Army, though the fewer, did so excell the rest in industry and activity'.

<sup>695</sup> Ibid., pp. 328-9.

<sup>696</sup> Ibid., p. 322.

the record shows that Baxter's analysis of the Commonwealth (which, by his own admission, was indebted to Prynne's account) was still referred to by his peers and people living in the Restoration period. As I have suggested above, the significance of Baxter's, Blackleach's and Rogers's criticisms is that Prynne's version of events, despite its far-fetched premises and mind-boggling allegations, managed to attract the attention of some of his contemporaries. At a time of extreme social and political volatility, the limits of plausible reality could certainly be stretched. As a rather crude centoist, Prynne assembled together quite an extraordinary collection of tales and anecdotes, often presented as indubitable evidence, which formed part of Prynne's several plots. For example, in his crusades against Arminianism, Prynne reported rumours that leading Arminian bishops were fraternising with Catholic priests. In *Romes Master-Peece*, he revealed that Laud—the most prominent ecclesiastic in the Church of England regularly had prior knowledge of a Jesuit plot. With the publication of *The Popish Royal Favourite*, Prynne divulged how King Charles and his secretary Windebank had bent and circumvented prosecutions of Catholics. Later, in *Hidden Workes of Darknesse* and *Canterburies Doome*, he amplified these claims by giving synopses of the Jesuits' subversive actions in other European regimes. In both works he appended the text of a pseudographical document pertaining to be the correspondence of a Jesuit and a 'Rector at Bruxels'. As in the 1648 letter of to the Independent MP Thomas Westrow, the Brussels letter signalled that foreign agents were collaborating to undermine the English government. Moreover, like Richelieu's dying instructions and the personal confession of Pope Innocent X, it demonstrated that real persons of power and influence (in this case, the Duke of Buckingham) were involved in the Jesuits' plans.<sup>697</sup> Some of these countless stories—especially those pertaining to Prynne's portrayal of the Quakers—were extensively repeated and reworked over the course of the last half of the seventeenth century.

Prynne's animosity towards the Quakers derived from his belief that they, too, were a weapon used by the Jesuits to undermine the stability of the Three Kingdoms. According to Prynne, the Jesuit programme made use of sectarian and dissident religious movements, such as the Shakers, Ranters, and Seekers, to strengthen their alleged divisive agenda. As Prynne saw it, these groups were little more than sorcerous conventicles which had originally been devised in seminaries abroad under the watchful eye of Franciscan and Jesuit superiors.<sup>698</sup>

---

<sup>697</sup> Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, sig. Y2r: 'For the better prevention of the Puritans, the Arminians have already locked vp the Dukes eares, and we have those of our Religion which stand continually at the Dukes Chamber to see who goes in and out.'

<sup>698</sup> Prynne, *Quakers Unmasked*, pp. 13-14. Prynne was one of many Puritan writers to asperse the Quakers as charlatans and evil-doers. For English anti-Quaker sentiment in the 1650s, see D. Manning, 'Accusations of

Citing Gee, Prynne assumed that most Jesuits were skilled in the black arts, and had passed on these powers and pastimes to their sectarian counterparts in the British Isles.<sup>699</sup> Due to the alluring nature of this craft, the Jesuits had in a short period of time created vast social movements for rapidly converting Protestants. In fact, they had done more harm to the Church and Realm of England in eight or nine years than any Catholic mass or publication had done in eighty years.<sup>700</sup> As if taking a cue from Contzen, they had ‘by degrees’ concealed their Jesuitism with ‘pleasing novelties’ and ‘superlative sanctity’.<sup>701</sup>

This is the fundamental premise of Prynne’s *Quakers Unmasked*. As he did in *Seasonable and Historical Vindication*, Prynne grounded his argument by highlighting the characteristics of Ignatius of Loyola. His reasoning worked like this: Ignatius had been an ecstatic, which meant that he was either a liar or possessed by the Devil. His followers therefore were either self-deluded or working in tandem with Satan and his demons. Prynne went into remarkable detail on this point in the post-script, drawing on numerous sources and examples of Jesuits using sorcery.<sup>702</sup> However, his most damning piece of information (one that bears a striking similarity to another anecdote in *Popish Royall Favourite*) was a witness statement by an ironmonger from Bristol named George Cowlishaw. The statement details Cowlishaw’s exchange with an Irish Franciscan named ‘Coppinger’. In Prynne’s account, Cowlishaw claimed that in September 1653 Coppinger had revealed that there was a special relationship between the Quakers and the Franciscans. Coppinger then predicted that the Quakers would arrive in Bristol three weeks after his discussion with Cowlishaw. His prediction came true eighteen days later when ‘two persons that bear the name of Quakers’ arrived in the city.<sup>703</sup>

---

Blasphemy in English Anti-Quaker Polemic, c.1660–1701’, *Quaker Studies*, 14, 2009, pp. 27-56; R. Moore, *Light in Their Consciences: The Early Quakers in Britain, 1646-1666*, University Park 2000, pp. 88-97; S. A. Kent, ‘The Papist Charges against the Interregnum Quakers’, *Journal of Religious History*, 12, 1982-3, pp. 180-90.

<sup>699</sup> Prynne, *Quakers Unmasked*, pp. 8-9: ‘John Jee his *Foot out of the Snare*, London, 1624. will prove the Jesuites and Priests in England are still accustomed to them [the black arts], to win and seduce their Proselytes.’

<sup>700</sup> Ibid., p. 5: ‘by this their New Stratagem and Liberty, they have (under the Disguises of being Quakers, Seekers, Anabaptists, Independents, Ranters, Dippers, Anti-Trinitarians, Anti-Scripturists and the like) gained more Proselytes, Disciples, and done more harm in eight or nine years space to the Church and Realm of England, more prejudice, dishonour, scandal to our Religion and Ministers, then ever they did by saying Masse, or Preaching, Printing any points of grossest Popery in 80. years time heretofore...’

<sup>701</sup> Ibid., p. 8: ‘they conceal their Jesuitisme and grossest points of Popery from their Disciples at first, baiting their hookes only with pleasing Novelties, shewes of Superlative Sanctity’.

<sup>702</sup> Ibid., pp. 20-5.

<sup>703</sup> Ibid., pp. 3-4: ‘The Information of George Cowlishaw of the City of Bristol aforesaid Ironmonger, taken the 22. day of January, 1654. Who informeth on his oath: that in the Month of September last, this Informant had some discourse in Bristol with one Coppinger, an Irish man, formerly a School-fellow of his, that came purposely thither for his passage into Ireland, who told this Informant, THAT HE HAD LIVED IN ROME AND ITALY Eight or Nine Years, and had taken upon him THE ORDER OF A FRYER OF THE

Immediately after Cowlshaw's information was made public, other clergymen started to repeat Prynne's evidence and use it as a defamatory weapon against the Quakers. Among them were Richard Baxter, Joshua Miller, Claudius Gilbert the Elder, Ralph Farmer and William Thomas.<sup>704</sup> Quaker apologists, however, rose to defend themselves, accusing Prynne of spreading false information. John Audland, for instance, writing in *The School Master Disciplined* (1655), challenged the account of the witness and expressed his suspicion that Coppinger either was a fabrication or a criminal. He also listed the names of his colleagues who were willing to testify against Cowlshaw's claims.<sup>705</sup> Similarly, George Whitehead in his *Truth Tryumphing in a Suffering Time over Deceit and Falsehood* (1664), noted that 'Cowlinshaw's oath' was insufficient evidence and could not be construed as grounds to 'instigate' persecution.<sup>706</sup> Whitehead did not mince words. He saw Prynne's dissembling as 'worse than the very heathen'.<sup>707</sup> And yet Prynne's story and the insinuations associated with it—the Franciscan-Quaker connection—continued to be repeated by pamphleteers and ministers for decades.<sup>708</sup>

---

FRANCISCAN COMPANY: And he told this Informant, that he had been AT LONDON lately for some months, and whilst he was there, he had been at all the Churches, and Meetings, publick and private, that he could hear of, and that none came so near him, As the Quakers: And being at a meeting of the Quakers, he there met with two of his acquaintance in Rome (the which two persons were of the same Franciscan Order and Company) that were now become Chief Speakers amongst the Quakers, and he himself had spoke among the Quakers in London about thirty times, and was well approved of amongst them. And this Informant further saith, that the said Mr. Coppinger asked him, what kinds of opinions in Religion there were in Bristol? and this Informant told him, That there were several opinions and judgements: and not naming any opinions of the Quakers; the said Mr. Coppinger asked him, whether there had been any Quakers in Bristol? And the Informant answered him, NO. Whereupon the said Mr. Copinger told him, the said Informant, two or three times That if he did love his Religion and his Soul, he should not hear them: Whereupon this Informant told him, that he thought none of them would come to Bristol: who expressly replied, that if this Informant would give him five pounds, he would make it five hundred pounds, if some Quakers did not come to Bristol within three weeks or a month then following. And on the morrow following the said Coppinger departed this City for Ireland, his native place, and about eighteen days after, there came to this City... two persons that bear the name of Quakers.' This story has a striking (and perhaps not coincidental) resemblance with the depositions of Thomas Mayo and James Wadsworth in *The Popish Royall Favourite*.

<sup>704</sup> Richard Baxter, *The Quakers Catechism, or, The Quakers Questioned, Their Questions Answered*, London 1655, sigs C4r-D1r; Joshua Miller, *Antichrist in Man: the Quaker's Idol*, London 1655, pp. 30-2; William Thomas, *Rayling Rebuked: or, A Defense of the Ministers of This Nation*, London 1656, sig. C2v; Claudius Gilbert, *Libertine School'd, Or A Vindication of the Magistrates Power in Religious Matters: In Ansvver to Some Fallacious Quaeries Scattered about the City of Limrick*, London 1657, p. 18; Ralph Farmer, *The Imposter Dethron'd, or, The Quakers Throne of Truth Detected to Bee Satans Seat of Lyes*, London 1658, p. 33.

<sup>705</sup> John Audland, *The Schoolmaster Disciplined*, London 1655, pp. 7-10.

<sup>706</sup> George Whitehead, *Truth Tryumphing in a Suffering Time over Deceit and Falsehood*, London 1664, p. 5: 'Cowlshaw's Oath of a bare report (if it be true that such a thing was reported) was no sufficient evidence to convict the Quakers (so called) of being guilty of *W. P.* his Charge aforesaid, nor for him to passe such a severe Sentence and Judgment upon them, nor to go about to instigate the Magistrates to persecute or suppress them as he hath done.'

<sup>707</sup> *Ibid.*: 'He hath shewed himself worse then the very heathen in this thing, to take a mans Information against people behind their backs, as sufficient for their conviction, whilst the accused were not present to answer face to face before their accusers.'

<sup>708</sup> See for example, John Gaskin, *A Just Defence and Vindication of Gospel Ministers and Gospel Ordinances*, London 1660, p.142; Richard Blome, *The Fanatick History, or An Exact Relation and Account of the Old*

Prynne's use of Cowlshaw's testimony shows us that his way of producing stories and presenting them as based on factual evidence (be they letters, meetings, hearsay information or one-to-one interviews) was consistent throughout his career. Although Prynne's Laudian Plot expanded into the Ancient Plot after 1647, the method by which he communicated his worldview remained the same.<sup>709</sup> As previously indicated, more often than not, Prynne's anecdotes feature antagonists who are persons of note as opposed to ordinary laypeople. Thus, the Habernfeld Plot emphasizes the role of elites such as Cardinal Barberini, George Con, and Toby Matthews. The letter to the Independent MP explains how Catholics of 'ingenuity' planned to support the Army against the king. Similarly, the passage taken from Priorato's *Histories* underscores Cardinal Richelieu's intrigues. The same is true for every other fable: the secrets of Pope Innocent X; the death threat letter from French Jesuits to Charles; the projects of Campanella and Parsons—all feature famous or notorious persons who had both the intellect and the resources to wreak catastrophic havoc on the English. To Prynne, such major events and mutations in English society were explicable only if seen through the prism of a Jesuit master plan. Like all of his peers, Prynne's cognitive outlook was intermeshed with his religious convictions. His dualistic historiography was typified by his long-lasting, impassioned crusade against what he presumed were non-Christian agents operating in the British Isles and Europe at large, and the most prominent of them, by Prynne's assessment, were the Jesuits. To further illustrate how Prynne utilized these stories to prop up his Ancient Plot and extend his propagandizing efforts, I will provide three final examples from *Seasonable and Historical Vindication*, *True and Perfect Narrative*, and *Brief Vindication*.

The first example I will mention is the purported testimony of an 'English Protestant Nobleman'. In *Seasonable and Historical Vindication*, Prynne stated that papist associates of this 'person of honor' invited him to visit a Jesuit college in Rome. Upon his arrival, the Protestant was ushered into a main gallery which was divided into different chambers, each representing a different province. He was then told that each chamber contained letters from its designated region. These letters circulated on a weekly basis, and were regularly analysed by the region's parochial supervisor. Intrigued, the Protestant guest approached the Jesuit provincial who was in charge of England's communication and news and proceeded to enquire about the progress of the Jesuits in England. To his surprise, the provincial responded

---

*Anabaptists and New Quakers*, London 1660, p. 177; Thomas Good, *Firmianus and Dubitantius, or, Certain Dialogues Concerning Atheism, Infidelity, Popery, and Other Heresies and Schisme's That Trouble the Peace of the Church*, London 1674, p. 98; Nalson, *Foxes and Firebrands*, p. 141.

<sup>709</sup> Prynne, *True and Perfect Narrative*, p. 45

that the Jesuits had 1500 active members in England who were faring comparatively well in spite of the country's civil unrest. The provincial attributed his colleagues' success to their aptitude for disguising themselves by working 'in several Professions & Trades'.<sup>710</sup>

Another anecdote (which, due to Prynne's promotion of it, would eventually become immortalized as an anti-Catholic legend) first appeared in *True and Perfect Narrative*. At first, his tale was fairly simple: the confessor of Henrietta Marie (presumably Robert Philip or Philips) had disguised himself as a soldier and attended the execution of King Charles.<sup>711</sup> After the king was killed, Philip had flourished his sword and gleefully celebrated with other Jesuits and papists. In *Brief Vindication*, Prynne related that the story had been told to him by a 'Bencher of Lincolns Inne'. Apparently this bencher had been an associate of a 'gentleman' named 'Henry Spottsworth'. Thus Spottsworth was the eyewitness, the one who purportedly had first-hand knowledge of the Queen's confessor, having witnessed his actions at the execution. In this account, Spottsworth identified the jubilant confessor as he was riding away from the execution. He expressed his surprise at the confessor's presence at the 'sad

---

<sup>710</sup> Prynne, *Seasonable and Historical Vindication*, sigs G1r-G1v: 'An English Protestant Nobleman (a person of honor) whose Ancestors were Papists, being courteously entertained within these two years at Rome by some eminent Iesuits, in their chief Colledge there, was brought by them into a Gallery having Chambers round about it, with Titles over every door for several Kingdoms, and amongst the rest, one for England. Upon which, he enquiring of the Iesuits, what these titles signified; was answered by them, That they were the Chambers of the Provincial Iesuits, of each Kingdom and Province (written ever the respective doors) wherein they had any members of their society now residing, who received all Letters of intelligence from their Agents in those places every week, and gave account of the to the General of their Order. That the Provincial for England, lodged in the Chamber over which the title ENGLAND was written, who could shew him the last news from England: which he desiring to see, they thereupon knocked at the door, which was presently opened: the Provincial being informed who & what the Lord was, read the last news from England to them. Hereupon the Nobleman demanded of them. Whether any of their society were now in England? & how they could stay with safety, or support themselves there, seeing most of the English Nobility, Gentry, and Families that were Papists, were ruined in their estates, or sequestred by the late wars & troubles, so as they could neither harbour, conceal nor maintain them, as they had done heretofore? They answered, It was true; but the greater the dangers and difficulties of those of their society now in England were, the greater was their merit. And that they had then above fifteen hundred of their Society in England, able to work in several Professions & Trades, which they had there taken upon them, the better to support & secure themselves from being discovered...' Prynne had apparently personally heard this tale from 'an eminent Divine and others more than once'. Compare with Prynne, *True and Perfect Narrative*, p. 43: 'Yea, [me] being further assured, by an eminent Divine and others more than once, from the mouth of a Noble English Lord, returning from Rome about 4 years since, That the Provincial of the English Jesuites, when he went to see their College in Rome, assured him, they had then above fifteen hundred of their Society of Jesuites in England, able to work in several Professions and Trades, which they had there taken upon them, the better to support, and secure themselves from being discovered, and infuse their Principles into the vulgar People.'

<sup>711</sup> After one of his letters (in which he appeared to ask King Louis XIII of France to intervene in English affairs) to a French acquaintance was intercepted in 1640, Philip was impeached and subsequently imprisoned in the Tower of London in 1641. Among other allegations, he was accused of plotting with Jesuit Robert Parsons to 'destroy and depose kings'. Significantly, the impeachment document also relates that Philips was frequently visited by groups of Jesuits and 'many of the Popish faction'. See *The Impeachment and Articles of Complaint against Father Philips the Queenes confessor*, sigs A2r-A4r. With the Queen's invention, Philip was released in 1642 after which point he accompanied her to the Hague and afterward to France. Prynne had commented on Philip and his questionable role as a correspondent of Francis Windebank, George Conn, and Cardinal Richelieu in 1645. See Prynne, *Hidden Workes of Darknesse*, pp. 204-5, 215.

spectacle' and the confessor responded that he and at 'least forty or more Priests and Iesuites' had come to make themselves available in case Charles decided to convert to Catholicism.<sup>712</sup>

Significantly, Prynne used this account to support his claims about Campanella and Parsons. It was one of 'divers instances' which confirmed the 'deportment' of the Jesuits 'in relation to the Kings death, and the change of our Government'.<sup>713</sup> It is worth noting that, like the plotlines involving Campanella and Richelieu, the Spottsworth report was rapidly reproduced and commented on by other pamphleteers. In 1660 one writer expressed his disappointment that Prynne and Baxter could lend credibility to a tale that was 'deep Calumny'.<sup>714</sup> Yet in 1662, Henry Foulis included it in his book, *The History of the Wicked Plots and Conspiracies of Our Pretended Saints, the Presbyterians* (1662). Like Prynne, Foulis used the passage to call the reader's attention to Jesuit subterfuge in British politics.<sup>715</sup> By 1663, some particulars had been added to the story. For example, the author of the popular antipopery work *Fair Warning, or, XX Prophecies Concerning the Return of Popery* (1663) wrote that the confessor's name was 'Sarabras'.<sup>716</sup>

The fable was further elaborated in Peter du Moulin's *A Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion* (1664). Du Moulin divided the story into three separate parts. The first repeated what Prynne had already expressed regarding the confessor and his sword flourishes. However, Du Moulin reported that the confessor exclaimed: 'Now the greatest enemy we have in the world is gone!' In the second part of Du Moulin's tale, an unnamed 'Protestant gentleman of good credit' encounters a 'company of Jesuited persons' in Rouen, France. The most 'grave' member of the party declares that he and his companions had

---

<sup>712</sup> Prynne, *Brief Necessary Vindication*, pp. 44-5: 'When the King was executed before Whitehall, Jan. 30. 1648. Mr. Henry Spottesworth riding casually that way just as his head was cut off, espied the Queens Confessor there on Horseback in the habit of a Trooper, drawing forth his sword, and flourishing it over his head in triumph, (as others there did) at this spectacle. At which being much amazed, and being familiarly acquainted with the Confessor, he rode up to him, and said; O Father! I little thought to have found you here, or any of your profession at such a sad spectacle. To which he answered, There were at least forty or more Priests and Iesuites there present on Horseback besides himself; and that one end of his and their coming thither, was, That if the King had died a Roman Catholick he might not want a Confessor, had he desired one.'

<sup>713</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45.

<sup>714</sup> *A Vindication of the Roman Catholicks of the English Nation*, London 1660, pp. 9-10: 'yet there be some, who... affirmed... that... cutting off of the late Kings head was the plot and work of the Papists: though never one of them appear'd against him, and so many of them [Papists] lost their lives and Estates to keep his head upon his shoulders, and the Crown upon his head. If this be not a deep Calumny, proceeding from the very gall of bitterness, let any indifferent man judge. And therefore I admire how it could fall from the pens of two such Eminent persons as Mr. Pryn and Mr. Baxter, who are in other matters justly esteemed prudent and rational men, great lovers of Truth, and of their Countries good.'

<sup>715</sup> Foulis, *The History of the Wicked Plots and Conspiracies*, p. 14.

<sup>716</sup> *Fair Warning, or, XX Prophecies Concerning the Return of Popery*, London 1663, p. 47. In his diary, Samuel Pepys noted that the book was recalled by Archbishop Gilbert Sheldon because of the controversy around the story of the confessor. See Samuel Pepys, *The Diary*, ed. R. Latham and W. Matthew, 11 vols, Berkeley 1995, IV, p. 111.

masterminded the king's execution because he had failed to keep his promise of 're-establishing the Catholick religion' after marrying Henrietta Marie.<sup>717</sup> It is possible that Du Moulin's 'company of Jesuited persons' was based on Prynne's description of the group of forty Jesuits and Priests who accompanied the queen's confessor. Finally, in what we can call part three of Du Moulin's story, the scene shifted and it described the proceedings of secret conclaves which, he claimed, had been held on the continent a year prior to Charles's execution. During the first meeting in Paris, 'English Jesuits' had consulted members of the 'Faculty of Sorbon' to seek their guidance on England's 'likely posture to change government' and to ask about the lawfulness of a potential Catholic intervention. The French academicians answered 'affirmatively'. Afterwards, the delegation journeyed to Rome and posed the same queries to the Pope. The Pope and his council, concluding that an intervention was 'lawful and expedient', immediately gave their consent.<sup>718</sup>

According to Du Moulin, the troubles which arose in the New Model Army and the King's eventual death were the direct result of meddling by the elite papists.<sup>719</sup> Moulin's extended anecdote is useful and relevant because it shows how just one of Prynne's stories was reproduced and revised to scapegoat Catholics and to substantiate the idea that the English revolution was a Jesuit brainchild. Indeed, details revealed in a letter sent by Prynne in 1664 prove that Du Moulin had sought out Prynne for the origin of the Spottesworth report. Prynne stated that Spottesworth was dead but that the lawyer who related to him Prynne's witness (as well as his sister) were still alive. He promised to give Du Moulin further evidence, but admitted that he had lost a key document in his study or in the

---

<sup>717</sup> Peter du Moulin, *A Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion*, London 1664, pp. 58-9: 'The Roman Priest and Confessour is known, who when he saw the fatal stroke given to our Holy King and Martyr, flourished with his sword, and said, Now the greatest enemy that we had in the world is gone. When the newes of that horrible execution came to Roan, a Protestant Gentleman of good credit was present in a great company of Jesuited persons: where after great expressions of joy, the gravest of the company, to whom all gave ear, spake much after this sort: *The King of England at his Marriage had promis'd Which is most false. us the re-establishing of the Catholick Religion in England; and when he delayed to fulfill his promise, we summoned him from time to time to performe it: We came so far as to tell him, that if he would not do it, we should be forced to take those courses which would bring him to his destruction.*'

<sup>718</sup> Ibid, p. 59: 'the year before the Kings death, a select number of English Jesuits were sent from their whole party in England; first to Paris, to consult with the Faculty of Sorbon, then altogether Jesuited; to whom they put this question in writing: That seeing the State of England was in a likely posture to change Government, whether it was lawful for the Catholicks to work that change, for the advancing and securing of the Catholick Cause in England, by making away the King, whom there was no hope to turn from his heresie? Which was answered affirmatively. After which the same persons went to Rome, where the same question being propounded and debated, it was concluded by the Pope and his Council, that it was both lawful and expedient for the Catholicks to promote that alteration of State.'

<sup>719</sup> Ibid., p. 60: 'In pursuance of that Order from Rome, for the pulling down both the Monarch and the Monarchy of England, many Jesuites came over... About thirty of them were met by a Protestant Gentleman, between Roan and Diepe, to whom they said (taking him for one of their party) that they were going into England, and would take Armes... and endeavour to be Agitators.'

countryside. Nonetheless he averred ‘upon oath’ that the narrative was true and declared he was satisfied with how he had conducted his enquiry.<sup>720</sup> Du Moulin publicly confirmed Prynne’s role in divulging the requested information in 1679 in the fourth edition *A Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion*.<sup>721</sup> Yet, Du Moulin and Foulis were not the only writers to use the tale to propagate the Spotswood-Sarabras tale. Between 1659 and 1700 it appeared in dozens of publications, cited by historians, civic officials, and preachers.<sup>722</sup>

In closing, I would like to provide one more example. In *Brief Vindication*, Prynne stated that one of the reasons he believed the Good Old Cause and the Commonwealth to be a ‘Plote of the Iesuites’ was the personal testimony of a legal acquaintance (‘a Grave Protestant Gentleman of the Temple’). Prynne narrated that this man had conversations with a popish friend around Easter in 1659. The two men discussed things relating to the current upheaval in British politics and to the late ‘Revolutions and changes of Government’ in Britain. The Protestant insisted that all the uprisings had been planned and executed by Jesuits. His popish friend however instructed his friend to ‘be patient’ and decided to investigate the matter on his own. To do this he spent time in the company of Jesuits in London (‘where most Papists

---

<sup>720</sup> *Catalogue of a Collection from the Stowe Manuscripts*, London 1883, p. 71: ‘I receiued yours this euening concerning my *Narrative*, p. 55, of the Queens confessors brandishing his sword at the late kings murder. I there print that Mr. Henry Spotsworth was death {sic} but the Bencher who related it to me (and, I conceiue, his sister) ar both aliue, but not in London. As soone as I see the relation, I shall render you a fuller account which I did then set down in writing, and had the Benchers attestation and some further euidence as to the priests discourse and excuse of it, before I printed it, but haue lost the paper or left it in my study in the country. What I haue printed I shall aver vpon oath, that I remad this relation more then once or twice, and made the best inquiry I could to satisfy myselfe.’

<sup>721</sup> Peter du Moulin, *A Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn., London 1679, p. 60. Here du Moulin also expressed his opinion that it was ‘worth enquiring upon what ground’ the author of *Fair-Warning* derived the the name ‘Sarabas’. See *ibid.*, p. 65.

<sup>722</sup> See *Loyolana: Ignatian fire-works*, p. 121; Roger Palmer, *A Reply to the Answer of a Catholique Apology*, London 1668, pp. 62-3; Joshua Stopford, *The Ways and Methods of Romes Advancement; Or, Whereby the Pope and His Agents Have Endeavoured to Propagate Their Doctrines: Discovered in Two Sermons Preached on Novem. 5. 1671*, York 1672, pp. 39-41; Laurence Womock, *The Religion of the Church of England, the Surest Establishment of the Royal Throne*, London 1673, pp. 33-4; William Denton, *The Burnt Child Dreads the Fire, or, An Examination of the Merits of the Papists Relating to England*, London 1675, p. 61; Edward Pelling, *The Good Old Way, or, A Discourse Offer'd to All True-Hearted Protestants Concerning the Ancient Way of the Church*, London 1680, p. 125; *A Seasonable Address to the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, Court of Aldermen, and Commoners of the City of London, upon Their Present Electing of Sheriffs*, London 1680, p.2; Frankland, *The Annals of King James and King Charles the First*, sig. b1v; John Nalson, *Foxes and Firebrands, or a Specimen of the Dangers of Popery and Separation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, London, 1682, pp. 86-7; Edward Pelling, *A Sermon Preacht on January 30th, 1683 in Westminster-Abby before the Reverend and Honourable, the Kings judges*, London 1684, p. 39; Thomas Long, *A Compendious History of All the Popish & Fanatical Plots and Conspiracies against the Established Government in Church & State in England, Scotland, and Ireland from the First Year of Queen Elizabeth’s Reign to This Present year 1684*, London 1684, p. 91; John Gother, *Pulpit-Sayings, or, The Characters of the Pulpit-Papist Examined*, London 1688, p. 15; *A Defence of the Missionaries Arts, or a Brief History of the Romanists Plots*, London 1689, p. 84; William Turner, *A Compleat History of the most Remarkable Providences both of Judgment and Mercy, Which Have Hapned in this Present Age Extracted from the Best Writers*, London 1697, p. 117.

in England were then assembled'). He returned to his friend five or six days later and admitted that what the Protestant had said was true. The man claimed that most Jesuits were knaves and all have been working to establish an English Commonwealth to benefit the national interest of the Spanish monarch.<sup>723</sup> Again, Prynne's methodology is clear: cite a reputable witness (the Protestant Gentleman), highlight the revelations of an aristocratic insider (the experiential evidence of his popish friend), and tout the unfolding evidence as supplementary confirmation of an established narrative, that is the Jesuits' mobilisation of the Army and the murder of King Charles.

Prynne's Laudian and Ancient Plots can be seen as interlinking stages of one continuous, supple and evolving myth. At the beginning of this study, I set out to conduct a narratological analysis of Prynne's antipopery stories. Seeing Prynne as a representative 'paranoid spokesman', I hypothesized that his conspiratorial myths emerged not in a spontaneous or random manner, but in an accretionary way, incorporating real concerns about particular politico-religious movements and mentalities that Prynne believed were detrimental to the national interests of the English state. These I generalized as Arminianism, Machiavellianism, and Jesuitism. To defend my assertion, I propounded that the 'Jesuit' Campanella (a stock character whose original fabrication I attributed to Prynne) in the Ancient Plot could be used as a tool to uncover the literary phylogenesis as it were of Prynne's overall conspiratorial narratives.

I then went on to show that Campanella is a part of a constellation of figures (Contzen, Parsons, and Richelieu) who appear in Prynne's Ancient Plot and who—collectively—share heredity with characters and themes featured in Prynne's Laudian Plot. With this in mind, I proceeded to argue that the pliability and fecundity of Prynne's

---

<sup>723</sup> Prynne, *Brief Vindication*, p. 35: 'he calls upon me for *more evidence*, if I have it, to prove his *Good Old Cause and Commonwealth a Plot of the Iesuites*, I shall gratify him herein...A grave Protestant Gentleman of the Temple last *Trinity Term* riding up to *London*, meeting with a Popish Gent. of his acquaintance on the way, they discoursing of these last *Revolutions* and changes of Government, the Protestant told him, *that these alterations were but the Plots and productions of the Jesuites and those of his Religion, who did but laugh at us in their sleeves, to see what fools they made us.* At which the Papist growing somewhat angry; *He desired him to be patient, since they were antient friends, and what he spake was not in jeast or scoff, as he took it, but in sober sadness; desiring him (having great acquaintance amongst the Papists) to inquire out the truth of what he spake, when he came to London, where most Papists in England were then assembled, for both their satisfactions, and to give him an account thereof;* which he promised to do. About 5. or 6. dayes after, this Papist told him, *That according to his request, he had made diligent inquiry of the truth of what he spake on the way; and that he found, all or most of the Iesuites were Knaves, they and most of the Iesuited Papists being against the King, and wholly for a Commonwealth, as being most advantagious for the King of Spains Interest;* using more words to the same effect.' This tale is almost identical to the one in Challoner's testimony in *Canterburies Doome*. See Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, pp. 414-15. It also bears some resemblance to the Coppinger-Cowlshaw exchange.

storytelling (exemplified by his reimagining of Contzen, Campanella, Parsons, and Richelieu) was measurably conditioned by his zealous but rigorous responses to the following aggregate of specific factors: the Arminian controversies and the concomitant rise in power of Archbishop Laud and other Church of England bishops; the extralegal privileges of English Catholics and their sympathizers at the court of James I and later at the court of Charles I (as outlined in *The Popish Royall Favourite*); the moral panic about Catholic assassination plots (typified by the decades-long paranoia which followed the Gunpowder Plot); the anti-Jesuit, anti-Spanish, and anti-Machiavelli propaganda (especially the works of John Gee, Lewis Owen, and James Wadsworth); the alliance of Independent radicals and other sectarians with the New Model Army against Charles I and moderate Presbyterians; the indefinite seclusion or suspension of non-compliant MPs during Pride's Purge; and finally the attempt by some Republicans to marginalize and vilify Charles II and the movement to restore the monarchy.

To bolster my argument that Prynne's mythography had a certain influence, I also provided examples of other seventeenth-century works in which his grand narrative and supplementary anecdotes and fables (such as the Sarabras legend) were mentioned and analysed. People did regard him with varying degrees of admiration and contempt, and there were many persons of rank who premised their opinions of Catholics on Prynne's judgement. It should be noted that Prynne's character assassinations (executed through his sensational stories) had real-world consequences. Like Senator McCarthy and other paranoid spokespersons, Prynne had—both temporarily and posthumously—tangible influence on the lives of policymakers. Indeed, as one writer in 1683 complained, he had a reputation for searching into 'Princes cabinets'.<sup>724</sup> His power however, as we have seen, can certainly be attributed to his strategic use of stories to impact English minds. As regards these stories, I have provided evidence that they attest to Prynne's reuse of certain narrative patterns and plotlines. For example, we saw that Prynne's account in *Brief Vindication* of the Jesuit conclave mirrors the story that Prynne coaxed from Thomas Challoner in *Canterburies Doome*. We also saw how the exchange between Coppinger in Cowlshaw in *Quakers Unmasked* appears to draw on the testimony of the Thomas Mayo and Francis Newton in *Popish Royall Favourite*.

In sum, I think it is fair and critically defensible to stand by what I maintained at the beginning of this investigation: that Prynne's storytelling had a certain effect on antipopery literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The reasons for this can—at

---

<sup>724</sup>*The Grand Inquest, or, A Full and Perfect Answer to Several Reasons, by Which It Is Pretended His Royal Highness, the Duke of York, May Be Proved to Be a Roman-Catholick*, London 1680, p. 17.

the very least—be attributed to his prodigious ability to create new plots, reinterpret old ones, and disseminate his discoveries. In this sense, Prynne was both a literary conjurer and a body-snatcher, one who breathed new life into figures like Campanella in order to further his popish apocrypha. As we have seen, this narrative process featured as part of his propaganda for over three decades but there is enough evidence to suggest that Prynne was still actively mythologizing during what we can describe as his ‘retirement’ from his literary crusading.<sup>725</sup>

For example, in his his multi-volume work, *An Exact Chronologicall Vindication and Historical Demonstration of Our British, Roman, Saxon, Danish, Norman, English Kings Supreme Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction* (published between 1666 and 1670), Prynne continued to write about the legacy of papist conspiracies.<sup>726</sup> In the fourth volume, Prynne—keeping to habits of his younger years—wrote that a major cause of the English Civil War (‘our late Confusions’) was the Catholic Church’s apparent tolerance of lay and women preachers. One of the examples he used to make his case was that of Mary Ward and her followers, who justified their itinerant preaching by citing the 1584 papal bull of Gregory XIII.<sup>727</sup>

According to Prynne, the bull, which said that Jesuits and their emmissaries should preach ‘in all places without interruption, though not in orders’, caused a ‘prodigious increase of the Jesuites beyond all other Orders of the Roman Church’. Some of these Jesuits became instruments of Spain’s and the pope’s universal monarchy.<sup>728</sup> They were active, Prynne

---

<sup>725</sup> Ostensibly for his services to Charles II, Prynne was made Keeper of the Records at the Tower of London in 1661. See Kirby, *William Prynne*, p. 148. Both Samuel Pepys and Isaac Basire (1607–1676) reported that Prynne privately worried about papist conspiracies. After the Great Fire of London, Prynne was appointed to an investigative commission to determine the causes of the conflagration. The commission’s report includes several pages of far-fetched testimonies, all gleaned from purported eyewitnesses. See *A True and Faithful ACCOUNT OF THE SEVERAL INFORMATIONS EXHIBITED To the Honourable Committee appointed by the PARLIAMENT To Inquire into the Late Dreadful Burning Of the City of London. TOGETHER With other INFORMATIONS touching the Insolency of POPISH PRIESTS and JESUITES; and the INCREASE of POPERIE*, brought to the Honourable Committee appointed by the Parliament for that purpose, London 1667.

<sup>726</sup> Prynne, *An Exact Chronologicall Vindication and Historical Demonstration of Our British, Roman, Saxon, Danish, Norman, English Kings Supreme Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction*, 4 vols, London 1666-70. This massive work, Prynne’s last literary project before his death in 1669, surveys the reigns of John, Henry III, and Edward I. Early editions of this work were destroyed in the fire of London. Prynne did not publish the texts in chronological order, writing that he was forced to ‘praeponere’ the second volume before the first because he needed to add more information to it. See *Exact Chronologicall Vindication and Historical Demonstration*, II, sig. B1v. Altogether what remains are three volumes and an incomplete, untitled fourth volume.

<sup>727</sup> Mary Ward (1585-1645) was an English renuciant who founded a community of uncloistered nuns (also called ‘Jesuitesses’) in 1609 or 1610. Heavily criticised by Catholics and Protestants alike, Ward based her order on Jesuit teachings. The papal bull of 1584, *Ascendente Domino*, reaffirmed the Jesuit founding document, *Formula Instituti*. For more on Mary Ward’s influences see, H. Peters, *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*, tr. H. Butterworth, Leominster 1994, pp. 115-17.

<sup>728</sup> Prynne, *Exact Chronologicall Vindication and Historical Demonstration*, IV, p. 73: ‘This Liberty of preaching indulged by this Popes Bull to Lay-Jesuits, in all places without controll, hath been one cause of the growth of such Preachers during our late Confusions, many of these disguised Jesuits having bin preachers among us; & of the prodigious increase of the Jesuites beyond all other Orders of the Roman Church, (through the extraordinary favours, assistances of the *Pope*, and *King of Spain*; they being the most active Instruments to

outlined, during the reigns of Elizabeth and James; they orchestrated Charles' destruction; they gave birth to the Commonwealth; they ruled over England's monarchs with a secret consistory.<sup>729</sup>

From this, we can see that Prynne, even in his latter years, relied upon his Ancient Plot thesis to make sense of historical events. In volume one of *Exact Chronologicall Vindication and Historical Demonstration*, Prynne cautioned Charles II against tolerating Jesuits, as one could 'conjecture, if not conclude' that they were involved in the ousting of Charles I.<sup>730</sup> Declaring that the 'downe-fall' of the Catholic Church was 'near at hand' Prynne asserted that he was writing principally to accelerate their demise.<sup>731</sup>

As in his pre-Civil War and Interregnum works, Prynne in *Exact Chronological Vindication* fashions himself as an expounder who set out to lift his countrymen to greater heights by giving them knowledge of themselves. As always, Prynne provides this knowledge by scouring centuries of English history and compiling instances of Catholic insubordination. Hence, the text serves as additional evidence for my contention that Prynne unceasingly told anti-popery stories to impose on his compatriots his idea of what it truly meant to be religiously and culturally English. Though the names of Campanella, Richelieu, Contzen, and

---

promote the *Popes Universal Monarchy over the Church*, and *Spaniards Universal Monarchy over the whole world*,) worthy our special Observation.'

<sup>729</sup> Ibid., p. 75: '[they] made very many attempts (1) to destroy the sacred persons of Queen Elizabeth, (2) King James, were the principal contrivers of the late horrid Gunpowder Treason, to blow up our King, Queen, Prince, all the Royall Issue, Lords, Commons, Church, Kingdom, Religion, Parliaments at once, had a principal hand in the unparallel'd murder, proceedings against our late King Charles of glorious memory; and had no small influence in the late metamorphosis of our Hereditary Kingdomes, into the confused Chaos of a new Free Commonwealth; Having (as the General of the English Jesuites confessed to a Noble English Lord in their Colledge at Rome) Anno 1653. in England above 1500 of their Society able to work in several trades, (which the Bull of Pope Gregory the 13th. inables them to exercise, as well as to preach without Orders.) They having a Consistory and Council that ruled all the affairs of the Kings in England...'

<sup>730</sup> *An Exact Chronologicall Vindication and Historical Demonstration*, I, sig. h2r: 'Whether there be not just probable grounds from hence, and other circumstances to conjecture, if not conclude, that the late execrable, bloody Murder of Your Royal Father, and treasonable Designes against Your own Sacred person, and all the Royal Line, to banish, crush, extirpate, or deprive them of the Inheritance of the Crown of England, originally sprung from these Jesuitical Romish Doctors, and their disguised Emissaries...'

<sup>731</sup> Ibid., sigs k1v-k2r: '...the down-fall of these Luciferian Popes, and Popish Prelates, is near at hand...the acceleration whereof, was one principal end of these my Voluminous Collections...'; and *Exact Chronologicall Vindication and Historical Demonstration*, III, p. 1: '...the discovery and countermining of which [the popes' and bishops'] long-agitated Design in successive ages, is the principal scope, end of these my Chronological Collections Elsewhere, Prynne was more idealistic about what treatise would actually accomplish. Prynne's statements reveal that he was still the paranoid spokesman, wielding information as a weapon against Catholics. See, *ibid.*, fol. l3r-v: '...This *Vindication* will prevent all future Treasons, Rebellions Conspiracies of Popes, Popish Prelates, Priests, Iesuites...make all Roman Catholicks lesse dependent on, obsequious to Popes Treasonable or seditious bulls...it will deal a fatal blow to the whole body of Popery...' Prynne apparently thought such an outcome could be feasible if he marketed to the right persons. Indeed, he specifically stated that the material was meant for an international audience of kings, 'great officers of state', and 'serious professors of the Protestant faith or Romish religion'. Furthermore, Prynne admitted that he left a majority of the content in Latin and French in order to 'make them more communicable and diffusive to Statesmen and scholars in forraign parts'. See, *ibid.*, sigs B2r, B3r.

Parsons no longer passed his lips, those Laudian and Ancient Plot tales which Prynne had a role in formulating and propagating from the 1630s onward were in essence still alive and well in his history books. Thus, any future study of Prynne must acknowledge that his extensive political storytelling, which often took the form of religio-nationalist myth-making, was inextricable from his public service as a published informer. As such, it contributed considerably to Prynne's posthumous reputation.

# Bibliography

## Works by William Prynne

- The Perpetuities of a Regenerate Mans Estate Wherein It Is Manifestly Proved by Sundry Arguments, Reasons and Authorities. That Such as Are Once Truly Regenerated and Ingrafted into Christ by a Lively Faith, Can Neither Finally nor Totally Fall from Grace,* London 1626.
- The Unlovelinesse, of Love-Lockes. Or, A Summarie Discourse, Prooving: the Wearing, and Nourishing of a Locke, or Love-Locke, to Be altogether Unseemely, and Unlawfull unto Christians,* London 1628.
- A Briefe Survey and Censure of Mr Cozens His Couzening Devotions Proving both the Forme and Matter of Mr Cozens His Booke of Private Devotions, or the Houres of Prayer, Lately Published, to Be Meerely Popish: to Differ from the Private Prayers Authorized by Queene Elizabeth 1560,* London 1628.
- The Church of Englands Old Antithesis to New Arminianisme, Where in 7. Anti-Arminian Orthodox Tenents, Are Evidently Proved, Their 7. Opposite Arminian (Once Popish and Pelagian) Errors Are Manifestly Disproved, to Be the Ancient, Established, and Undoubted Doctrine of the Church of England,* London 1629.
- Newes from Ipswich, Discovering Certaine Late Detestable Practises of Some Domineering Lordly Prelates, to Undermine the Established Doctrine and Discipline of Our Church, Extirpate All Orthodox Sincere Preachers and Preaching of Gods Word, Usher in Popery, Superstition and Idolatry; with Their Late Notorious Purgations of the New Fastbooke,* Ipswich 1636.
- A Looking-Glasse for All Lordly Prelates,* London 1636.
- Histrion-Mastix,* London 1633.
- A Quench-Coale. Or A Briefe Disquisition and Inquirie, in What Place of the Church or Chancell the Lords-Table Ought to Be Situated,* London 1637.
- A Catalogue of Such Testimonials in All Ages as Plainly Evidence Bishops and Prebysters to be Both One Equal and the Same in Jurisdiction, Office,* London 1641.
- A New Discovery of the Prelates Tyranny,* London 1641.
- The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie, both to Regall Monarchy, and Civill Unity: or, An Historicall Collection of the Severall Execrable Treasons, Conspiracies, Rebellions, Seditions, State-Schismes, Contumacies, Oppressions, & Anti-Monarchicall Practices, of Our English, Brittish, French, Scottish, & Irish Lordly Prelates, against Our Kings, Kingdomes, Laws, Liberties,* London 1641.
- A Sovereign Antidote to Prevent, Appease, and Determine Our Unnaturall and Destructive Civill Warres and Dissentions,* London 1642.
- Soveraigne Power of Parliaments and Kingdomes,* 4 vols, London 1643.
- The Popish Royall Favourite: or, a Full Discovery of His Majesties Extraordinary Favours to, and Protections of Notorious Papists, Priestes, Jesuites, against All Prosecutions and Penalties of the Laws Enacted against Them Notwithstanding His Many Royall Proclamations, Declarations, and Protestations to the Contrary,* London 1643.
- A Breviate of the Life of William Laud, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury,* London 1644.
- Hidden Workes of Darkenes Brought to Publike Light, or, A Necessary Introduction to the History of the Archbishop of Canterburie's Triall,* London 1645.

*A Fresh Discovery of Some Prodigious New Wandring-Blasing-Stars, & Firebrands, Stiling Themselves New-Lights, Firing Our Church and State into New Combustions*, London 1645.

*Truth Triumphant over Falshood, Antiquity over Novelty*, London 1645.

*Canterburies Doome, or, The First Part of a Compleat History of the Commitment, Charge, Tryall, Condemnation, Execution of William Laud, Late Arch-bishop of Canterbury*, London 1646.

*The Sovereaign Power of Parliament and Kingdomes: Divided into Four Parts Together with an Appendix*, London 1646.

*New Presbyterian Light Springing out of Independent Darkness, or VI. Important New Queries Proposed to the Army*, London 1647.

*A True and Ful Relation of the Officers and Armies Forcible Seising of Divers Eminent Members of the Commons House, Decemb. 6. & 7. 1648*, London 1648.

*Demand of His Liberty to the Generall, December 26, 1648*, London 1648.

*The Machavilian Cromwellist and Hypocritical Perfidious New Statist Discovering the Most Detestable Falshood, Dissimulation and Machavilian Practices of L. G. Cromwel and His Confederates*, London 1648.

*The Petition of Right of the Free-Holders and Free-Men of the Kingdom of England*, London 1648.

*Substance of a Speech in the House of Commons*, 3rd edn, London 1649.

*A Brief Memento to the Present Unparliamentary Juncto Touching Their Present Intentions and Proceedings to Depose and Execute, Charles Stuart, Their Lawful King*, London 1649.

*The First Part of an Historical Collection of the Ancient Parliaments of England, from the Yeer of Our Lord 673, till the End of King John's Reign, Anno 1216*, London 1649.

*Sad and Serious Political Considerations Touching the Invasive War Against our Protestant Brethren in Scotland*, London 1650.

*The Sword of Christian Magistracy Supported*, London 1653.

*A Gospel Plea (Interwoven with a Rational and Legal) for the Lawfulness and Continuance of the Antient Setled Maintenance and Tenths of the Ministers of the Gospel*, London 1653.

*Jus Patronatus, or A Briefe Legal and Rational Plea*, London 1654.

*A Seasonable, Historical, Legal Vindication and Chronological Collection of the Good Old Fundamental Liberties, Franchises, Rights, Laws of All English Freemen*, London 1654.

*A New Discovery of Free-State Tyranny: Containing Four Letters, Together with a Subsequent Remonstrance of Several Grievances and Demand of Common Right*, London 1655.

*The First and Second Part of a Seasonable, Legal, and Historicall Vindication and Chronological Collection of the Good Old Fundamentall Liberties, Franchises, Rights, Laws of all English Freemen*, London 1655.

*The Second Part of A Seasonable Legal and Historical Vindication, and Chronological Collection of the Good Old Fundamental Liberties, Franchises, Rights, Lawes, Government of All English Freemen*, London 1655.

*New Discovery of Free-State Tyranny*, London, 1655.

*Quakers Unmasked*, 2nd edn., London 1655.

*A New Discovery of Some Romish Emissaries*, London 1656.

*A Summary Collection of the Principal Fundamental Rights, Liberties, Proprieties of All English Freemen*, London 1656.

*Demophilos, or, The Assertor of the Peoples Liberty Plainly Demonstrating by the Principles even of Nature Itself, and by the Primitive Constitutions of All Governments since the*

- Creation of the World that the Very Essence and the Fundamentals of All Governments and Laws Was Meerly the Safety of the People, and the Advancement of Their Rights and Liberties*, London 1658.
- Eight Military Aphorismes Demonstrating the Uselessness, Unprofitableness, Hurtfulness and Prodigall Expensiveness of All Standing English Forts and Garrisons*, London 1658.
- Some Popish Errors, Unadvisedly Embraced and Pursued by Our Anticommunion Ministers*, London 1658.
- A Plea for the Lords, and House of Peers, or, A Full, Necessary, Seasonable Enlarged Vindication of the Just, Antient Hereditary Right of the Earls, Lords, Peers, and Barons of This Realm to Sit, Vote, Judge, in All the Parliaments of England*, London 1658.
- A Legal Vindication of the Liberties of England, against Illegal Taxes and Pretended Acts of Parliament, Lately Enforced on the People*, London 1659.
- A Brief Necessary Vindication of the Old and New Secluded Members, from the False Malicious Calumnies; and of the Fundamental Rights, Liberties, Privileges, Government, Interest of the Freemen, Parliaments, People of England, from the Late Avowed Subversions 1. Of John Rogers, in His Un-Christian Concertation with Mr. Prynne, and Others. 2. Of M. Nedham, in His Interest Will not Lie. Wherein the True Good Old Cause is Asserted, the False Routed*, London 1659.
- Ten Quaeres upon the Ten New Commandements of the General Council of the Officers of the Armies*, London 1659.
- True and Perfect Narrative of What Was Done, Spoken by and between Mr. Prynne, the Old and Newly Forcibly Late Secluded Members, the Army Officers, and Those now Sitting, both in the Commons Lobby, House, and Elsewhere on Saturday and Monday Last (the 7 and 9 of This Instant May)*, London 1659.
- The Re-publicans and Others Spurious Good Old Cause, Briefly and Truly Anatomized*, London 1659.
- A Brief Necessary Vindication of the Old and New Secluded Members, from the False Malicious Calumnies; and of the Fundamental Rights, Liberties, Privileges, Government, Interest of the Freemen, Parliaments, People of England*, London 1659.
- A Gospel Plea (Interwoven with a Rational and Legal) for the Lawfulness and Continuance of the Antient Setled Maintenance and Tenths of the Ministers of the Gospel*, 2 vols, London 1660.
- The First Part of the Signal Loyalty and Devotion of Gods True Saints and Pious Christians (as also of Some Idolatrous Pagans) towards Their Kings*, London 1660.
- Conscientious, Serious Theological and Legal Quaeres, Propounded to the Twice-Dissipated, Self-Created Anti-Parliamentary Westminster Juncto, and Its Members*, London 1660.
- An Exact Chronologicall Vindication and Historical Demonstration of Our British, Roman, Saxon, Danish, Norman, English Kings Supreme Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction*, 4 vols, London 1666-70.

## Primary Sources

- A. B., *Mutatus Polemo. The Horrible Strategems of the Jesuits, Lately Practised in England, during the Civil-Wars, and Now Discovered by a Reclaimed Romanist*, London 1650.
- Abernathy, Thomas, *Abjuration of Popery*, London 1638.

- A Copy of a Letter from an Officer of the Army in Ireland, to his Highness the Lord Protector*, London 1656.
- A Defence of the Missionaries Arts, or a Brief History of the Romanists Plots*, London 1689.
- A Dreame, or Newes from Hell*, London 1641.
- A Letter from Sir Arthur Hesilrige to the Honorable William Lenthal ... Together with Colonel Lilburn's Letter to Sir Arthur Hesilrige*, London 1648.
- A Letter to General Monk, Expressing the Sense of Many Thousands of the Well Affected People of England, Old Parliamenters, and Old Puritanes*, London 1659.
- Articles Whereupon It Was Agreed by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the Whole Cleargie, in the Convocation Holden at London in the Yere of Our Lorde God. 1562*, London 1571.
- A Seasonable Address to the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor, Court of Aldermen, and Commoners of the City of London, upon Their Present Electing of Sheriffs*, London 1680.
- A True and Faithful ACCOUNT OF THE SEVERAL INFORMATIONS EXHIBITED To the Honourable Committee appointed by the PARLIAMENT To Inquire into the Late Dreadful Burning Of the City of London. TOGETHER With other INFORMATIONS touching the Insolency of POPISH PRIESTS and JESUITES; and the INCREASE of POPERY, brought to the Honourable Committee appointed by the Parliament for that purpose*, London 1667.
- A True and Perfect Relation of a Great Victory Obtained by the Parliaments Forces in Northumberland*, London 1648.
- Audland, John, *The Schoolmaster Disciplined*, London 1655.
- A Vindication of the Roman Catholicks of the English Nation*, London 1660.
- Barlow, William, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference... at Hampton Court*, London 1604.
- Baxter, R., *The Quakers Catechism, or, The Quakers Questioned, Their Questions Answered*, London 1655.
- , *A Key for Catholicks, to Open the Jugling of the Jesuits, and Satisfie All that Are but Truly Willing to Understand, whether the Cause of the Roman or Reformed Churches Be of God*, London 1659.
- , *Fair-Warning, or, XXV Reasons against Toleration and Indulgence of Popery*, London 1663.
- , *A search for the English Schismatick*, London 1681
- , *A Holy Commonwealth*, ed. W. Lamont, Cambridge 1994.
- Bennet, Thomas, *An Answer to the Dissenters Pleas for Separation, or, An Abridgment of the London Cases*, Cambridge 1700.
- Blackleach, John, *Endevors Aiming at the Glory of God, that Peace & Truth May Meet Together*, London 1650.
- Blome, Richard, *The Fanatick History, or An Exact Relation and Account of the Old Anabaptists and New Quakers*, London 1660.
- Bonde, Cimelgus, *Salmasius His Buckler, or, A Royal Apology for King Charles the Martyr*, London 1662.
- Botero, Giovanni, *Reason of the State*, tr. P. J. and D. P. Waley, New Haven 1956.
- , *Reason of the State*, ed. R. Bireley, Cambridge 2017.
- Brethren in Iniquity, or, The Confederacy of Papists with Sectaries*, London 1690.
- Burton, Henry, *For God, and the King*, London 1636.
- Campanella, Tommaso, *De monarchia Hispanica discursus*, Amsterdam 1640.
- , *De monarchia Hispanica discursus. Editio novissima, aucta et emendata ut praefatio ad lectorem indicat*, Amsterdam 1653.

- , *A Discourse Touching the Spanish Monarchy: Wherein We Have a Political Glasse, Representing Each Particular Country, Province, Kingdome, and Empire of the World, with Wayes of Government by which They May be Kept in Obedience. As Also the Causes of the Rise and Fall of Each Kingdom and Empire*, tr. Edmund Chilmead, London 1654.
- , *Advice to the King of Spain for Attaining the Universal Monarchy of the World. Particularly concerning England, Scotland and Ireland, How to Raise Division between King and Parliament, to Alter the Government from a Kingdome to a Commonwealth. Thereby Embroiling England in Civil War to Divert the English from Disturbing the Spaniard in Bringing the Indian Treasure into Spain. Also for Reducing Holland by Procuring War betwixt England, Holland, and Other Sea-Faring Countries, Affirming as Most Certain, that If the King of Spain become Master of England and the Low Countries, He Will Quickly Be Sole Monarch of All Europe, and the Greatest Part of the New World*, tr. Edmund Chilmead, London 1660.
- , *Opere*, ed. A. D’Ancona, 2 vols, Turin 1854.
- , *Discorsi ai principi di Italia*, ed. L. Firpo, Turin 1945.
- , *Tutte le opere*, ed. L. Firpo, Milan 1954.
- , *Monarchia del Messia*, ed. V. Frajese, Rome 1995.
- , *Monarchie d’Espagne et Monarchie de France*, ed. G. Ernst, French translations by S. Waldbaum and N. Fabry, Paris 1997.
- , *La Monarchia di Spagna: Prima stesura giovanile*, ed. G. Ernst, Naples, 1989.
- , *Lettere: 1595-1638*, ed. G. Ernst, Pisa 2000.
- , *De politica*, ed. A. Cesaro, Naples 2001.
- , *La città del sole*, ed. G. Ernst, Rome 2006.
- , *Del senso delle cose e della magia*, ed. G. Ernst, Bari 2007.
- , *Lettere*, ed. G. Ernst, Florence 2010.
- , *Selected Philosophical Poems*, ed. S. Roush, Chicago 2011.
- Care, Henry, *The History of the Damnable Popish Plot, in Its Various Branches and Progress*, London 1680.
- Catholik-Christian, *Pyrotechnica Loyolana, Ignatian Fire-Works, or, The Fiery Jesuits Temper and Behaviour*, London 1667.
- Catalogue of a Collection from the Stowe Manuscripts*, London 1883.
- Charles I, *His Maiesties Declaration to All His Loving Subiects, of the Causes Which Moved Him to Dissolve the Last Parliament*, London 1628.
- , ‘The King to William Prynne’ in *The Letter Book of John Viscount Mordaunt 1658-1660*, ed. M. Coate, London 1945.
- Contzen, Adam, *Looke about You: The Plot of Contzen, the Moguntine Jesuite, to Cheate a Church of the Religion Established Therein and to Serve in Popery by Art without Noisior Tumult*, London 1630.
- Cromwell, Oliver, *Speeches to the Parliament in the Painted Chamber*, London 1654.
- Culpeper, Nicholas, *Catastrophe Magnatum, or the Fall of Monarchie, a Caveat to Magistrates, Deduced from the Eclipse of the Sunne, March 29, 1652, with a Probable Conjecture of the Determination of the Effects*, London 1652.
- Daillé, Jean, *An Apologie for the Reformed Churches; Wherein is shew'd The necessitie of their separation from the Church of Rome: Against those who accuse them of making a Schisme in Christendome. And a Preface added; containing the Judgement of a University-Man, concerning Mr. Knot's last book against Mr. Chillingworth*, London 1653.
- Denton, William, *The Burnt Child Dreads the Fire, or, An Examination of the Merits of the Papists Relating to England*, London 1675.
- , *The Ungrateful Behaviour of the Papists, Priests, and Jesuits*, London 1679.

- Du Moulin, Peter, *A Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion*, London 1664.  
 ———, *A Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion*, 4<sup>th</sup> edn, London 1679.
- D'Israeli, Isaac, *The Calamities and Quarrels of Authors: With Some Inquiries Respecting Their Moral and Literary Characters, and Memoirs for Our Literary History*, 3 vols, London 1814.
- Elsynge, Henry, *A Declaration of the Commons Assembled in Parliament; Concerning the Rise and Progresse of the Grand Rebellion in Ireland*, London 1643.
- Elys, Edmund, *The Second Epistle to the Truly Religious and Loyal Gentry of the Church of England*, London 1687.
- England's Ichabod, Glory Departed, Discoursed by Two Christian Men*, London 1650.
- Fage, Fage, *Cosmography or, a Description of the Whole World*, London 1667.
- Fair Warning, or, XX Prophecies Concerning the Return of Popery*, London 1663.
- Farmer, Farmer, *The Imposter Dethron'd, or, The Quakers Throne of Truth Detected to Bee Satans Seat of Lyes*, London 1658.
- Foulis, Henry, *The History of the Wicked Plots and Conspiracies of Our Pretended Saints*, London, 1662.
- Frankland, Thomas, *The Annals of King James and King Charles the First*, London 1681.
- Franklin, Benjamin, *Papers*, ed. L. Labaree, 39 vols to date, New Haven 1959-.
- Gaskin, John, *A Just Defence and Vindication of Gospel Ministers and Gospel Ordinances*, London 1660.
- Gatton, Benjamin, *A View of the Cruelty and Ignorance of the Romish Church*, London 1704.
- Gee, John, *Foot out of the Snare*, London 1624.
- Gentillet, Innocent, *A Discourse Upon the Means of Well Governing and Maintaining in Good Peace a Kingdom or Other Principalities*, tr. Simon Patrick, London 1602.
- Gilbert, Claudius, *The Libertine School'd, Or A Vindication of the Magistrates Power in Religious Matters: In Answer to Some Fallacious Quaeries Scattered about the City of Limrick*, London 1657.
- Glanvill, Joseph, *A Praefatory Answer to Mr. Henry Stubbe, the Doctor of Warwick Wherein the Malignity, Hypocrisie, Falshood of His Temper, Pretences, Reports, and the Impertinency of his Arguings & Quotations in His Animadversions on Plus Ultra Are Discovered*, London, 1671.
- Good, Thomas, *Firmianus and Dubitantius, or, Certain Dialogues Concerning Atheism, Infidelity, Popery, and Other Heresies and Schisme's That Trouble the Peace of the Church*, London 1674.
- Goodwin, John, *Calumny Arraign'd and Cast*, London 1645.
- Gother, John, *Pulpit-Sayings, or, The Characters of the Pulpit-Papist Examined*, London 1688.
- Guicciardini, Francesco, 'Discorsi politici', in *Opere inedite*, ed. P. and L. Guicciardini, Florence, 1857.
- Hall, Henry, *Digitus Testium, or A Dreadful Alarm to the Whole Kingdom*, London 1650.
- Hancock, Robert, *The Loyalty of Popish Principles Examin'd*, London 1682.
- Haberveschl von Habernfeld, Andreas, *A True Narrative of the Popish-Plot against King Charles I and the Protestant Religion*, London 1680.
- Heylin, Peter, *A Briefe Relation of the Death and Sufferings of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate, the L. Archbishop of Canterbury*, London 1644.
- , *Cyprianus Anglicus: or, the History of the Life and Death of the Most Reverend and Renowned Prelate William, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, London 1668.
- Hills, Henry, *The Grand Designs of the Papists, in the Reign of Our Late Sovereign, Charles the I and Now Carried on against His Present Majesty*, London 1678.

- Kellet, Edward, *Tricoenivm Christi in nocte prodicionis suae*, London 1641.
- L'Estrange, Hamon, *The Reign of King Charles: A History Faithfully and Impartially Disposed into Annals*, London 1655.
- L'Estrange, Roger, *A Brief History of the Times*, 3 vols, London 1688.
- Levitt, William, *The Samaritans Box Newly Opened*, London 1647.
- Lilburne, John, *Rash Oaths Unwarrantable: And the Breaking of Them as Inexcusable*, London 1647.
- Lloyd, David, *Modern Policy Compleated, or, The Publick Actions and Councils both Civill and Military of His Excellency the Lord Generall Monck*, London 1660
- London, William, *A Catalogue of the Most Vendible Books in England Orderly and Alphabetically Digested under the Heads of Divinity, History, Physick and Chyrurgery, Law, Arithmetick, Geometry, Astrology ... : with Hebrew, Greek and Latine for Schools and Scholars: the Like Work Never Yet Performed by Any: Also, All Sorts of Globes, Mapps of the World or in Parts ... : All to be Sold by the Author at his Shop in New-Castle*, London, 1657-8.
- Long, George, ed., *The Supplement to The Penny Cyclopaedia of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge*, 3 vols, London 1845.
- Long, Thomas, *A Compendious History of All the Popish & Fanatical Plots and Conspiracies against the Established Government in Church & State in England, Scotland, and Ireland from the First Year of Queen Elizabeth's Reign to This Present year 1684*, London 1684.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, *The Prince*, ed. Q. Skinner and R. Price, Cambridge 1988.
- Marten, Henry, *A Word to Mr Prynne*, London 1649.
- Merret, Christopher, *A Short Reply to the Postscript, &c. of H. S. Shewing His Many Falsities in Matters of Fact; the Impertinencies of His Promised Answers to Some Physicians that have Written against the Apothecaries: His Conspiracy with Apothecaries to Defame Them, the R.S. and Many Learned Men of Our Nation*, London 1670.
- Miller, Joshua, *Antichrist in Man: The Quaker's Idol*, London 1655.
- Nalson, John, *Foxes and Firebrands, or a Specimen of the Dangers of Popery and Separation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn, 2 vols, London 1682.
- Oates, Titus, *A True Narrative of the Horrid Hellish Popish Plot*, London 1679.
- Owen, Lewis, *The Running Register, Recording a True Relation of the State of the English Colledges, Seminaries and Cloysters in All Forraine Parts*, London 1626.
- , *The Unmasking of All Popish Monks, Friars, and Iesuits. Or, A Treatise of Their Genealogie, Beginnings, Proceedings, and Present State*, London 1628.
- Palmer, Roger, *A Reply to the Answer of a Catholique Apology*, London 1668.
- Pelling, Edward, *The Good Old Way, or, A Discourse Offer'd to All True-Hearted Protestants Concerning the Ancient Way of the Church*, London 1680.
- , *A Sermon Preached on the Anniversary of That Most Execrable Murder of K. Charles the First Royal Martyr*, London 1682.
- , *A Sermon Preacht on January 30th, 1683 in Westminster-Abby before the Reverend and Honourable, the Kings judges*, London 1684.
- Pepys, Samuel, *The Diary*, ed. R. Latham and W. Matthew, 11 vols, Berkeley 1995.
- Pettit, Edward, *Visions of Government*, London 1684.
- The Ax Laid to the Root of the Tree: or, a Discourse Wherein the Anabaptists Mission and Ministry Are Examin'd and Disprov'd*, London 1705.
- Pettus, John., 'To the Right Honourable James Earle of Suffolk, Lord Lietenant of That Country', in *England's Independency upon the Papal Power Historically and Judicially Stated*, London 1674, sigs A4r-A4v.

- Pickering, Daniel, *The Statutes at Large, from the First Year of Q. Mary, to the Thirty-fifth Year of Q. Elizabeth, Inclusive*, Cambridge 1763.
- Prayers and Thanksgiving to Be Used by All the Kings Maiesties Loving-Subjects*, London 1606.
- Priorato, Galeazzo, *Dell'istoria*, Venice 1648.
- Reynolds, Edward, *An Humble Exhortation to the Honourable House of Commons, ... Taken out of a Sermon Preach'd upon Hosea XIV. 1,2*, London 1711.
- Rogers, John, *Diapoliteia. A Christian Concertation with Mr. Prin, Mr. Baxter, Mr. Harrington, for the True Cause of the Commonwealth. Or, An Answer to Mr. Prin's (Perditory) Anatomy of the Republick, and His True and Perfect Narrative, &c. To Mr. Baxter's (Purgatory) Pills for the Army, and His Wounding Answer to the Healing Question. With Some Soft reflections upon his Catholick (or Rather Cathulactick) Key; and an Examen of the Late Petition of the Sixth of July to this Parliament*, London 1659.
- Mr. Pryn's Good Old Cause Stated and Stunted 10 Years Ago*, London 1659.
- Rushworth, John, *A Petition from His Excellency Thomas Lord Fairfax and the General Council of Officers of the Army, to the Honourable the Commons of England in Parliament Assembled, Concerning the Draught of an Agreement of the People*, London 1649.
- Sanderson, *A Compleat History of the Life and Raigne of King Charles from his Cradle to his Grave*, London 1658.
- Sarpi, P., *The Free Schoole of Warre, or, A treatise, Whether It Be Lawfull to Beare Armes for the Seruice of a Prince That Is of a Diuers Religion*, London 1624.
- Schoppe, Kaspar, *Stratagematis & sophismatis politicis societatis Iesu*, s.l. 1636.
- Severall speeches delivered at a conference concerning the power of Parliament, to proeed against their King for misgovernment*, London 1648.
- Shaw, John, *No Reformation of the Established Reformation*, London 1685.
- Shaw, Samuel, *Holy Things for Holy Men*, London 1658.
- Smith, John, *The Narrative... Containing a Further Discovery of the Late Horrid and Popish-Plot*, London 1679.
- Smith, George, *An Alarum: To the Last Warning Peece of London*, London 1646.
- Speeches and Passages of This Great and Happy Parliament: from the Third of November 1640, to this instant June, 1641*, London 1641.
- Stopford, Joshua, *The Ways and Methods of Romes Advancement; Or, Whereby the Pope and His Agents Have Endeavoured to Propagate Their Doctrines: Discovered in Two Sermons Preached on Novem. 5. 1671*, York 1672.
- Stubbe, Henry, *The Common-Wealth of Israel, or A Brief Account of Mr. Prynne's Anatomy of the Good Old Cause*, London 1659.
- , *Campanella Revived, or, An Enquiry into the History of the Royal Society, Whether the Virtuosi There Do Not Pursue the Projects of Campanella for the Reducing England unto Popery*, London 1670.
- The Confession of John Browne, a Iesuite, in the Gate-House Twice Examined by a Committee from the Honourable House of Commons*, London 1641.
- The Fallacies of Mr. William Prynne, Discovered and Confuted*, London 1644.
- The Grand Inquest, or, A Full and Perfect Answer to Several Reasons, by Which It Is Pretended His Royal Highness, the Duke of York, May Be Proved to Be a Roman-Catholick*, London 1680.
- The History of Popish Sham-Plots from the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to this Present Time*, London 1682.
- The History of the Troubles and Tryal of the Most Reverend Father in God and Blessed Martyr, William Laud, Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury*, 2 vols, London 1695.

- The History of the Works of the Learned; or, An Impartial Account of Books Printed in Europe from 1699 to 1711*, London 1700.
- The Impeachment and Articles of Complaint against Father Philips the Queenes Confessor*, London 1641.
- The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England, from the Earliest Times to the Restoration of King Charles II*, 24 vols, London 1763.
- The Resolution of His Excellency the Lord General Fairfax, and His Generall Councill of Officers*, London 1648.
- Thomas, William, *Rayling Rebuked: or, A Defense of the Ministers of This Nation*, London 1656.
- T. R., *A Two-Inch Board for M. Prynne to Peep thorow*, London 1647.
- Turner, William, *A Compleat History of the most Remarkable Providences both of Judgment and Mercy, Which Have Hapned in this Present Age Extracted from the Best Writers*, London 1697.
- Turnor, Thomas, *The Case of the Bankers and Their Creditors Stated and Examined*, London 1674.
- Vane, Henry, *A Healing Question Propounded and Resolved*, London 1656.
- Vicars, John, *To His Reverend and Much Respected Good Friend, Mr. John Goodwin: Be These I Pray Presented*, London 1645.
- Undone Again; or, the Plot Discover'd. Being a Detection of the Practices of Paptists with Sectaries, for Overthrowing the Government*, London 1710.
- Vindiciae, Contra Tyrannos: Or, Concerning the Legitimate Power of a Prince Over the People, and of the People Over a Prince*, ed. and tr. H. Languet, Cambridge 1994.
- Wadsworth, James, *English Spanish Pilgrime*, London 1629.
- Waterhouse, Edward, *A Short Narrative of the Late Dreadful Fire in London*, London 1667.
- Watson, William, *A Decacordon of Ten Quodlibeticall Questions Concerning Religion and State Wherein the Authour Framing Himselfe a Quilibet to Every Quodlibet, Decides an Hundred Crosse Interrogatorie Doubts, about the Generall Contentions betwixt the Seminarie Priests and Jesuits at this present*, London 1602.
- Wells, Edward, *Some Testimonies of the Most Eminent English Dissenters, as also of Foreign Reformed Churches*, London 1706.
- White, John, *A Defence of the Way*, London, 1614.
- Whitehead, George, *Truth Tryumphing in a Suffering Time over Deceit and Falsehood*, London 1664.
- Whitelocke, Bulstrode, *Memorials of the English Affairs from the Beginning of the Reign of Charles the First to the Happy Restoration of King Charles the Second*, London 1682.
- Womock, Laurence, *The Religion of the Church of England, the Surest Establishment of the Royal Throne*, London 1673.

## Secondary Literature

- Addante, L., 'Campanella e Machiavelli: Indagine su un caso di dissimulazione', *Studi storici*, 45, 2004, pp. 727–750.
- , *Tommaso Campanella: Il filosofo immaginato, interpretato, falsato*, Rome and Bari 2018.
- Aistrope, T., *Conspiracy Theory and American Foreign Policy*, Manchester 2016.

- Allen, D. E., 'Merret, Christopher, in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 60 vols, Oxford, 2004, XXXVII, pp. 900-901.
- Anglo, S., *Machiavelli, The First Century: Studies in Enthusiasm, Hostility, and Irrelevance*, Oxford 2005.
- Baker, P., 'The Regicide', in *The Oxford Handbook of the English Revolution*, ed. M. J. Braddick, Oxford 2015, pp. 154-69.
- Barducci, M., 'Order, Conflict and Liberty: Machiavellianism in English Political Thought, 1649–1660', in *Machiavellian Encounters in Tudor and Stuart England: Literary and Political Influences from the Reformation to the Restoration*, ed. A. Arienzo, New York, 2016, pp. 157-72.
- Barbuto, G., *Il principe e l'Anticristo: Gesuiti e ideologie politiche*, Napoli 1994.
- Bellany, A., 'Libels in Action: Ritual, Subversion and the English Literary Underground 1603-1642', in *The Politics of the Excluded: c.1500-1850*, ed. Tim Harris, Basingstoke 2001, pp. 99-124.
- Bireley, R., *The Counter-Reformation Prince: Anti-Machiavellianism or Catholic Statecraft in Early Modern Europe*, Chapel Hill 1990.
- Boone, R. A., *Mercurino di Gattinara and the Creation of the Spanish Empire*, New York 2016.
- Braddick, M., *God's Fury, England's Fire: A New History of the English Civil Wars*, London 2008.
- Braun, H., 'Conscience, Counsel and Theocracy at the Spanish Hapsburg Court', in *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe, 1500-1700*, ed. H. Braun and E. Vallance, Houndsmills 2004, pp. 56-66
- Bruce, J., 'Biographical Fragment', in *Documents Relating to the Proceedings Against Willian Prynne in 1634 and 1637*, ed. S. Gardiner, London 1877, pp. i-xxxv.
- Buckley, W., *McCarthy and His Enemies: The Record and Its Meaning*, Chicago 1954.
- Burke, P., 'The Black Legend of the Jesuits: An Essay in the History of Social Stereotypes', in *Christianity and Communities in the West: Essays for John Bossy*, ed. S. Ditchfield, Aldershot 2001, pp. 165-82.
- Bushnell, R., 'The Machiavell', in *Tudor England: An Encyclopedia*, ed. A. F. Kinney and D. W. Swain, New York 2002.
- Byford, J., *Conspiracy Theories: A Critical Introduction*, Houndsmills 2011.
- Carrafiello, M., 'English Catholicism and the Jesuit Mission of 1580-1581', *The Historical Journal*, 37, 1994, pp. 761-74
- , *Robert Parsons and English Catholicism, 1580-1610*, Cranbury 1998.
- Chatman, S., 'What Can We Learn from Contextualist Narratology?', *Poetics Today*, 11, 2, 1990, pp. 309-28.
- Church, W., *Richelieu and Reason of State* Princeton 1972.
- Clegg, C., *Press Censorship in Caroline England*, Cambridge 2008.
- Cogswell, T., *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-1624*, Cambridge 1989.
- Collier, J., *Debating Perseverance: The Augustinian Heritage in Post-Reformation England*, Oxford 2018.
- Collinson, P., *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, Cambridge 2013.
- Collins, J., *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*, Oxford 2005.
- Como, D., and P. Lake, 'Puritans, Antinomians and Laudians in Caroline London: The Strange Case of Peter Shaw and Its Contexts', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 50 (1999), pp. 684-715.
- Coward B., and P. Gaunt, *The Stuart Age: England, 1603–1714*, 5th edn, New York 2017.

- Cromartie, A., 'The Mind of William Laud', in *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited*, ed. C. A. Prior and G. Burgess, Farnham 2011, pp. 75-100.
- Cubitt, G., *The Jesuit Myth: Conspiracy Theory and Politics in Nineteenth-Century France*, Oxford 1993.
- Dandele, T. J., 'The Imperial Renaissance', in *The Renaissance World*, ed. J. J. Martin, New York 2007.
- Davies, S., *Renaissance Ethnography and the Invention of the Human*, Cambridge 2016.
- Davis, C. T., 'Dante and the Empire', in *The Cambridge Companion to Dante*, ed. by R. Jacoff, Cambridge 1993, pp. 67-80.
- Davis, N., *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France*, Stanford 1987.
- De Mattei, R., 'La Monarchia di Spagna di Campanella e la Ragion di Stato di Botero', *Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* (classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche), 3, 1927, pp. 432-85, republished in *La politica di Campanella*, Rome, 1927, pp. 18-79.
- , *La politica di Campanella*, Rome 1927.
- , 'Le edizioni della *Monarchia di Spagna*', in *Studi campanelliani*, Florence 1934, pp. 57-69.
- , 'Polemiche secentesche italiane sulla "Monarchia universale"', *Archivio Storico Italiano*, 110, 2, 1952, pp. 145-65.
- , 'Le edizioni inglesi della *Monarchia di Spagna* di Tommaso Campanella', *Giornale Critico della Filosofia Italiana*, 48, 1969, pp. 194-205.
- Dolan, F., *True Relations: Reading, Literature, and Evidence in Seventeenth-Century England*, Philadelphia 2013.
- Donaldson, P., *Machiavelli and the Mystery of the State*, Cambridge 1988.
- Donogan, B., *War in England 1642-1649*, Oxford 2008.
- Eamon, W., 'Natural Magic and Utopia in the Cinquecento: Campanella, the Della Porta Circle, and the Revolt of Calabria,' *Memorie Domenicane*, 26, 1995, pp. 369-402.
- Edwards, F., *Robert Persons: The Biography of an Elizabethan Jesuit, 1546-1610*, St Louis 1996.
- Elliott, J. H., 'Monarquía compuesta y monarquía universal en la época de Carlos V', in *Carlos V, europeísmo y universalidad*, ed. F. Montes-Gonzalez and J. L. Castellano, 5 vols, Madrid 2001, V, pp. 699-710.
- Ernst, G., *Religione, ragione e natura: Ricerche su Tommaso Campanella e il tardo Rinascimento*, Milan 1991.
- , 'Introduzione', in Tommaso Campanella, *La Monarchia di Spagna: Prima stesura giovanile*, ed. G. Ernst, Naples, 1989, pp. 7-17, 79-82.
- , 'Introduction' and 'Note philologique', in *Monarchie d'Espagne et Monarchie de France*, ed. G. Ernst, French translations by S. Waldbaum and N. Fabry, Paris 1997, pp. VII-XLVIII; 607-12.
- , *Il carcere, il politico, il profeta: saggi su Tommaso Campanella*, Pisa 2002.
- , *Tommaso Campanella: The Book and the Body of Nature*, transl. D. Marshall, Dordrecht, 2010.
- Estabrook, C. B., 'Stubbe, Henry', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 60 vols, Oxford, 2004, LIV, pp. 203-4.
- Evigrenis, I. D., 'Wrestling with Machiavelli', *History of European Ideas*, 37, 2011, pp. 85-93.
- Foxley, R., *The Levellers: Radical Political Thought in the English Revolution*, Manchester 2013.
- Frajese, V., *Profezia e machiavellismo: Il giovane Campanella*, Roma 2002.

- Maltby, W., *The Black Legend in England. The Development of anti-Spanish Sentiment 1558-1660*, Durham NC 1971.
- Mayers, R. E., 'Real and Practicable, not Imaginary and Notional: Sir Henry Vane, A Healing Question and the Problems of the Protectorate', *Albion*, 27, 1996, pp. 37-72.
- Miller, J., *Popery and Politics*, Cambridge 1973.
- Moore, R., *Light in Their Consciences: The Early Quakers in Britain, 1646-1666*, University Park 2000.
- Feingold, M., 'Chilmead, Edmund', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison, 60 vols, Oxford, 2004, XI, pp. 460-461.
- Feingold, M., and P. Gouk, 'An Early Critic of Bacon's *Sylva Sylvarum*: Edmund Chilmead's Treatise on Sound', *Annals of Science*, 40, 1983, pp. 139-57.
- Felzenberg, A., *A Man and His Presidents: The Political Odyssey of William F. Buckley Jr.*, New Haven 2017.
- Firpo, L., *Bibliografia degli scritti di Tommaso Campanella*, Turin 1940, pp. 63-66.
- , *Scritti scelti di Giordano Bruno e Tommaso Campanella*, Turin 1945.
- , 'Botero, Giovanni', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, Rome 1964-, XIII, pp. 352-362.
- , *Il Supplizio di Tommaso Campanella: Narrazioni, documenti, verbali delle torture*, Rome 1985.
- , *I processi di Tommaso Campanella*, ed. E. Canone, Rome 1998.
- Fitch, T., 'Caroline Puritanism as Exemplified in the Life and Work of William Prynne', Ph.D. thesis, University of Edinburgh 1949.
- Forshaw, P., 'Astrology, Ritual and Revolution in the Works of Tommaso Campanella (1568–1639)', in *The Uses of the Future in Early Modern Europe*, ed. A. Brady and E. Butterworth, London 2010, pp. 181-97.
- Foley, H., ed., *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, 8 vols, London 1875-1883.
- Foster, S., *Notes from the Caroline Underground*, Springfield 1978.
- Frajese, V., *Profezia e machiavellismo: Il giovane Campanella*, Rome 2002.
- Fried, R., *Nightmare in Red: The McCarthy Era in Perspective*, Oxford 1990.
- , *McCarthyism: The Great American Red scare: A Documentary History*, Oxford 1997.
- George, C. H., and K., *Protestant Mind of English Reformation, 1570-1640*, Princeton 1961.
- Giamatti, A., *Exile and Change in Renaissance Literature*, New Haven 1984.
- Gigliani, G., 'Campanella e Glisson: Motivi ilozoistici nella medicina inglese della seconda metà del Seicento', *Bruniana & Campanelliana*, 2 (1996), pp. 237-45.
- , 'L'anticristo e i suoi emissari: Cosmologia, escatologia e storia nel *De gentilismo non retinendo* di Campanella', *Bruniana et Campanelliana*, 23, 2017, pp. 635-42.
- Gill, X., 'Vision europea de la Monarquia Espanola como monarquia compuesta', in *Las monarquias del Antiguo Regimen, monarquias compuestas?*, ed. C. Russell and Jose Andres-Gallego, Madrid 1996, pp. 65-95.
- , 'The Forces of the King: The Generation that Read Botero in Spain', in *The Early Modern Hispanic World*, ed. K. Lynn and E. Rowe, Cambridge 2017, pp. 268-91.
- Gilson, E., *Dante the Philosopher*, London 1948.
- Greenspan, N., *Selling Cromwell's Wars: Media, Empire and Godly Warfare, 1650–1658*, New York 2016.
- Grendler, P., *The Jesuits and Italian Universities 1558-1773*, Washington DC 2017.
- Hardin, R. F., 'The Early Poetry of the Gunpowder Plot: Myth in the Making', *English Literary Renaissance* 22 (1992), pp. 62–79.

- Headley, J., 'The Habsburg World Empire and the Revival of Ghibellinism', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 7, 1978, pp. 93-127.
- , *Tommaso Campanella and the Transformation of the World*, Princeton, 1997.
- , 'Geography and Empire in the Late Renaissance: Botero's Assignment, Western Universalism, and the Civilizing Process', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 53, 2000, pp. 1119-55.
- Houlston, V., *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Persons's Jesuit Polemic, 1580–1610*, Aldershot 2007, pp. 121-3.
- , *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Person's Jesuit Polemic, 1580–1610*, Aldershot 2013.
- Hibbard, C., *Charles I and the Popish Plot*, Chapel Hill 1983.
- Hill, C., *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution*, London 1991 [1972].
- , *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century*, London 1997.
- Hofstadter, R., 'The Paranoid Style in American Politics', *Harper's Magazine* (Nov., 1964), pp. 77-86.
- Iannaccaro, G., 'Lexicographers as Censors: Checking Verbal Abuse in Early English Dictionaries', in *Enforcing and Eluding Censorship: British and Anglo-Italian Perspectives*, ed. G. Iannaccaro and G. Iamartino, Newcastle upon Tyne 2014.
- Ibanez, J. J., 'The Baroque and the Influence of the Spanish Monarchy in Europe (1580-1648)', in *The Transatlantic Hispanic Baroque: Complex Identities in the Atlantic World*, London 2014, pp. 113-23.
- Jacob, J. R., *Henry Stubbe, Radical Protestantism and the Early Enlightenment*, Cambridge, 2002.
- James, L., 'I was no "master of this work" but a servant to it? William Laud, Charles I and the making of Scottish ecclesiastical policy, 1634–6', *Institute of Historical Research*, 90, 2017, pp. 506-525.
- Jutte, D., *The Age of Secrecy: Jews, Christians, and the Economy of Secrets, 1400–1800*, New Haven 2015.
- Kahn, V., *Machiavellian Rhetoric: From the Counter-Reformation to Milton*, Princeton 1994.
- Katz, D., *God's Last Words: Reading the English Bible from the Reformation to Fundamentalism*, New Haven 2004.
- Kent, S. A., 'The Papist Charges against the Interregnum Quakers', *Journal of Religious History*, 12, 1982-3, pp. 180-90.
- Kenyon, J., *The Popish Plot*, London 1972.
- Kettering, S., 'Political Pamphlets in Early Seventeenth-Century France: The Propaganda War between Louis XIII and His Mother 1619-20', *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 42, 4, 2011, pp. 963-80.
- Kewes, P., "'The Idol of State Innovators and Republicans'" Robert Persons's *A Conference About the Next Succession* (1594/5) in Stuart England', in *Stuart Succession Literature: Moments and Transformations*, ed. P. Kewes and A. McRae, Oxford 2018, pp. 149-85.
- Kirby, E., *William Prynne: A Study in Puritanism*, New York 1972.
- Kishlansky, M., 'A Whipper Whipped: The Sedition of William Prynne', in *Historical Journal*, 53, 3, 2013, pp. 603-27.
- , 'Martyrs' Tales', *Journal of British Studies*, 53, 2014, pp. 334-55.
- Lake, P., *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*, Cambridge 1982.
- Lake P., and D. Como, "'Orthodoxy" and Its Discontents: Dispute Settlement and the Production of "Consensus" in the London (Puritan) "Underground"', *Journal of British Studies*, 39 (2000) pp. 34-70.

- Lambert, S., 'Richard Montagu, Arminianism and Censorship', in *Past and Present*, 124, 1, 1989, pp. 36-68.
- Lamont, W., *Marginal Prynne*, London 1963.
- 'The Great Fear', *London Review of Books*, July, 1983, pp. 19-20.
- Larkin, H., *The Making of Englishmen: Debates on National Identity 1550-1650*, Leiden 2014.
- Lathbury, T., 'Laud and Prynne', *The British Magazine*, June, 1849, pp. 601-34.
- Law, T. G., ed., *The Archpriest Controversy: Documents Relating to the Dissensions of the Roman Catholic Clergy, 1597-1602: From the Petyt MSS of the Inner Temple*, 2 vols, London 1896-1898.
- Lima, L. F., 'Between the New and the Old World: Iberian Prophecies and Imperial Projects in the Colonisation of the Early Modern Spanish and Portuguese Americas', in *Prophecy and Eschatology in the Transatlantic World, 1550–1800*, ed. A. Crome, London 2016, pp. 33-64.
- Loewenstein, D., *Treacherous Faith: The Specter of Heresy in Early Modern English Literature and Culture*, Oxford 2013.
- Loveman, K., *Reading Fictions, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture*, Aldershot 2008, pp. 47-59.
- McCoog, T., *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England 1541-1588: Our Way of Proceeding?*, Leiden 1996,
- Maggi, A., 'Tommaso Campanella's Philosophy and the Birth of Modern Science', *Modern Philology*, 107, 2010, pp. 475-92.
- Malcolm, N., *Reason of State, Propaganda, and the Thirty Years' War: An Unknown Translation by Thomas Hobbes*, Oxford 2007.
- Manning, D., 'Accusations of Blasphemy in English Anti-Quaker Polemic, c.1660–1701', *Quaker Studies*, 14, 2009, pp. 27-56.
- Marotti, A. F., *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England*, Notre Dame 2005.
- 'The Intolerability of English Catholicism', in *Writing and Religion in England, 1558-1689: Studies in Community-Making and Cultural Memory*, ed. A. Johnson and R. D. Sell, Burlington 2009, pp. 47-69.
- Matthews, A., 'Joyce Junior Once More', in *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, 11, 1907, pp. 280-94.
- Meinecke, F., *Machiavellism: The Doctrine of Raison d'État and Its Place in Modern History*, tr. D. Scott, New Haven 1962.
- Milton, A., *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640*, Cambridge 1995.
- , 'Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England', in *Historical Journal*, 41, 1998, pp. 625-51.
- , 'The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach', in *Politics, Religion, and Popularity in Early Modern Stuart Britain*, ed. T. Cogswell, R. Cust, and P. Lake, Cambridge, 2002, pp. 162-84.
- , *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*, Manchester 2007.
- Mohamed, F., 'Milton, Sir Henry Vane, and the Brief but Significant Life of Godly Republicanism', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 76, 1, 2013, pp. 83-104.
- Nelson, E., 'The Jesuit Legend: Superstition and Myth-Making', in *Religion and Superstition in Reformation Europe*, Manchester 2002, pp. 94-115.
- Niccoli, O., *Prophecy and People in Renaissance Italy*, Princeton 1990.

- Nünning, A., 'Surveying Contextualist and Cultural Narratologies: Towards an Outline of Approaches, Concepts and Potentials', in *Narratology in the Age of Cross-Disciplinary Narrative Research*, ed. S. Heinen and R. Sommer, Berlin 2009, pp. 48-70.
- Olstead, K., *Real Enemies: Conspiracy Theories and American Democracy, World War I to 9/11*, Oxford 2011.
- Pagden, A., *Spanish Imperialism and the Political Imagination: Studies in European and Spanish-American Social and Political Theory, 1513-1830*, New Haven, 1990.
- , *Lords of All the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c.1500-c.1800*, New Haven 1995, pp. 11-62.
- Peacey, J., 'Reporting a Revolution: a Failed Propaganda Campaign', in *The Regicides and Execution of Charles I*, ed. J. Peacey, London 2001, pp. 161-80.
- , *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and the Interregnum Period*, Burlington 2004.
- , 'The Paranoid Prelate: Archbishop Laud and the Puritan Plot', in *Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theory in Early Modern Europe*, ed. B. Coward and J. Swann, Aldershot 2004, pp. 113-29.
- , *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution*, Cambridge 2013.
- Pearce, A. S. W., *John Spottiswoode: Jacobean Archbishop and Statesman*, Edinburgh 2014, pp. 296-7.
- Peters, H., *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*, tr. H. Butterworth, Leominster 1994.
- Petrina, A., *Machiavelli in the British Isles: Two Early Modern Translations of The Prince*, London 2016 [2009].
- Phelan, J. L., *The Millennial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World*, Berkeley 1970.
- Pincus, S., *Protestantism and Patriotism: Ideologies and the Making of English Foreign Policy, 1650-1668*, Cambridge 2002.
- Porter, H. C., *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge*, 2nd edn, Cambridge 2015.
- Prendergast, M., and T. Prendergast, 'The Invention of Propaganda: A Critical Commentary on and Translation of *Inscrutabili Divinae Providentiae Arcano*', in *The Oxford Handbook of Propaganda Studies*, ed. J. Auerbach and R. Castronovo, Oxford 2013, pp. 19-26.
- Questier, M., 'John Gee, Archbishop Abbot, and the Use of Converts from Rome in Jacobean Anti-Catholicism', *Recusant History*, 24, 1993, pp. 347-60.
- , *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580-1625*, Cambridge 1996.
- , 'Arminianism, Catholicism, and Puritanism in England during the 1630s', *The Historical Journal*, 49, 1, 2006, pp. 53-78.
- Raymond, J., *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*, Cambridge 2003.
- Reeves, M., *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages*, Oxford 1969
- , *Joachim of Fiore and the Prophetic Future*, New York 1977.
- Ridgedell, T., 'The Archpriest Controversy: The Conservative Appellants against the Progressive Jesuits', *British Catholic History*, 33, 2017, pp. 561-82.
- Rohls, J., 'Calvinism, Arminianism and Socinianism in the Netherlands until the Synod of Dort', in *Socinianism and Arminianism: Antitrinitarians, Calvinists, and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-century Europe*, ed. M. Muslow and J. Rohls, Leiden 2005, pp. 21-8.
- Rutter, T., *The Cambridge Companion to Christopher Marlowe*, Cambridge 2012.
- Sawyer, J., *Printed Poison: Pamphlet Propaganda, Faction Politics, and the Public Sphere in Early Seventeenth-Century France*, Berkeley 1990.
- Shapin, S., *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England*, Chicago 1994.
- Shapiro, B., *A Culture of Fact: England, 1550-1720*, Ithaca 2003.

- Shinn, A., *Tales of Turning: Conversion Narratives in Early Modern England*, London 2018.
- Shrecker E., and P. Deery, *The Age of McCarthyism: A Brief History With Documents*, 3rd edn, Boston 2017.
- Snell, A., *Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England*, Cambridge 2007.
- Stanglin, K. D., and T. H. McCall, *Jacobus Arminius: Theologian of Grace*, Oxford 2012.
- Steneck, N. H., 'Greatrakes the Stroker: The Interpretations of Historians', *Isis*, 73, 1982, pp. 161-77.
- Streete, A., 'Arminian is Like a Flying Fish: Region, Religion and Polemics in the Montagu Controversy 1623-1626', in *Region, Religion and English Renaissance Literature*, ed. D. Coleman, Farnham 2013, pp. 105-21.
- Tempest, Richard, *An Entertainment of Solitarinesse*, London 1649.
- Thackray, I., 'Zion Undermined: The Protestant Belief in a Popish Plot during the English', *History Workshop Journal*, 18 (1984), pp. 25-52.
- The Later Stuart Church, 1660-1714*, ed. G. Tapsell, Manchester 2017.
- The Records of the Honorable Society of Lincoln's Inn*, 2 vols, London 1896.
- Trace, J., *Giovanni Botero and English Political Thought*, PhD Dissertation, Cambridge University, Cambridge 2018.
- Tutino, S., *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570-1625*, Aldershot 2007.
- , 'Huguenots, Jesuits and Tyrants: Notes on the *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos* in Early Modern England', *Journal of Early Modern History*, 11, 3, 2007, pp. 175-96.
- , *Thomas White and the Blackloists: Between Politics and Theology during the English Civil War*, New York 2016.
- Tyacke, N., *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of Arminianism c. 1530-1640*, Oxford 1987.
- , *Aspects of English Protestantism 1530-1700*, Manchester 2001.
- , 'From Laudians to Latitudinarians: A Shifting Balance of Theological Forces', in Underdown, D., *Revel, Riot and Rebellion*, Oxford 1984.
- Urbanek, V., 'The Comet of 1618: Eschatological Expectations and Political Prognostications during the Bohemian Revolt', in *Tycho Brahe and Prague: Crossroads of European Science*, ed. J. R. Christianson et al., Frankfurt am Main 2002, pp. 282-91.
- , 'Mezi paracelsiánskou medicínou a rosenkruciánskými manifesty: studijní léta Ondřeje Habervešla z Habernfeldu', *Acta Universitatis Carolinae - Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis*, 47 (2007), 1-2, pp. 171-81.
- Viroli, M., *From Politics to Reason of State*, Cambridge 1992.
- Walsham, A., *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain*, Burlington 2014.
- Walter, J., 'Authority and Protest', in *A Social History of England 1500-1750*, ed. by K. Wrightson, Cambridge 2017, 221-41.
- Webster, T., *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, c.1620-1643*, Cambridge 1997.
- White, H., 'The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality', *Critical Inquiry*, 7 1980, pp. 5-27.
- White, P., *Predestination, Policy and Polemic: Conflict and Consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War*, Cambridge 2002.
- Yates, F. Y., *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*, London, 1975.