

Roger L'Estrange and the Huguenots: Continental Protestantism and the Church of England

Anne Dunan-Page

▶ **To cite this version:**

Anne Dunan-Page. Roger L'Estrange and the Huguenots: Continental Protestantism and the Church of England. Anne Dunan-Page et Beth Lynch. Roger L'Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture, Ashgate, pp.109-130, 2008, 978-0-7546-5800-9. halshs-00867280

HAL Id: halshs-00867280
https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00867280

Submitted on 27 Sep 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

CHAPTER SIX

Roger L'Estrange and the Huguenots: Continental Protestantism and the Church of England[1]

Anne Dunan-Page, University of Montpellier

At the end of October 1680, Roger L'Estrange disappeared from his London home. Traversing muddy roads and wintry seas, he first joined the duke of York in Edinburgh and then set sail for The Hague. There he informed Thomas Ken, the almoner of the Princess of Orange and the future bishop of Bath and Wells, that he intended to take communion at Ken's Anglican service.[2] This was one way to escape charges of crypto-catholicism.[3] Another was to make himself scarce. On his return, L'Estrange rehearsed some of the accusations that had prompted his flight: Miles Prance and Lawrence Mowbray had testified that in 1677, he had been seen 'three or four times' at Mass in Somerset House; the physician Richard Fletcher

[1] I wish to thank Hubert Bost, Christine Ferdinand, Claudette Fortuny, Mark Goldie, Geoff Kemp, Yves Krumenacker, Jacqueline Lagrée, François Laplanche, Jacques Le Brun, Christopher Page and Myriam Yardeni for their help and advice.

[2] The satirical cartoon *Strange's Case Strangly Altered* (1680) dates L'Estrange's flight to 26 October (see Figure 3). *CSPD* confirms that he had already fled by 28 October (*CSPD*, 1680–1681, p. 72). See L'Estrange's 'To the Reverend Dr Thomas Ken' (1681). Ken was about to leave The Hague; see E.H. Plumptre, *The Life of Thomas Ken, D.D, Bishop of Bath and Wells*, second rvd edn (1890), pp. 139–55 and Hugh A.L. Rice, *Thomas Ken: Bishop and Non-Juror* (London, 1958), p. 48. See also the *Observator* 3.6 (21 February 1686) and 3.16 (12 March 1686).

[3] For L'Estrange's reluctance to communicate in his parish of St Giles-in-the-Fields, see Henry Care's *Weekly Pacquet of Advice from Rome* (with *The Popish Courant*) 3.46 (22 April 1681) and Langley Curtis, *The True Protestant Mercury: Or, Occurrences Forein and Domestick*, no. 29 (Saturday 2 April to Wednesday 6 April 1681). Narcissus Luttrell alludes to Prance and L'Estrange communicating together the following Easter; Luttrell, vol. 1, p. 178.

reported that L'Estrange had confessed, in the Half Moon Tavern in Cheapside, to being a catholic; the dissenting printer Jane Curtis said L'Estrange had refused to license anti-Papist books. Meanwhile, on 10 December, Joseph Bennett, a printer of Bloomsbury, linked L'Estrange to Captain Samuel Ely who had tried to get Simpson Tonge to depose against his father.[4]

Appearing before the Privy Council, L'Estrange was cleared of charges.[5] Yet the tide of events in the autumn gave him little chance of emerging unscathed. He was summoned three times before the House of Lords that finally issued a warrant against him on 30 October – but he was already gone. He made an appearance in effigy at the Whig procession of 17 November, alongside the 'Popish Midwife' Elizabeth Cellier (Figure 7).

That L'Estrange's flight to Holland passed for cowardice, and indeed for a confession of guilt, is revealed in an indignant speech by the Whig peer John Lovelace and a satirical piece, *An Hue and Cry after R.Ls*.[6] Soon afterwards, there appeared a spurious exchange, ostensibly between L'Estrange and his publisher Henry Brome, attributed to Stephen

---

[4] *L'Estrange No Papist* (1681) pp. 8–10. See HMC, 11th Report, Appendix, pt II, MSS House of Lords, 1678–88, no. 264, p. 167 and nos 334–35, pp. 246–48. L'Estrange denies all charges in *The Dissenter's Sayings* (1681), sig. A3r–A4v. For a full account of his activities, see Kitchin, pp. 252–66.

[5] See *L'Estrange's Case in a Civil Dialogue Betwixt 'Zekiel and Ephraim* (1680). For commentaries, see David J. Littlefield, 'The Polemic Art of Sir Roger L'Estrange: A Study of his Political Writings, 1659–1688', unpublished doctoral thesis (Yale, 1961), pp. 116–26. L'Estrange's pamphlets relating to the Popish Plot have been discussed by Beverly J. Rahn, 'The Pen and the Plot: Pamphlets of Sir Roger L'Estrange, 1678–1681', unpublished doctoral thesis (Columbia, 1975).

[6] *A Collection of the Substance of Several Speeches and Debates made in the Honourable House of Commons … To which is prefixt A Speech of the Noble Lord L— against Roger L'Estrange* (1681), p. 3. For L'Estrange's response, see *L'Estrange no Papist*, p. 29.

College.[7] Thus, under pressure, L'Estrange felt he needed to justify his hasty departure. He claimed that he found a peaceful 'retreat' in Holland which allowed him to compose his thoughts, for he was 'weary of being told every hour of the day how many *Traytors, Conspirators, Rogues, Rascals* and *Papists* I was called in the *Coffee-Houses* by a Pack of *new-fashion'd Christians*'.[8] He was therefore absent from London at the height of the crisis, between October 1680 and late February 1681, although he would soon resume his full activities. His return, duly advertised by Langley Curtis,[9] was signalled by a new wave of pamphlets and by the publication of the *Observator* a few weeks later.[10]

Although L'Estrange always maintained that his Dutch 'recess' gave him a welcome respite from his publishing activities, he was hardly idle abroad. The first part of his *Dissenter's Sayings* (1681) was probably composed in The Hague, and he gratified his

---

[7] 'A Letter Out of Scotland, from Mr. R.L.S. To His Friend, H.B. in London' (1681) and 'A True Copy of a Letter (intercepted) going for *Holland*' (1681). Stephen Dugdale swore at the trial that College had admitted being the author of 'A True Copy'; see *The Impartiall Protestant Mercury; Or, Occurrences Foreign and Domestick*, published by Richard Janeway, no. 35 (19 to 23 August 1681). For commentaries, see Kitchin, pp. 260, 290 and Harold Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II* (Lexington, 1996), p. 191.

[8] *L'Estrange No Papist*, p. 3.

[9] Curtis, *True Protestant Mercury*, no 17 (19 to 23 February 1681). Kitchin dates L'Estrange's return more precisely on 20 February (p. 266).

[10] For comments, see Burnet, p. 221. For L'Estrange's Tory propaganda in the *Observator*, see Ralph Bernard Long, 'Dryden's Importance as a Spokesman for the Tories', *University of Texas Studies in English*, 21 (1941): 79–99; James Sutherland, *The Restoration Newspaper and Its Development* (1986; Cambridge, 2004), pp. 1–43. Timothy Crist has dated the Tory backlash on 1 February 1681 with the first issue of *Heraclitus Ridens*; 'Francis Smith and the Opposition Press in England, 1660–1688, unpublished doctoral thesis (Cambridge, 1977), p. 205 (for his comment on the *Observator*, see pp. 212–24).

interest in the book trade there.[11] One may picture him pacing up and down the Great Hall of the Binnenhof, where the largest concentration of book dealers could to be found. There was of course a mordant irony in such a scene, for in Holland L'Estrange found himself at the heart of an unceasing (and at time highly subversive) printing activity. It was more pandaemonium than safe haven.[12]

The French protestants were well established within the book trade of the Low Countries, not only in The Hague (where there were 15 printers with French names at the end of the seventeenth century) but also in Leiden, Rotterdam and in the Damrak quarter of Amsterdam where the proximity of the town hall to the Exchange and to the harbour guaranteed a brisk trade.[13] They were about to be joined by a new wave of refugees fleeing the persecutions of Louis XIV, soon to reach a climax with the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in October

---

[11] See Dorothy Turner, 'Roger L'Estrange and the Print Culture of the Restoration', unpublished doctoral thesis (Ottawa, 1996), p. 200.

[12] For the regulation of the press at the Restoration, see Crist, 'Francis Smith' and his 'Government Control of the Press after the Expiration of the Printing Act in 1679', *Publishing History*, 5 (1979): 49–77. See also John S.T. Hetet, 'A Literary Underground in Restoration England: Printers and Dissenters in the Context of Constraints, 1660–1689', unpublished doctoral thesis (Cambridge, 1987) and Maureen Bell, 'Elizabeth Calvert and the "Confederates"', *Publishing History*, 32 (1992): 5–49. For L'Estrange's role in shaping the public sphere, see Geoff Kemp, 'L'Estrange and the Publishing Sphere', in Jason McElligott (ed.), *Fear, Exclusion and Revolution: Roger Morrice and Britain in the 1680s* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 67–90.

[13] Roger Chartier, 'Magasin de l'univers ou magasin de la République? Le commerce du livre néerlandais aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles', in C. Berkvens-Stevelinck, H. Bots, P.G. Hoftijzer and O.S. Lankhorst (eds), *Le Magasin de l'Univers: The Dutch Republic as the Centre of the European Book Trade* (Leiden and New York, 1992), pp. 289–307; Christiane Berkvens-Stevelinck, 'L'Edition française en Hollande', in Roger Chartier et Henri-Jean Martin (eds), *Histoire de l'édition française* (1984; Paris, 1990), pp. 403–17; Henri-Jean Martin, *Livre, Pouvoirs et Société à Paris au XVIIe siècle (1598–1701)* (1969; Geneva, 1999), vol. 2, pp. 591–3, 721–7, 739–56. For the French printers, see J. A. Gruys and C. de Wolf (eds), *Thesaurus, 1473–1800 of Dutch Printers and Booksellers With Places and Years of Activity* (Nieuwkoop, 1989), pp. 241–2.

1685.[14] L'Estrange, after his return to England, joined the surge of loyalism that followed the dissolution of the Oxford Parliament and published an abridged version of a French work that had just emerged from a Huguenot shop in Amsterdam, one he had surely obtained in Holland. It was entitled *An Apology for The Protestants: Being A full Justification of their Departure from The Church of Rome, With Fair and Practicable Proposals for A Re-union* (1681). L'Estrange's biographer of 1913, George Kitchin, was unable to trace the original,[15] but it has subsequently been identified as *Apologie pour les Protestans. Où l'Auteur justifie pleinement leur conduite & leur separation de la Communion de Rome et propose des moyens faciles & raisonnables pour une sainte et bienheureuse Reunion*, compiled by an anonymous French Reformed divine.[16] It was first published in 1672 for Paul Warnaer and reissued in 1680 for Jean-Maximilien Lucas and (it may now be added) for Henri Janssen in 1682.

---

[14] See C.C. Gibbs, 'The Reception of the Huguenots in England and the Dutch Republic, 1680–1690', in Ole Peter Grell, Jonathan I. Israel and Nicholas Tyacke (eds), *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 275–306; Hans Bots, 'Le Refuge dans les Provinces Unies', in Eckart Birnstiel and Chrystel Bernat (eds), *La Diaspora des Huguenots. Les réfugiés protestants de France et leur dispersion dans le monde, XVIe–XVIIIe siècles* (Paris, 2001), pp. 63–74 and John Marshall, *John Locke, Toleration and Early Enlightenment Culture* (Cambridge, 2006). For Huguenot emigration to England during the Restoration, see Bernard Cottret, *The Huguenots in England: Immigration and Settlement c.1550–1700*, trans. Peregrine and Adriana Stevenson (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 185–204 and Robin Gwynn, 'Arrival of Huguenot Refugees in England, 1680–1705', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London*, 21/4 (1969): 366–73 (later *Huguenot Society of Great-Britain and Ireland*, hereafter both cited as *PHS*); 'The Distribution of Huguenot Refugees in England', *PHS*, 21/5 (1970): 404–36; 'The Distribution of Huguenot Refugees in England, II: London and Its Environs', *PHS*, 22/6 (1976): 509–68.

[15] Kitchin, pp. 299, 350–1.

[16] See Pierre M. Conlon, *Prélude au Siècle des Lumières en France. Répertoire chronologique de 1680 à 1715* (Geneva, 1970–1975), nos 62, 19413. A twentieth-century manuscript note on the title page of the Trinity College copy, I.15.52 (8), mentions that the work might 'possibly' be by the French minister Paul Fétizon.

This is not the first sign of L'Estrange's connection with French protestants and protestantism. In 1679 Louis Delafaye, a convert from Roman catholicism and the translator of the *London Gazette*, turned L'Estrange's *Narrative of the Plot* into French, with a dedication to the Duke of Ormond. Not only does Delafaye call L'Estrange an 'honest' and 'very capable' man, he also maintains that the accusations of catholicism and bigotry levelled against him were nonconformist inventions.[17] Later, in 1683, Joanna Brome published an abridged French version of L'Estrange's *Dissenter's Sayings* for the attention of the 'Reformed Churches over the sea', with a title even more explicit than the original: *Le Non-Conformiste anglois Dans ses Ecris, dans ses Sentimens, & dans sa Pratique*. The translator (possibly L'Estrange himself) describes how the English dissenters claim an affiliation with Continental protestants to gain a hearing for their ideas and to deceive the 'reasonable people' amongst whom they aspire to have a welcome.[18] Even though L'Estrange was careful to be associated only with the French protestants or Huguenots, there was some deliberate confusion in anti-L'Estrange satire. In *An Hue and Cry after R.Ls*, for instance, L'Estrange's 'French' name is enough to give rise to suspicions of catholicism.[19]

This chapter examines L'Estrange's translation of the French *Apologie pour les Protestans* in the context of the competition between Anglicans and dissenters for the support they hoped to derive from Continental Reformed churches in the midst of the Tory reaction of mid-

---

Fétizon is the author of a later *Apologie pour les Reformez*, published anonymously in The Hague in 1683, but I have not found any proof that he is the author of the previous *Apologie*.

[17] *Histoire de la Conspiration d'Angleterre, traduite de l'Anglois du Sieur L'Estrange par L.D.L.F.* (1679), sig. a2r, my translation.

[18] *Le Non-Conformiste anglois* (1683), sig. A2r–v.

[19] *An Hue and Cry after R.L.s* (1681) p. 1.

1681.[20] The Restoration brought the question of the Huguenots' allegiance to the Anglican Church sharply to the fore and split their community. The largest and oldest Huguenot church in London, Threadneedle, still worshipped according to the Genevan discipline, and hence was in that sense 'nonconformist'. It had enjoyed this privilege since the charter granted to it by Edward VI in 1550. The newer Huguenot Church, La Savoie, established in the fashionable West End in 1661, was created on the condition that it conform to the Anglican liturgy and discipline. Hence it used a French translation of the Book of Common Prayer, revised by one of its ministers, the Anglo-Norman Jean Durel.[21]

It is within the context of the Huguenots' debates on Anglicanism that I place L'Estrange's work. Two matters will prove essential in order to understand his publications on his return from Holland, to extend the scope of his work beyond purely local interests and to glimpse some surprising consequences of his involvement with foreign booksellers. They are the issues debated among French protestants and the way in which the persecutions of the Huguenots were represented to an English public following the *dragonnade* of the summer and autumn of 1681.

---

[20] An indication of the general misconceptions about the work is the misquoting of its title as '*Apology for the French Protestants*' both by Kitchin (p. 350) and by Love ('L'Estrange').

[21] See John McDonnell Hintermaier, 'Rewriting the Church of England: Jean Durel, foreign Protestants and the polemics of Restoration Conformity', in Randolph Vigne and Charles Littleton (eds), *From Strangers to Citizens: The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550–1750* (Brighton and Portland, 2001), pp. 353–8. For the nonconformity of French churches see Robin Gwynn, *Huguenot Heritage*: *The History and Contribution of the Huguenots in Britain*, second rvd edn (Brighton and Portland, 2001), pp. 118–39 and 'Conformity, non-conformity and Huguenot settlement in England in the later seventeenth century', in Anne Dunan-Page (ed.), *The Religious Culture of the Huguenots, 1660–1750* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 25–44; Cottret, pp. 149–204.

'You have turn'd a *French* Book into *English*, upon a *Subject* ... that you your self are *Asham'd* of'[22]

At 604 pages, the French *Apologie* is a dense and determined treatise by an author conscious of intervening in a long history of Christian apologetic and debate reaching back to late Antiquity. The first two parts vilify the catholic clergy for their unjust and unchristian persecution of French protestants – those who profess the true tenets of Christianity and preserve an irreproachable allegiance to the French monarch. The rest of the volume is dedicated to proposals for reuniting the two churches in order to avoid 'dangerous extremities'.[23] Unlike some contemporary Protestant reunionist tracts, the compiler here requires the Roman Church to begin a series of sweeping reforms, encompassing transubstantiation, communion under a single species, the authority and infallibility of the pope, the cult of the saints and of the Virgin Mary, Purgatory, indulgences, the use of Latin and salvation by works.[24] One could scarcely imagine a more comprehensive demand. The

---

[22] *Observator*, 3.102 (31 October 1685).

[23] *Apologie pour les Protestans* (Amsterdam, 1672), p. 234. Hereafter cited as *Apologie*.

[24] See the summaries of those points in *Apologie*, pp. 15, 62–3, 350–1. For the abuses of the Roman faith, see John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 68–72. For English literature on reunion, there is John Mitton Batten, *John Dury, Advocate of Christian Reunion* (Chicago, 1944), pp. 195–7 (for Dury's project of reunion of protestant and catholic churches); Norman Sykes, 'Ecumenical movements in Great Britain in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill (eds), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517–1948* (London, 1967), pp. 121–67; H.R. McAdoo, 'Anglican/Roman Catholic Relations, 1717–1980. A Detection of Themes', in J.C.H. Aveling, D.M. Loades and H.R. McAdoo (eds), *Rome and the Anglicans. Historical and Doctrinal Aspects of Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations* (Berlin and New York, 1982), pp. 146–73 and Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 345–73.

author calls upon Louis XIV to summon a General Council independent of Rome, to be guided by the Scriptures and presided over by the Holy Spirit.[25]

L'Estrange's translation of the *Apologie* was entered in the Term Catalogue for Easter 1681 and advertised in *The Observator* on 13 August 1681.[26] It cost two shillings for 154 pages of text.[27] There was never a second edition, even though it is the work which L'Estrange advertised most often in *The Observator* – indeed, no less than eight times in the space of ten months between 13 August 1681 and 3 June 1682. Other publications that L'Estrange advertised with a similar emphasis were his rendering of Seneca's *Epistolæ Morales* and *The Dissenter's Sayings*.[28] These were two of his most enduring and popular works, showing that his advertising campaigns could be quite successful. The want of a second edition of the *Apology* suggests a somewhat unexpected failure.

This apparent lack of success can be partly explained by generic ambiguities. The *Apology* can hardly be included among L'Estrange's translations of literary or moral works, but neither is it an example of the short controversial literature which had become his trademark. Some copies which I have examined for this study were included in *A Collection of Several Tracts in Quarto* (Kemp A56a). In copies that were bound separately, an advertisement for the *Collection* was often inserted at the end of the volume, and on the title page the *Apology* is listed among L'Estrange's tracts 'against *Popery* and *Presbytery*', rather than among his translations.[29] Those appear in a separate section and were never included in collected works

---

[25] *Apologie*, p. 85.

[26] Arber I. 443.

[27] See flyleaf note in St John's College copy Ee.5.1.

[28] The frequency with which L'Estrange advertised *The Dissenter's Sayings* is remarked upon by Care, *Weekly Pacquet*, 3.78 (2 December 1681).

[29] Individual copies with the catalogue are Magdalen College, Oxford a.8.11 (16), Bodleian Library 4° V34 (1) Th, British Library 108.e.7, St John's College, Cambridge Ee.5.1 (10) and Ee.11.22 (4). The other copies

(Figure 8). This simple catalogue of L'Estrange's *œuvre* suggests that there was already some doubt concerning the nature of the *Apology*, for it cannot easily be categorized, as some of L'Estrange's opponents wished to read it, as crypto-catholic. On the other hand, the advertisement can scarcely be said to put the nature of the book beyond contention.

L'Estrange's *Apology* was often bound with contemporary tracts by men who have left notes of their expenses and collecting habits. It was often included among Church of England controversies of the early 1680, with defences of (or attacks upon) Edward Stillingfleet's *Mischief of Separation* and *Unreasonabless of Separation*.[30] There is a strong likelihood that the readers who encountered L'Estrange's *Apology* in such collections would have perceived it as a piece of Anglican apologetic against the dissenting threat – and one worthy to keep company with Stillingfleet. At the end of the copy once possessed by the Anglican minister John Horden, for instance, there is a manuscript note (in Greek) dubbing L'Estrange's words the 'wisdom of the only God.'[31]

Hesitations about how to read the work were perhaps inspired by its very title. For instance, the *Apology* is described on the fly-leaf of one of such collection as 'A Justification of Protest: for their departure Ch. Of R.', an amalgam of various parts of L'Estrange's title, but one that emphasizes the protestant aspect of the work, rather than the reunion with Rome.[32] L'Estrange himself often advertises his translation in the *Observator* by its main title, an 'Apology for the Protestants'. Whig newswriters, on the other hand, insisted on calling it

---

examined are: Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BnF) D2–1618, Bodleian Library, Pamph. C. 155 (19), Bodleian Library, Ashm. 1208 (5), Cambridge University Library F.3.1, Cambridge University Library Acton.c.25.1077 (8), Sidney Sussex College T.5.11, Trinity College, Cambridge, I.15.52 (8), St John's College, Cambridge Gg.3.13 (3), Gg.4.21 and a copy in the writer's possession.

[30] St John's College Ee.5.1, Trinity College I.15.52.

[31] Cambridge University Library F.3.1.

[32] St John's College Ee.5.1.

'proposals for Reunion with the Church of Rome'.[33] In 1685, L'Estrange offered his longest defence of the *Apology* in reply to an anonymous pamphlet entitled *The Difference between the Church of England, and the Church of Rome, Consider'd and Stated*, and there for the very first time he gives a literal translation of the full title of the French original, not the abbreviated form that had appeared on the title page of his translation. It runs 'An *Apology* for *Protestants*, wherein the Author fully Justifies their Proceedings, and Departure from the Church of *Rome*: With a Proposal of *Means, EASY* and *REASONABLE*, for a *Holy and a Blessed REUNION*.'[34]

This means, in effect, that L'Estrange cites his translation of the *Apologie* by three different titles – in the advertisements, on the title page of his version and in his reply to the pamphlet. This is plainly strategic, serving to distinguish the advocacy of the protestant cause in the text from the proposal for reunion with the Church of Rome. From the very beginning, L'Estrange had felt the need to keep the material he was translating at one remove, even perhaps at arm's length. His translation includes an address to the reader in which he is plainly unwilling to appear alone in his high estimate of the French original. He mentions an intermediary, a friend of irreproachable character and reputation, who brought the book to his notice: 'The Original of this *Apology* was put into my hand by one of the Worthiest Men that I know upon the Face of the Earth; to all the intents of a Virtuous, a Friendly, and an Agreeable Conversation'.[35]

---

[33] Care, *Weekly Pacquet*, 4.14 (24 March 1682) and 4.15 (31 March 1682). For accusations of Popery levelled against the dissenters, see Marshall, pp. 462–65.

[34] *The Observator Defended by the Author of the Observators* (1685), p. 25.

[35] *An Apology for the Protestants* (1681) A2r. Hereafter cited as *Apology*.

In a sense, this anxiety was misplaced, because no attack upon the French original appeared in either France or the Netherlands.[36] This is all the more surprising given the controversy surrounding the many forms of reunionist literature at the end of the seventeenth century.[37] The *Réunion du Christianisme* by Isaac d'Huisseau, to cite only the best-known example, resulted in the much-publicized excommunication of its author, a minister of the Academy of Saumur, in 1671.[38] In England, the French minister Jean Gailhard kept the Earl of Huntingdon informed about d'Huisseau and commented that 'this judgment was attended with too much partiality and passion.'[39] The absence of any known response to the *Apologie* a year later makes it unlikely that it was received as a particularly dangerous compromise with Rome. The reunion it proposes is anything but 'fair' and 'reasonable', as its title page proclaims, since it calls for the virtual abandonment of the catholic dogma and worship. It is

---

[36] The piece is not included in catalogues of reunionist literature such as Antoine Rabaut-Dupuis, *Détails historiques et recueils de pièces sur les divers projets de réunion de toutes les communions chrétiennes, qui ont été conçus depuis la Réformation jusqu'à ce jour* (Paris, 1806) and M. Tabaraud, *Histoire critique des projets formés depuis trois cents ans pour la réunion des communions chrétiennes* (Paris, 1824). Neither does it feature in Antoine A. Barbier, *Dictionnaire des Ouvrages Anonymes*, third rev. edn, 5 vols (Paris, 1872–89), nor in Louis Desgraves, *Répertoire des Ouvrages de Controverse entre Catholiques et Protestants en France*, 2 vols (Geneva, 1984–85).

[37] See Jean Orcibal, *Louis XIV et les Protestants* (Paris, 1951), pp. 30–41; René Voeltzel, *Vraie et fausse église selon les protestants français du XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 1956), pp. 36–79; and Jacques's Solé, *Le Débat entre Protestants et Catholiques français de 1598 à 1685*, 4 vols (Paris, 1985), vol. 1, pp. 357–406 for a more thorough exposition.

[38] The most comprehensive study is Richard Stauffer, *L'Affaire d'Huisseau: Une controverse protestante au sujet de la reunion des Chrétiens (1670–1671)* (Paris, 1969). See also, Rabaut-Dupuis, pp. 97–8; Paul Hazard, *La Crise de la conscience européenne* (1935; Paris, 1961), pp. 85–7; Orcibal, pp. 11–17; Voeltzel, pp. 45–50 and Hubert Bost, *Pierre Bayle* (Paris, 2006), pp. 66–7.

[39] HMC, 78th report, Hastings II, p. 156. On Gailhard, see Mark Goldie, *Oxford DNB*.

strikingly different from either d'Huisseau's or later projects of reunion within a broad Gallican Church, such Jean Dubourdieu's list of articles – a last effort to avoid the eradication of French protestantism, but one that was considered by many to be unacceptable.[40]

If L'Estrange's translation, but not L'Estrange's original, caused quite a stir, it probably had more to do with the personality of the translator than with the content of the work. L'Estrange did not attempt to disguise the fact that he was the translator and made sure that his name appeared on the title page of the *Apology*. Many publications had called for a union of Anglicans and dissenters around the potentially unifying theme of anti-catholicism;[41] by appearing to advocate a union of protestants with the Church of Rome (if only on the title page), L'Estrange was being provocative for he knew he would open himself once more to charges of catholicism.[42] This was a time when contemporary polemics from dissenting

---

[40] Jean Dubourdieu, 'Projet de réunion des deux églises', in *Oeuvres Complètes de Bossuet*, ed. F. Lachat (Paris, 1864), vol. 17, pp. 353–6 and 'A True Copy of a Project for the Reunion of Both Religions in France'. Dubourdieu became of one the most outspoken advocates of what Bernard Cottret has termed 'French Anglicanism' (see Cottret, p. 176).

[41] See Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (1987; Cambridge, 1990), pp. 96–129 for the Whig exploitation of catholic fears and pp. 130–44 for the Tory counter-attack; Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678–1681* (1994; Cambridge, 2006), pp. 200–202, 314–16.

[42] Ibid., pp. 308–47. This came with accusations of parliamentary tyranny. For what he calls the 'Romanist-Whig connection', see also Mark Goldie, 'John Locke and Anglican Royalism', *Political Studies* 31 (1983): 61–85. Miller and Knights argue that anti-catholicism by and large dropped out of politics after the Oxford Parliament (see Miller, pp. 189–91, Knights, pp. 362–64). For the dissenting backlash, see Knights, pp. 289–91 and Gary S. De Krey, *London and the Restoration, 1659–1683* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 223–4, 238–46. For Whig and Tory propaganda, see also Crist, 'Francis Smith', pp. 183–290 and Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and Lockes's* Two Treatises of Government (Princeton, 1986), pp. 181–227. For the accusations against both

quarters attempted to efface the difference between a catholic and a 'Tory High Churchman of an extreme type', as J.G. Muddiman calls L'Estrange.[43]

L'Estrange's chief opponent, the Whig pamphleteer Henry Care, was the first to comment upon the translation.[44] This gave L'Estrange an opportunity to explain himself by posing as an eirenist with reference to Hugo Grotius.[45] It was not so much the text itself as L'Estrange's address to the reader which inspired Care's objections. The address provides not one but three 'apologies' as L'Estrange moves away from the contentious topic of a catholic reunion to vituperation against dissenters. The first apology envisages his translation as an apology for the 'Reformed catholics' in their separation from Roman catholics.[46] This resumes the theme of *The Reformed Catholique*, a previous pamphlet by L'Estrange offering a scathing denunciation of all 'false' protestants.[47] As L'Estrange peremptorily declares there, '*A Reformed Catholique* (properly so called) *is an Apostolical Christian,* or *a Son of the Church of* England'.[48] The second apology is an apology 'for the *Reformation*', which in L'Estrange's usage means an apology for a Church of England. Both the French *Apologie* and L'Estrange's translation go so far as to affirm that the Anglican 'Ecclesiastical Government' with its '*Order, Discipline, Rites* and *Ceremonies*' was approved by the Holy Spirit and also

---

papists and dissenters, see Lois G. Schwoerer, *The Ingenious Mr. Henry Care, Restoration Publicist* (Baltimore and London, 2001), pp. 157–66.

[43] J.G. Muddiman, *The King's Journalist, 1659–1689*. *Studies in the Reign of Charles II* (London, 1923), p. 151.

[44] See Care, *Weekly Pacquet*, 4.14 (24 March 1682) and 4.15 (31 March 1682). For the *Weekly Pacquet* and its readership, see Crist, 'Francis Smith', pp. 134–42 and Schwoerer, pp. 44–75.

[45] *Observator*, 1.109 (10 March 1682), 1.114 (22 March 1682).

[46] *Apology*, sig. A2r.

[47] *Reformed Catholique*, pp. 20–1.

[48] Ibid., p.1. For comments on the use of 'Reformation' in dissenting literature, see De Krey, pp. 301–11. For the distinction between 'Protestant', 'Reformed' and 'Dissenter', see *Observator*, 1.1 (13 April 1681).

by the Reformers, notably Calvin and Beza.[49] L'Estrange uses 'Reformed' in the sense of the Continental Reformed Churches, more particularly French protestant churches. This allows him in passing to remark that France tolerates no protestant dissenters, just as Holland silences Anabaptists, a point that rankled with his dissenting adversaries, who took it as one further proof of Anglican intolerance. L'Estrange's third and final apology is his own. He claims that his translation provides a public testimony that he is no Papist, since it reveals a virulent opposition to the Church of Rome. Anyone who looked into the book would then have discovered that the process of translating the *Apologie* involved L'Estrange in *theological* arguments in favour of radical reforms of the Roman Church and proclaiming the superiority of the Anglican Church in matters of discipline. In this sense, the *Apology* is far less secularist and political than other private apologies of the same period, such as *L'Estrange no Papist*.[50]

Despite this three-fold defence of his translation, questions arise as to L'Estrange's motives for publishing such a text. For one who had just returned from exile on suspicion of catholicism, seeming to propose a reunion with Rome was hardly an obvious way to support the loyalist cause that trumpeted its anti-catholicism. L'Estrange apparently wished to provoke a debate about a reunion of Anglicans and catholics that would take attention away from the issue of Anglicans and dissenters uniting against Rome. Doing so through the literary medium of translation at once allowed him to espouse the views of his original and, when challenged, to argue that he was not responsible from them. Yet there are telling signs that L'Estrange was perhaps not entirely comfortable with the results of his unionist

---

[49] *Apologie*, p. 45; *Apology*, sig. A3r.

[50] For L'Estrange's 'secularism', see Littlefield, p. 26; Violet Jordain, 'Mission in the Market Place: Sir Roger L'Estrange's *Observator in Dialogue* as an Instrument for Teaching and Delighting the Common Londoner, 1681–1687', unpublished doctoral dissertation (Los Angeles, 1968), pp. 66, 69, 78–9; Turner, pp. 16, 60, 73–80.

propaganda. Uncharacteristically, when faced with a deluge of complaints in the press, he remained silent about his translation for another three years (except for what he calls a 'few touches' here and there in *The Observator*). He took up the gauntlet again only when his detractors cited it to accuse him of pursuing an 'accommodation' policy with James. This time, however, instead on focusing on the *Apology* as a defence of the Church of England against the dissenters, as he had done in 1681, L'Estrange emphasizes that he had been misunderstood and that he was well aware of the impracticality of a reunion. His *Apology*, he now claims, was only a 'proposal' or a 'wish'. 'All that I did was barely to *Contemplate* a PROVIDENTIAL POSSIBILITY of it.'[51] He explained at length, both in *The Observator* and in his reply to criticism, that he had simply put forward a '*Laudable Project*', '*Well meant,* and no hurt done in the *Wish*,' a '*charitable Contemplation* of the *Possibility* of a *Re-union*'.[52] L'Estrange was trying to pass off the *Apology* as the dream of an eirenist who, trusting providence, wishes for passions to abate and for Christian charity to preside over a truly 'catholic' Europe: 'I propose no Joyning of Churches: But I do most Passionately *Wish*, and *Pray* for't, though I never *Offer'd* at it.'[53]

How could L'Estrange claim that his arguments differed from those of the original author who intended a true union, while he remained an idealist?[54] Comparison of the French and English versions – a new tool for exploring L'Estrange's thought – reveals his almost slavishly literal rendition of those parts of the original he chose to retain. They differ only in L'Estrange's omission of material he judged to be 'wholly Foreign to the Drift of the

---

[51] See also *Observator*, 3.218 (16 October 1686).

[52] *Observator Defended*, pp. 10, 26.

[53] *Observator*, 3.102 (Saturday 31 October 1685). See also 3.6 (21 February 1685), 3.9 (26 February 1685), 3.153 (10 March 1686), 3.220 (23 October 1686).

[54] *Observator Defended*, p. 25.

Discourse'.[55] These omissions are mostly found in Parts III and IV of the French text, giving an account of the present state of France and calling upon Louis XIV to protect his loyal protestant subjects and to convene an ecumenical Council.[56] The French divine's theological and ecclesiological arguments in the *Apologie* were meant to end the erosion of the Huguenots' civil liberties in France and to spur Louis to respect the Edict of Nantes.[57] L'Estrange, on the contrary, alerts his readers to the fact that a reunion already existed for all intents and purposes in the Church of England. Hence he saw no need to dwell on practical measures such as the Council proposed by the French divine. This also meant that L'Estrange prudently refrained from joining the mounting chorus of protests against the French clergy (and indirectly against Louis XIV himself), while cunningly enlisting the help of the French protestants.

Reconstructing the history of the French *Apologie*

Before examining the way L'Estrange enlists the help of the French protestants, a detour is needed to reconstruct the readership and fate of L'Estrange's original. The French *Apologie* does not easily yield clues about its provenance nor the distribution channels it followed from France into Holland and England. On examination, copies issued by Paul Warnaer, Jean-Maximilien Lucas and Henry Janssen prove to be three impressions, rather than three editions, of the text. Some copies of the first impression contain a list of errata, but L'Estrange does not incorporate them.[58] It is therefore impossible to determine with absolute

---

[55] *Apology*, sig. A4v.

[56] *Apologie*, pp. 560–95.

[57] *Apologie*, p. 465.

[58] The copies of the 1672 Warnaer impressions which were examined for this study are: Cambridge University Library F167.d.5.5 (without errata); Bibliothèque de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français (BPF) 0–629 and 3130 (both with errata); BPF 9624 (without errata), Magdalen College Old Library l.6.5. (without errata) and a copy in the writer's possession (without errata); of the 1680 Lucas impression are Bibliothèque Nationale de

certainty whether L'Estrange possessed the Warnaer or the Lucas impressions, both printed before his translation. However, Lucas's *Apologie* was advertised in the *Haerlemse Courant* of 27 February 1680, which is well in time for L'Estrange to have obtained a copy while in The Hague.[59]

One copy of the French *Apologie*, of the ten inspected for this study, has a note of ownership that clearly reveals the identity of its owner. It is now in the Old Library of Magdalen College, Oxford, and belonged to a Restoration Fellow of the College, John Fitzwilliam. Fitzwilliam kept careful records of his extensive purchases, which included one copy of the Warnaer *Apologie*, acquired in 1673.[60] The flyleaf has Fitzwilliam's Latin motto, *Tota philosophorum vita Com[m]ent[ati]o mortis e[st]* [All the life of philosophers is a meditation upon death], preceded by a text which is damaged but eventually decipherable as *Reddenda e[st] rat[ti]o villica[cion]is* [An account of stewardship must be rendered], which proves to be a quotation from Luke 16.2. The copy was purchased for 8*d*, from 'R. Scott', identifiable as Robert Scott, one of the most prominent London booksellers, and the *Apologie* duly appears in his magnificent 1674 catalogue, *Catalogus Librorum ex Variis Europæ Partibus Advertorum*.[61] It is easy to understand why Fitzwilliam traded with Scott. Dubbed 'the greatest librarian in Europe', Scott was one of the chief dealers for the Restoration artistic, scientific and religious communities, with regular customers such as Samuel Pepys, Christopher Wren, Joseph Williamson, Robert Hooke and John Cosin seeking out his shop in

---

France D2–3221, British Library 3901.bb.34; and of the 1682 Janssen impression BPF 0–643. This is by far the rarest of the three impressions, and I have so far been able to trace only this single copy.

[59] I.H. van Eeghen, *De Amsterdamse Boekhandel, 1680–1725*, 6 vols (Amsterdam, Scheltema & Holkema NV, 1962–78), vol. 3, pp. 228–30.

[60] Magdalen College Old Library l.6.5. On Fitzwilliam's career, see D.A. Brunton, 'John Fitzwilliam', *Oxford DNB*.

[61] *Catalogus Librorum* (1674), p. 157. The entry is for 'Apologie pour les Protestans. 1673.'

Little Britain. He possessed the widest stock of Continental books then available, and had warehouses in Paris and Frankfurt which he visited frequently.[62] By 1673, he was an agent for the Press of Oxford University and was involved in the early printing experiments at the Sheldonian theatre, hence his regular appearances in Oxford.

Fitzwilliam shared with Scott (and with L'Estrange) an intense concern with the spread of dissent. In Anthony Wood's view, he was a 'Laudian' and an 'Arminian' almost to the point of ridicule.[63] He remained loyal to James and refused to take the oaths to William and Mary after the Revolution. Scott displayed the same staunch Stuart loyalty and attachment to Anglicanism, coupling his principles with ferocious attacks against dissenting publications. In 1681, the year L'Estrange translated the *Apologie,* Scott was appointed to the Court of Assistants of the Stationers' Company for his 'zeal and diligence contribut[ing] to the discovering and repressing of several exorbitant and licentious practices committed in printing much to the scandal and dishonour of the government.'[64] In 1673, when Scott acquired the book, the *Apologie* appears to have been restricted to a coterie of Restoration luminaries fluent in French, and there is nothing in the background and commitments of either Scott or Fitzwilliam to suggest that they read that the French *Apologie* as a token of crypto-catholicism. If anything, it was probably considered as a defence of 'high' Anglicanism since

---

[62] See Henry R. Plomer (ed), *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers who were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667* (London, 1907) and *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1715* (Oxford, 1922); McKenzie and Bell, vol. 2, p. 56, etc. ; Leona Rostenberg, 'Robert Scott, Restoration Stationer and Importer', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 48 (1984): 49–76 and Marja Smolenaars, 'Robert Scott', *Oxford DNB*. For Scott's activities in Oxford, see Harry Carter, *A History of the Oxford University Press*, vol. 1, *To the Year 1780* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 47–9 and Rostenberg, pp. 52, 54, 57–63.

[63] Cited in Smolenaars, 'Scott'.

[64] Cited by Rostenberg, pp. 74–5. See also Crist, 'Francis Smith', pp. 236–43 and Hetet, p. 184.

the French divine refers many times to the superiority of the Anglican model. But when it was translated eight years later by L'Estrange, who was already suspected of catholicism, and who advertised it (as I shall show below) in the midst of the Poitou *dragonnade*, the *Apology* had different implications and was more widely circulated, for it presented potential readers with a much milder challenge than the 604 pages of the French original. L'Estrange's wary evocation of the person who introduced him to the book suggests that the true distribution channels of the *Apologie* were better kept behind a veil.

Some explanation for this discretion can perhaps be found in the circumstances of the 1680 impression of the French original. That year the *Apologie* was being sold (and perhaps published) by the Huguenot *marchand-libraire* Jean-Maximilien Lucas (1646?–1697).[65] Lucas had not yet attained fame, but he had already composed a brief work that would shake Europe, namely a short biography entitled *La Vie de Monsieur de Spinosa* – the beginning of Spinoza's 'legend' in the early European Enlightenment.[66] Lucas was perhaps also the author

---

[65] Lucas was a member of a well-established dynasty of Calvinist printers from Rouen and not, as is sometimes supposed, the son of the minister Lucas Janssen (or Jansse). In 1670, seven out of the 27 protestant printers or booksellers in Rouen, belonged to the Lucas family. I base these remarks on findings by Jean-Dominique Mellot, *L'Edition rouennaise et ses marchés (vers 1600–vers 1730). Dynamisme provincial et centralisme parisien* (Paris, 1998), pp. 276–9. See also Mellot and Elisabeth Queval (eds), *Répertoire d'imprimeurs/libraires (vers 1500–vers 1810*), new rvd edn (Paris, 2004), pp. 372–3. For Lucas's biography, see *The Oldest Biography of Spinoza*, ed. A. Wolf (London, 1927), pp. 24–8; K.O. Meisma, *Spinoza et son cercle. Etude critique et historique sur les hétérodoxes hollandais*, trans. S. Roosenburg (1896; Paris, 1983), pp. 6–11; Paul Vernière, *Spinoza et la pensée française avant la Révolution* (Paris, 1954) vol. 1, pp. 24, 26–7; Martin, p. 896; Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *Grub Street Abroad: Aspects of the French Cosmopolitan Press from the Age of Louis XIV to the French Revolution* (Oxford, 1992), p. 92; and Françoise Charles-Daubert (ed.), *Le 'Traité des trois imposteurs' et 'L'Esprit de Spinoza'. Philosophie clandestine entre 1678 et 1768* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 108, 129–31.

[66] *La Vie* was published under Lucas's name in 1719 in *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* edited by Henri du Sauzet. See Vernière, vol. 1, p. 27. For editions of the text, see Charles-Daubert, *Philosophie clandestine.*

of *L'Esprit de Monsieur de Spinosa*, later known with many modifications as *Le Traité des trois imposteurs*.[67] When his Amsterdam shop was closed by the Dutch authorities, on 3 January 1681, he turned to clandestine activities and founded the polemical *Quintessence des Nouvelles*.[68] Lucas was not a typical Huguenot refugee, even by Dutch standards, but rather a seditious bookseller and journalist, perhaps the author of the most incendiary of clandestine manuscripts, a radical thinker, and disciple of Spinoza.

It now seems that L'Estrange had indeed heard of Lucas's titles, the evidence being forthcoming from a neglected letter in the *Calendar of State Papers* for 1677. The text concerns George Wells, 'a bookseller ... being lately set up in St Paul's Churchyard'. Wells was 'so unhappy as to buy of Lucas, a bookseller of Amsterdam, but then in London, several books, amongst which were some *Escole des filles, Aloyisiæ Zigææ Amores* &c. which he did not conceive any way prohibited in England.'[69] It seems that Lucas had a *penchant* not only

---

[67] Charles-Daubert's hypothesis is that Lucas was the author both of *La Vie* and also of the original *L'Esprit*; see *Philosophie clandestine*, pp. 198–110, 118–31 and '*L'Esprit de Spinosa* et les *Traités des trois imposteurs*', in Silvia Berti, Françoise Charles-Daubert and Richard H. Popkin (eds), *Heterodoxy, Spinozism, and Free Thought in Early-Eighteenth-Century Europe: Studies on the* Traité des Trois Imposteurs (Dordrecht, Boston and London, 1996), pp. 131–89. See also Vernière, vol. 2, p. 365; Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment. Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650–1750* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 302–07, 694–700. Silvia Berti has given much more prominence to Jan Vroesen, 'The first edition of the "Traité des trois imposteurs" and its debt to Spinoza's "Ethics"', in M. Hunter and D. Wootton (eds), *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 182–220 and 'Scepticism and the *Traité des trois imposteurs*', in Richard H. Popkin and Arjo Vanderjagt (eds), *Scepticism and Irreligion in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Leiden and New York, 1993), pp. 216–29.

[68] See Jean Sgard, *Dictionnaire des Journalistes, 1600–1789* (Grenoble, 1976), pp. 244–5.

[69] *CSPD*, 1677, p. 492–3. The letter is from Robert Scott (incidentally the dealer who had distributed the 1672 Warnaer *Apologie*) to Joseph Williamson. The two books mentioned are *L'Escole des Filles*, sometimes attributed to Paul Scarron, and Nicholas Chorier's *Satyra Sotadica de Arcanis Amoris et Veneris* (published as

for Spinozist works but also for pornographic literature, which he tried to sell while in the English capital. L'Estrange, having sent for copies of the said books, came in person to Wells's shop which he shut for several hours after having unceremoniously expelled all customers, and demanded to examine Well's books. Wells 'gave [L'Estrange] ingenuously what he had of those books and *told him of whom he had them*' (my emphasis).[70]

This testimony reveals that Lucas was in London to trade with local dealers at the beginning of 1677 in dubious literature (*L'Escole des Filles* was famously burnt by Pepys after a profitable period spent reading it in bed). It also shows that the Huguenot's stock was already on L'Estrange's blacklist of forbidden books; and finally, it leaves no doubt that L'Estrange was informed of Lucas's activities by George Wells. I would surmise that when L'Estrange went to Holland three years later in 1680, he wished to deepen his acquaintance with Lucas's stock after his preliminary encounter with some unsavoury material in 1677, and that this is how he came upon a copy of the French *Apologie* which Lucas was selling. This leaves us with a tantalizing hypothesis. There is no proof that, prior to his Dutch trip, L'Estrange knew about Lucas for anything other than his selling of erotic dialogues, making it just possible that L'Estrange was not only in pursuit of religious literature while rummaging through foreign bookstalls. Whatever we choose to believe – and L'Estrange had enough calumnies heaped upon his head without adding another to them here – his 'Virtuous' friend in the preface to the *Apology* is almost certainly an invention. The success of L'Estrange's translating enterprise moreover depended on convincing his readers that a piece of reunionist literature was the standard platform of French protestantism.

L'Estrange, Stillingfleet and the French Protestants

---

the work of Aloisia Sigea), two of the most famous seventeenth-century erotic dialogues. See James Grantham Turner, *Schooling Sex: Libertine Literature and Erotic Education in Italy, France, and England, 1534–1685* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 106–220.

[70] *CSPD*, 1677, p. 492.

In his preface to the *Apology*, L'Estrange mentions that the Anglican liturgy and discipline were approved by three French divines. 'Mr. *Le Moin*' (Etienne le Moyne, a professor of Divinity at Leiden, originally from Rouen); 'Mr. *De l'Angle*' (Jean-Maximilien de Baux de L'Angle, the Younger, conforming minister of the French Church La Savoie and prebend of Canterbury), and the celebrated Charenton minister, Jean Claude. L'Estrange takes these names from the appendix to Edward Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation*.[71] As mentioned earlier, there are signs that L'Estrange's translation might have been regarded as a playing a part in Stillingfleet's polemics against the dissenters in the early 1680s.

This was in no sense a casual borrowing and a brief digression is necessary to reveal how much misrepresentation was involved in the process that brought this passage into L'Estrange's preface. Both Stillingfleet and L'Estrange vied for the support of the French

[71] Stillingfleet's book was advertised in *The City Mercury* on 16 December 1680; see H. Horwitz, 'Protestant Reconciliation in the Exclusion Crisis', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 15 (1964): 201–17 (at p. 215); De Krey, pp. 273–4; Ashcraft 490–7. Some of the answers to Stillingfleet's *Mischief of Separation* (1680) and *Unreasonableness of Separation* (1681) are given in William Orme, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings and Religious Connexions of John Owens* (1826), pp. 317–22. For the following controversy and Locke's unpublished answer to Stillingfleet, see C.E. Whiting, *Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution, 1660–1688* (1931; London, 1988), pp. 523–8; Gerald R. Cragg, *Puritanism in the Period of the Great Persecution, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 1957), pp. 232–6; John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646–1689* (New Haven and London, 1991), pp. 154–8; R.A. Beddard, 'Vincent Alsop and the Emancipation of Restoration Dissent', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 24 (1973): 161–84; John Marshall, 'The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-Men, 1660–1689: Stillingfleet, Tillotson and "Hobbism"', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 36 (1985): 407–27; Goldie, 'Sir Peter Pett', pp. 263–4 and Ashcraft, pp. 490–97. Very selectively, on the broader question of toleration and comprehension at the Restoration, see Norman Sykes, *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History, 1660–1768* (Cambridge, 1959), pp. 68–83; Horwitz, 'Protestant Reconciliation'; Geoffrey F. Nuttall and Owen Chadwick (eds), *From Uniformity to Unity, 1662–1962* (London, 1962), pp. 19–88; Tim Harris, Paul Seaward and Mark Goldie (eds), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford, 1990); Grell *et als* (eds), *From Persecution to Toleration*.

Huguenots, albeit for different reasons.[72] What both tactfully omit to mention is the widespread fear that the French were Presbyterians who would declare themselves openly for their dissenting brethren in England. French ministers, such as Jean Gailhard, had indeed written scathing criticisms of Anglicanism, and in 1680 Louis du Moulin had issued one of his most ferocious condemnations of the episcopalian system.[73] Bishop Morley complained to Henry Compton, the bishop of London, about the French 'Presbyterian Discipline' and worried that they 'may be dangerous to o[u]r selves by theyr joining (at least in opinion) w[i]th y^{e} most inveterate & most irreconciliable of o[u]r Enimies among o[u]r selves here att Home, I mean o[u]r Presbyterians'.[74] Morley's parenthesis is eloquent: the Huguenots were not directly accused of *de facto* presbyterianism, but their 'opinions' were enough to justify the fears of an Anglican prelate.

---

[72] On Stillingfleet's eirenicism, see Martin I.J. Griffin, *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (Leiden and New York, 1992), Chapter 3, and W.M. Spellman, *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660–1700* (Athens and London, 1993), pp. 33–53. For Henry Care's writings on comprehension, see Schwoerer, pp. 158–62.

[73] Jean Gailhard, *Apologie des Puritains d'Angleterre* (Geneva [?], 1663); Louis du Moulin, *A Short and true Account of the Several Advances the Church of England hath made Towards Rome* (1680). Du Moulin is particularly virulent against the Latitudinarians (pp. 60–4). For du Moulin's controversy with de l'Angle, see pp. 71–88. For Louis's writings, see Mark Goldie, 'The Huguenot Experience and the Problem of Toleration in Restoration England', in C.E.J. Caldicott, H. Gough and Jean-Paul Pittion (eds), *The Huguenots in Ireland: Anatomy of an Emigration* (Dun Laoghaire, 1987), pp. 175–203 and Vivienne Larminie, '*The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, the du Moulin connection and the location of the Church of England in the late seventeenth century', in Dunan-Page (ed.), pp. 57–70.

[74] Bod. MS Rawlinson C 984, fol. 50. For intercommunion between Anglican and French Reformed, see Norman Sykes, *The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: An Essay towards an Historical Interpretation of the Anglican Tradition from Whitgift to Wake*, second edn (London, 1949), pp. 29–33; Milton, pp. 493–4.

The three letters were allegedly given to Stillingfleet by Henry Compton.[75] While Compton had previously failed to win the support of the Dutch Calvinists in his defence of the Established Church, he fared better with the French.[76] The bishop of London had jurisdiction over the French churches; the Huguenot ministers were therefore directly accountable to Compton who always had to be pacified.[77]

How many letters Compton did send and pass on to Stillingfleet is unknown, but three ministers answered him.[78] Le Moyne was the first to do so, followed by de L'Angle and

---

[75] Accounts differ as to whether it was Stillingfleet or Compton who took the initiative to write to foreign divines. In the early eighteenth century, Claude Groteste de la Mothe gave his own version of the timing and purpose of the letters: they were written by Compton to help the French refugees settle in England. This slightly revisionist account of Compton's motives was taken at face value by Fernand de Schickler in magisterial study of the Huguenot churches, which is still heavily relied upon today, though in this detail it is mistaken; see Claude Groteste de la Mothe, *Correspondance Fraternelle de l'Eglise Anglicane, Avec les autres Eglises Réformées et Etrangères* (The Hague, 1705), pp. 10, 12; Fernand de Schickler, *Les Eglises du Refuge en Angleterre*, 3 vols (Paris, 1892), vol. 2, p. 324.

[76] In August 1680, Compton had enlisted the help of Ken, then still in the Hague, but Ken would not stoop so low as to ask the Dutch their opinion of the Church of England, see Bod. MS Rawlinson C 983, fol. 53. For Compton's attitude towards the French protestants, see Edward Carpenter, *The Protestant Bishop: Being the Life of Henry Compton, 1632–1713, Bishop of London* (London, 1956), pp. 321–43 and Sugiko Nishikawa, 'English attitudes towards Continental Protestants with Particular Reference to Church Briefs, c.1680–1740', unpublished doctoral thesis (London, 1998), pp. 131–77.

[77] For favourable opinions of Compton among the French community, see the curiously neglected letters from Samuel de L'Angle (to his brother Jean-Maximilien), Bod. MS Rawlinson C 982, fol. 15; from Le Moyne who mentions his 'extraordinary veneration' for the bishop, Bod. MS Rawlinson C 982, fol. 150; and from Pierre du Moulin the Younger, Bod. MS Tanner 36, fol. 124.

[78] Calamy mentions that Compton had also written to Spainheim, but that the letter was not deemed favourable enough to be included (Whiting, p. 528).

finally by Claude.[79] It is their three answers that Stillingfleet appends to the *Unreasonableness*, in French, with a faithful English translation, whence they passed to L'Estrange.[80] For Stillingfleet, the letters of the three pastors flatly denied the dissenters' contention that they had the support of foreign churches.[81]

It is easy to underestimate the importance of getting the opinion on the subject of episcopalianism of such a minister as Jean Claude. The author of his *Life* is very far from considering Claude's letter a mere footnote to the arguments of Stillingfleet, whom he does not even mention:

> [Compton] ... labour'd under apprehensions, for the divisions, with which the Church of *England* was threatned, upon occasion of the Episcopal Government. For the preventing of this mischief, he wrote to some of the most eminent *French* Ministers, that he might have their advice. Monsieur *Claude* made too much a noise in *France*, not to be consulted in an affair of this moment; he received a Letter from that Prelate, this was a slippery step, he had the eyes of all *Protestants* upon him, to see how he wou'd behave himself in so nice a concern; he came off from it with honour, he used a temperament, that was approv'd of by all rational

---

[79] On the title page of the first edition of Stillingfleet's book, only 'two' letters are mentioned, and not three (the title being altered to 'several' from the second edition onwards). One might surmise that it was perhaps Jean Claude's epistle that was originally missing, since it came late and was more mitigated than those of his two colleagues.

[80] Edward Stillingfleet, *The Unreasonableness of Separation: Or, An Impartial Account of the History, Nature, and Pleas of the Present Separation from the Communion of the Church of England*, third edn (1682), pp. 403–28. The letters are examined by Nishikawa, pp. 142–4, but Nishikawa does not seem to be aware of Claude's opposition to their publication. Stillingfleet had first-hand experience of Huguenot immigration. It seems to have been overlooked that in September 1681 he was nominated by royal appointment to a committee to oversee the distribution of relief to the French protestants with William Sancroft, Henry Compton, Patience Ward, the Whig Huguenots, John Dubois and Thomas Papillon and the philanthropist Thomas Firmin; see *The Currant Intelligence*, no. 42 (13 to 17 September 1681).

[81] Stillingfleet, p. 191. For the opposite point of view, see Gailhard, p. 120.

> persons, he own'd what is good in the Episcopacy, but he does not dissemble the feebleness of some Prelates, who seem to him too rigid over our calling ....[82]

Claude may indeed have had 'the eyes of all *Protestants* upon him', for in 1680 there were obvious problems with a Reformed minister writing in defence of the Church of England. Moreover, the Huguenots' sympathies towards episcopalianism differed sharply: Claude could hardly be said to be of the same mind as de L'Angle who had accepted Anglican re-ordination. Stillingfleet's detractors were therefore very quick to denounce such 'manipulation' of the French ministers to whom the English situation had been misrepresented.[83]

Claude himself clearly felt he had been deceived by Compton (with whom he had otherwise an excellent relationship) and Stillingfleet. In an overlooked letter to Mme de Régny dated 16 April 1681 in which he thanks her for having sent him a copy of the *Unreasonableness*, he vehemently protests that his thoughts were never meant to become public and were certainly not intended to support Stillingfleet's argument against the nonconformists.[84] Claude thought that he and his French colleagues were not being asked any question by Compton, but only whether they were supporting the dissenters' alleged opinion that 'a man cannot be saved in the Church of *England*.'[85] Their answer could only be that they did not support the dissenters, given that the Church of England was the 'Elder sister' of all Reformed churches.[86]

---

[82] *The Life and Death of Monsieur Claude*, *done out of the French by G.P.* (1688), pp. 31–2.

[83] See for instance John Barrett, *A Reply to the Reverend Dean of St. Paul's Reflections on the Rector of Sutton, &c.* (1681), pp. 79, 83, 87–8, 91–2 and Gilbert Rule, *A Rational Defence of Nonconformity* (1689), p. 274.

[84] *Les Œuvres Posthumes de Mr. Claude*, 5 vols (Amsterdam, 1688–89), vol. 5, pp. 264–5, 266–7, my translation.

[85] Stillingfleet, p. 404.

[86] Ibid., p. 441.

That did not amount, however, to an unconditional support for the Anglican clergy, as Claude appeals to Compton's legendary moderation and enquires whether he could find means to accommodate the dissenters. In a note to the bishop, Claude politely but firmly reminded his correspondent that there were rumours the English episcopal government was 'arbitrary and tyrannical' towards the dissenters; that nobody was ordained without acknowledging *iure divino* episcopacy; that French and Dutch ministers were re-ordained whereas catholic priests were not; and that some English bishops had too great a reverence for ceremonies.[87]

L'Estrange was fully aware that his translation of the *Apologie* would be read by his enemies as proof of his Popish sympathies. The endorsement of Stillingfleet and the Huguenots gave his translation legitimacy as a defence of Anglicanism in a European context, even if this meant ignoring Stillingfleet's leanings towards comprehension. Moreover, it has now been possible to establish the full extent of Stillingfleet's misrepresentation of the French Huguenots' position, relayed by L'Estrange to encourage belief in a French consensus over the discipline and liturgy of the Church of England.

The Poitou *dragonnade* and the English press

This one-sided view of the French Reformed position invites one to consider the importance of the Huguenots in the debates between Whigs and Tories when L'Estrange's *Apologie* was released in the spring or summer 1681 (although we do not possess commentaries by vital observators such as Roger Morrice or indeed the French ambassador Paul Barillon, who was preoccupied by the visit of William of Orange).[88] From May to November 1681, the *intendant*

---

[87] Ibid., p. 269.

[88] See Robin Gwynn, 'Roger Morrice and the Huguenot Refugees', in McElligott (ed), pp. 32–48. For Barillon's letters to Louis that summer, see Archives des Affaires Etrangères, Correspondance Politique Angleterre I/143, Juillet–Septembre1681. For d'Avaux's commentaries, see Jacques Solé, 'La diplomatie de

of Poitou, René de Marillac, quartered troops in protestant households, with the assent of both the Minister of War, Louvois and of Louis XIV.[89] Many testimonies began circulating in England picturing the treatment of the French protestants at the hands of the dragoons, with gruesome stories of forced abjurations obtained by torture.[90] Copies of declarations and edicts of Louis XIV circulated widely, as did narratives of the persecutions, newsbook accounts of the events, epistolary exchanges between French and English friends.[91] Works by the former

---

Louis XIV et les protestants français réfugiés aux Provinces-Unies (1678–1688)', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, 115 (Octobre–Décembre 1969): 627–60 (hereafter cited as *BSHPF*). For the *dragonnades* and the Revocation, see Marshall, pp. 17–28.

[89] For accounts of the 1681 *dragonnade*, see Orcibal, pp. 69–77; Samuel Mours, *Le Protestantisme en France au XVIIe siècle (1598–1685)* (Paris, 1967), pp. 159–63; Yves Krumenacker, 'Les dragonnades du Poitou: leur écho dans les mémoires', *BSHPF*, 131 (Juillet–Août 1985): 405–22; Janine Garrisson, *L'Edit de Nantes et sa Révocation. Histoire d'une intolérance* (Paris, 1685), pp. 127–83; Elisabeth Labrousse, *'Une foi, une loi, un roi?' La Révocation de L'Edit de Nantes* (Geneva and Paris, 1985), pp. 167–77; René Poujol, 'Le rôle des intendants dans les préliminaires de la Révocation', in Roger Zuber and Laurent Theis (eds), *La Révocation de l'Edit de Nantes et le protestantisme français en 1685* (Paris, 1986), pp. 87–112.

[90] For the impact of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes five years later, see John Miller, 'The Immediate Impact of the Revocation in England', in Caldicott *et als* (eds), pp. 161–203; John Marshall, 'Huguenot Thought after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes: Toleration, "Socinianism", Integration and Locke', in Vigne and Littleton (eds), pp. 383–96; Gwynn, *Huguenot Heritage*, pp. 166–82. See Care, *Weekly Pacquet*, 3.28 (18 December 1680); Benjamin Harris, *The Protestant (Domestick) Intelligence: Or, News from both City and Country* (previously, *Domestick Intelligence: Or News both from City and Country*), no. 95 (8 February 1681) and Curtis, *True Protestant Mercury*, nos 8 (18 to 22 January 1681) and 16 (16 to 19 February 1681).

[91] See for instance, 'The Horrible Persecution of the French Protestants in the Province of Poitou' (1681); Edmund Everard, *The Great Pressures and Grievances of the Protestants in France and their Apology to the Late Ordinances made against them* (1681); *The Present State of the Protestants in France. In Three Letters* (1681*)*; *A True and Perfect Relation of the New Invented Way of Persecuting the Protestants in France* (1681); *The Humble Petition of the Protestants of France, ... by the Mareschal Schombert and the Marquis of Ruvigny*

Sedan minister Pierre Jurieu were also rapidly translated into English.[92] The publishers who issued those tracts sometimes had strong dissenting sympathies, like Langley Curtis, Richard Janeway and Thomas Cockerill, who published one of the major accounts of Louis XIV's Huguenot legislation, with interlinear commentaries by the lawyer Edmund Everard. It is, however, in the Whig newspapers and pamphlets that the battle for the hearts and minds of the English protestants was being waged.

At the end of July, Thomas Benskins's *Domestick Intelligence* had begun reporting 'all manner of Insolencies by Imprisonings, Confiscations, Rapes, Murtherers, Firing, and Demolishing, forcing Women from their Husbands, and Children from their Parents, Burning Houses, Taxation Extraordinary, Imposts and such barbarous Severities the worst of the Heathen Emperours scarce ever used against the Christians'.[93] *The Impartiall Protestant Mercury* published by Janeway (to which contributed Thomas Vile and Henry Care[94]) had regular accounts of the 'Intollerable pressures laid upon the *Protestants* in the kingdom of *France*', at time with a graphic portrayal of men 'beat with Cudgels', 'Tortured with Pincers' and 'wollen'd' (which meant having a cord passed around one's temples and twisted with a

---

(1681). For a study of these, see Anne Dunan-Page, 'La dragonnade du Poitou et l'exil des huguenots dans la littérature anglaise: faits et fictions', *Moreana* 168 (2007).

[92] See *La Politique du Clergé de France* (Amsterdam, 1681) and *Les Derniers Efforts de l'Innocence Affligée* (The Hague, 1682) translated respectively as *The Policy of the Clergy of France* (1681) and *The Last Efforts of Afflicted Innocence* (1682). On those, see R.J. Howells, *Pierre Jurieu: Antinomian Radical* (Durham, 1983), pp. 29–37.

[93] Thomas Benskins, *The Domestick Intelligence: Or News both from City and Country Impartially Related*, no. 20 (28 July to 1 August 1681). Other reports were advertised throughout August in issues nos 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29.

[94] See Muddiman, pp. 242–3. Crist has argued that Richard Janeway, Richard Baldwin and Langley Curtis took over the leadership of the opposition press from Francis Smith and Benjamin Harris sometimes after April 1681; 'Francis Smith', p. 184.

stick behind), eighty-year olds 'Tied to Benches', and children 'abused'.[95] Langley Curtis reported the same cruelties in almost every issue of the *True Protestant Mercury* (to which, again, Care contributed).[96] In total opposition, the official *London Gazette*, which excluded all controversial news, did not report the *dragonnade*, and mentioned only twice that summer the 'severity' of a new edict that authorized children above 7 years of age to change their religion.[97]

The most horrible accounts of persecutions were publicized by the Whig newsmongers, a manipulation denounced by L'Estrange. In *The Observator* of 20 August 1681, L'Estrange's 'Whig' has the story of a French minister who suffered on the wheel for refusing to disclose the hiding place of his children. 'Tory' plainly disbelieves him and argues that such a tale of monstrous cruelty, if true, would reveal Louis XIV as a beast. On 31 August, L'Estrange was compelled to justify himself since this mockery had caused an uproar, especially as Charles had just issued letters to Compton and Patience Ward to welcome the Huguenots (followed by the Order of Hampton Court in which Charles granted free denization): 'His *Majesty* according to his Gracious Inclinations Compassionates and orders Relief for the *persecuted*

---

[95] *Impartiall Protestant Mercury*, nos 27 (22 to 26 July 1681), 35 (19 to 23 August 1681) and 48 (4 to 7 October 1681). See also nos 28 (26 to 29 July 1681), 31 (5 to 9 August 1681), 32 (9 to 12 August 1681, 40 (6 to 9 September 1681), 41 (9 to 13 September 1681), 43 (16 to 20 September 1681) and Francis Smith's *Smith's Protestant Intelligence: Domestick and Foreign*, nos 13 (10 to 14 March 1681) and 17 (24 to 28 March 1681).

[96] See for instance, nos 55, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 68, from 13 July to 30 August 1681. Similar accounts had circulated in France at the height of the Popish Plot, see Orcibal, pp. 67–9. For Jurieu, on the contrary, the authorities were far too lenient against the Papists, see Jurieu, *Politique Clergé de France*, pp. 130–46 and *Derniers Efforts*, pp. 96–130.

[97] *London Gazette*, nos 1634 (14–18 July1681), 1637 (25–28 July 1681) and 1658 (6 to 10 October 1681). For the news in the *Gazette*, see Peter Fraser, *The Intelligence of the Secretaries of State and their Monopoly of Licensed News, 1600–1688* (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 28–34, 51–6.

French Protestants. And at the same time the Observator *Laughs* at their Sufferings, and will needs prove them all, but *Flea-bitings*'.[98]

The Observator was reluctant to publish reports of the events in France and certainly did not surrender to the sentimentality and hyperbole of the Whig pamphlets. On 29 July, Henry Care had indeed mocked the half-hearted reception of the French protestants: 'Pitty them! What sure you wo'nt turn Fool in your Old Age? Those *Hugenots* are *Presbyterians,* man! And *errant dissenters*'.[99] He then declared that the likes of L'Estrange were always reluctant to help 'a Traiterous Villain of a Calvinistical *hugenote*'.[100] The Tories were therefore caught in a double bind. On the one hand, the most lacrymose accounts of the persecutions had to be denounced as Whig exaggerations, if not downright forgeries that played upon fears of catholics; on the other, a public display of sympathy towards the persecuted French helped to manifest one's protestantism. When the earl of Halifax was accused, like L'Estrange, of being a Papist and a French pensioner, he wrote to his brother that 'I shall endeavour to *justify my Protestantship* by doing all that is in my power towards the encouragement of those that shall take sanctuary here out of France' (my emphasis).[101] In

---

[98] Care, *Weekly Pacquet*, 3.64 (26 August 1681); *Observator*, 1. 48. See *His Majesties Letters to the Bishop of London and the Lord Mayor* (1681). The letters are dated 22 July 1681. See Luttrell, vol. 1, p. 112–13, 125–6; A.P. Hands and Irene Scouloudi, *French Protestant Refugees Relieved through the Threadneedle Street Church, London, 1681–1687*, Huguenot Society of London, Quarto Series XLIX (London, 1971), pp. 1–3.

[99] Care, *Weekly Pacquet*, 3.60 (29 July 1681).

[100] Ibid., 4.2 (30 December 1681).

[101] See *Savile Correspondence*, ed. William Durrant Cooper (London: Camden Society, 1858), p. 212. On Savile's recommendations to welcome the Huguenots in England, see pp. 197–8, 209–10, 213–14, 236. Savile urged for a bill of naturalization but Charles opted for letters of denization in the absence of a parliament. See George B. Beeman, 'Notes on the City of London Records Dealing with the French Protestant Refugees, Especially with Reference to the Collections Made under Various Briefs', *PHS*, 7 (1901–04): 108–92; Nishikawa, pp. 24–9.

the same way, Pierre Jurieu thought that Charles's welcome of the Huguenots helped to '*justify himself* against unfair suspicions that some harboured about his religion.' (my emphasis).[102]

The English newsbooks differed widely from the Dutch gazettes, which, as Hans Bots has shown, refrained from picturing the *dragonnades* in too vivid terms, essentially for fear of making the situation worse for the Huguenots who had remained in France.[103] If such qualms did exist in England, they were rapidly stifled. The Whigs tried to exploit the French domestic situation by linking catholicism with absolutism and the persecution of the protestants; the Tories were playing up to Huguenot rivalries to secure the help of famous ministers in support of the Church of England.

In the last instance, L'Estrange's *Apology* has therefore to be read as a counterpoint to the *Observator*. The preface of the translation trumpeted an Huguenot–Anglican alliance, while the polemical paper tried to prevent the Whigs from exploiting and sensationalizing the French persecutions and using it as part of their anti-absolutist, anti-French rhetorics. So it is pleasing to discover that, in October, L'Estrange received welcome support from *Heraclitus Ridens* (whose main contributors were Edward Rawlins and Thomas Flatman) which went a step further and directly accused the Whigs of being responsible for the treatment of the Huguenots:

> The *French* King having heard of the actions of the 41 Whigs and their Principles of Rebelling, and cutting off Kings heads in order to a thorough Reformation; thought the *French* Protestants by their actions and writings utterly disowned the Principles ... yet the Jesuits possessing that great Monarch with the danger of

---

[102] Jurieu, *Derniers Efforts*, 'premier entretien', p. 41. My translation.

[103] Hans Bots, 'L'écho de la Révocation dans les Provinces-Unies à travers les gazettes et les pamphlets' in Zuber and Theis (eds), pp. 281–98.

> suffering them to grow numerous from the deplorable Tragedy acted by the English Whigs, who will needs claim kindred, and call the Gallican Protestants *Brethren.*[104]

For better or for worse, there is therefore little doubt that the plight of the Poitou Huguenots played a prominent role in the Whig–Tory propaganda of mid-1681, the Whigs trying to exploit the press with dramatic accounts of the *dragonnade* that eventually backfired when it was denounced as a political manipulation of the French suffering. L'Estrange's *Apology* and *Observator* need to be considered side by side as illustrations of the precarious relationships among Anglicans, nonconformists, the Huguenot episcopalians and non-episcopalians at the eve of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, while also alerting us to the role played by the French protestants in the literature of the Exclusion Crisis.

---

[104] *Heraclitus Ridens*, no. 39 (25 October 1681).