The Venetian Connection in early seventeenth-century England

Eloise Mary McGaun Davies
Peterhouse

September 2021

This thesis is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Preface

This thesis is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the preface and specified in the text. It is not substantially the same as any work that has already been submitted before for any degree or other qualification except as declared in the preface and specified in the text. It does not exceed the prescribed word limit for the relevant Degree Committee.

Abstract: The Venetian Connection in early seventeenth-century England

Eloise Davies

Two high-profile events called attention to the threat the Papacy posed to temporal authority in early seventeenth-century England: first the Gunpowder Plot (1605), in which Catholics attempted to blow up the English Parliament, including the king, and then, shortly afterwards, the Venetian Interdict controversy (1606–7), a dispute over papal objections to the autonomy of Venetian laws. The English Ambassador to Venice, Sir Henry Wotton (1568–1639), and his chaplain, William Bedell (1571–1642), saw these twin crises as an opportunity to further the cause of 'Reformation' in both countries. They cultivated close links with the leaders of the Venetian anti-papal party, including the celebrated theologian Paolo Sarpi and his close associate Fulgenzio Micanzio. These connections developed into a broader network which spread from London via Geneva and Paris.

This dissertation draws on printed and manuscript sources (including a number of new finds) to trace the strength and influence of this network in greater detail than any previous account. Drawing on a variety of intellectual traditions – including Roman Law, Reformed theology and Gallican polemic – the Anglo-Venetian network it identifies developed a distinctive view of politics, rooted in the absolute rule of a secular sovereign and a deep-seated fear of universal papal monarchy. Its members made a substantial contribution to European debate and remained influential at the English court into the 1620s. In contrast to the accounts offered by David Wootton and Vittorio Frajese, which emphasise Paolo Sarpi's heterodox religious views, this thesis argues that Bedell, Sarpi and Micanzio developed a shared project for religious reform, which emphasised conformity to a strong state Church and hostility to what they perceived as Jesuit and Arminian innovations.

The network's activities had lasting implications for political debate in England, Venice and Europe, furnishing later writers on Church-State relations and civil religion with valuable intellectual resources. The final section of the thesis accordingly offers some more speculative comments on the Venetian Connection's legacy down to the eighteenth century.

Acknowledgements

My greatest debt is to Richard Serjeantson, for the inexhaustible supply of help, ideas and encouragement. I am also extremely grateful to Filippo de Vivo and Alex Walsham, for examining my thesis with care and attentiveness, and to John Robertson, for advising me from the earliest stages, conducting my first-year assessment and suggesting my title. During my research, I have benefitted from the conversation and suggestions of a huge number of people, and owe particular debts to Gregorio Baldin, Alex Bamji, Gino Benzoni, Annabel Brett, Richard Bourke, Theo Dunkelgrün, Mark Goldie, Nick Hardy, Arnold Hunt, Shiru Lim, Kirsten Macfarlane, Simone Maghenzani, Alana Mailes, Scott Mandelbrote, Noah Millstone, Charles Moore, Carol Rutter, Magnus Ryan, Brendan Simms, Ben Slingo, Sophie Smith, Sylvana Tomaselli, Tim Twining, Ashley Walsh, David Whittaker and Sam Zeitlin.

It would be hard to overstate my immense gratitude to the Master, Fellows and Staff of Peterhouse: the College has been a marvellous place to live and work for the last eight years, and I am grateful to all who contributed to making my time there such a delight. Among these many, a very special tip of the hat to Gerald Meade, whose unexpected death occurred the day before my viva: thanks for everything and rest in peace, old friend. I also owe the College a more literal debt for its sustained financial generosity, covering the costs of intensive courses in Latin and Italian, and co-funding my PhD. I am equally grateful to my other PhD co-funder, the Cambridge Arts and Humanities Research Council, and would like to register my gratitude to the teachers and students of the Accademia Vivarium Novum in Frascati and the Istituto Venezia in Venice, without whom I would have struggled to acquire the necessary language skills. My research was also made possible by further grants from the History Faculty's Archbishop Cranmer Fund, the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation, and a Maddock Research Fellowship at Marsh's Library, Dublin.

I have profited from the diligence and expertise of innumerable archivists and librarians at many institutions across the UK and Europe, but would like to say a

specific thank-you to a few who truly went above and beyond: Ernesto Gomez and Jo Maddocks at the Bodleian; Helen Carron at Emmanuel College; Lucy Gwynn at Eton College; Marta Zoppetti at the Fondazione Giorgio Cini; Suzanne Bedell (for the discussion of her namesake) at the Irish National Archives; Jason McElligott and all the team at Marsh's Library; and Stephen Dart at St Edmundsbury Cathedral. During my research trips, I benefitted from the hospitality of several very kind hosts, especially Lord and Lady Waldegrave at Eton, and Carolyn and Michael Tonkin at Kew. I also thank Tamsin Prideaux, Anya Perse and Ines Ivić, and Anya Rai-Sharma and Jenny Rallens, for keeping me entertained in Venice and Oxford respectively.

Many thanks to all my friends in Cambridge and beyond, especially William Aslet, Tobias Cremer, Julius Grower, James Hughesman, Thomas Langley, Alicia Mavor, Daniel McKay and Harry Spillane, all of whom made essential contributions to maintaining my sanity in deepest, darkest lockdown. Thanks also to my parents, Richard and Sheena Davies, and sister, Issy Davies, for enduring all the seventeenth-century chat and proof-reading. Finally, thanks to Jack Yates, for – amongst other things – all 'my' excellent cooking.

Note on dates and transliteration

Years

Unless otherwise specified, I have adapted years to the modern style, with the year beginning on 1 January rather than 1 March (the first day of the year *more veneto*) or 25 March (Lady Day, the start of the year in England). I have also converted dates given according to the Roman Calendar (e.g. 'XII Kal. Mart.') to the appropriate Julian/Gregorian form.

In the first instance, dates are given according to local dating conventions: therefore, for sections of the dissertation discussing events in England, in Old Style; and for sections of the dissertation discussing events in Venice, in New Style. When discussing simultaneous developments or interactions between the two, the date is given in the form '[Old Style date]/[New Style date] Month Year' (e.g. 5/15 November 1605). Though a mixed system is not ideal, it seems preferable to any of the alternatives. Adopting either Old or New Style wholesale would involve presenting dates for well-known events in either England or Venice in a form which would not match other histories of the period. Equally, using the form '[Old Style date]/[New Style date] Month Year' throughout would be excessively cumbersome and unnatural: for instance, it would be strange to give Venetian dates for William Bedell's correspondence with Samuel Ward in 1601–7, before Bedell even went to Venice.

Names

Place names are given in the form most commonly used in English language writing. Personal names are given in the original language, unless an English or Latin form is widely used in Anglophone scholarship (i.e. Robert Bellarmine, not Roberto Bellarmino; Pope Paul V, not Pope Paolo V).

Spelling and punctuation

I have generally quoted spelling and punctuation as it appears in the original print and manuscript sources, with the exception of silently expanding common contractions and

regularising a few letters to reflect modern spelling: ‘i’ to ‘j’ and vice versa; ‘u’ to ‘v’ and vice versa; and ‘vv’ to ‘w’.

Translation

Translations are my own, unless otherwise stated.

Abbreviations

Archives and Libraries

ASV	Archivio di Stato, Venice
BL	British Library, London
Add.	Additional
Harl.	Harley
BM	British Museum, London
BMV	Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice
It.	Italiano
BnF	Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris
Bodl.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
Eng. th.	English theological
CUL	Cambridge University Library
Emmanuel	Emmanuel College Library, Cambridge
Eton	Eton College Library, Windsor
LPL	Lambeth Palace Library, London
Correr	Biblioteca del Museo Correr, Venice
ÖNB	Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna
TNA	The National Archives (Public Record Office) at Kew, London
SP	State Papers
NLI	National Library of Ireland, Dublin
QUB	Queen's University Belfast
Sidney Sussex	Muniments Room, Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge
TCC	Wren Library, Trinity College, Cambridge
TCD	Trinity College, Dublin

Printed Publications

CSEL	*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*
CSPD	*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth I and James I* (London, 1856–72),12 vols, eds. R Lemon (Vols 1–2) and M A E Green (Vols 3–12); or (as indicated) *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reign of Charles I* (London, 1858–97), 23 vols, eds. J. Bruce (Vols 1–13), W.D. Hamilton (Vols 13-23) and S.C. Lomas (Vol. 23)
CSPV	*Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice* (London, 1864-1947), 38 vols, eds. R. Brown (Vols 1–7), G. Cavendish Bentinck (Vol. 7) and H.F. Brown (Vols 7–12) and A.B. Hinds (Vols 13–38)
Lettere ai Gallicani	Paolo Sarpi, *Lettere ai Gallicani* (Wiesbaden, 1961), ed. B. Ulianich
Lettere ai Protestanti	Sarpi, Paolo, *Lettere ai Protestanti* (Bari, 1931), 2 vols, ed. M.D. Busnelli.
Lettres italiennes	Paolo Sarpi, *Lettres italiennes* (Paris, 2017), ed. M. Viallon
LPS	L.P. Smith (ed.), *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton* (Oxford, 1907), 2 vols
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, online edition [https://www.oxforddnb.com/]
Ripensando Sarpi	C. Pin (ed.), *Ripensando Paolo Sarpi: Atti del Convengo Internazionale di Studi nel 450° anniversario della nascita di Paolo Sarpi* (Venice, 2006)
Sarpi, *Opere*	Paolo Sarpi, *Opere* (Milan, 1969) eds. G. Cozzi and L. Cozzi
Two Biographies	E.S. Shuckburgh (ed.), *Two Biographies of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, with a Selection of his Letters and an Unpublished Treatise* (Oxford, 1902)

Other Abbreviations

BCP	Book of Common Prayer
c./cc.	Carta/carte
f./ ff.	Filza/filze
reg.	Registro
s.l.	Place of publication unknown (*sine loco*)

Contents Page

Introduction

The major political and social question of the first years of the seventeenth century was how Europe could avoid the outbreak of widespread interconfessional violence. In the wake of the Reformation, the sixteenth century had witnessed bloody religious warfare engulf the German lands and France. Religion had been a major contributing factor in the rebellion of the Dutch against their Spanish rulers. England and Spain too, had been in a longstanding state of conflict, most directly expressed through the attempted invasion of England by the Spanish Armada in 1588. With the conversion of the French King Henri IV to Catholicism (1593), and the signing of the Treaty of London (1604) between Spain and England, Europe could enjoy a few years of relative peace, although lower level-conflict recommenced from 1609. But the years 1618 to 1648 saw Europe descend once again into widespread violence, during the conflict now known as the Thirty Years War. The diplomatic efforts of the first two decades had ended in failure.

This dissertation traces a network of individuals in England and Venice who grappled with Europe's confessional difficulties at the start of the seventeenth century, and developed a distinctive solution to them. This Anglo-Venetian network coalesced around hostility to the papacy, whose claims they regarded as the greatest source of destabilisation. The Gunpowder Plot in England (November 1605) coincided with a dispute over the reach of Venetian law, which culminated in the Pope placing Venice under Interdict (banning the public celebration of religious rites) in April 1606. These two events were grouped together by contemporaries as proof of the tangible threat the Pope's overweening claims posed to secular rulers. The English Ambassador to Venice, Sir Henry Wotton, and his chaplain, William Bedell, saw these twin crises as an opportunity and exerted themselves to cultivate links with the leaders of the Venetian anti-papal party, including the increasingly high-profile theologian Paolo Sarpi and his close associate Fulgenzio Micanzio. They thereby formed a broader network with important consequences for European, and specifically for British, history.

This bout of Anglo-Venetian exchange is not an unknown episode. W.B. Patterson places it at the centre of King James VI & I's hopes for the reunion of

Christendom, and it is one of the examples of English relations with European Catholicism touched on by Anthony Milton.[1] Filippo de Vivo, Stefano Villani, Simone Maghenzani, Chiara Petrolini and Diego Pirillo have done particularly valuable work tracking the texts and ideas involved.[2] But no study has yet explored the full range of manuscripts, vernacular pamphlets and Latin treatises available to treat the network of individuals at the Jacobean court interested in Venice as a whole.

The closest we have to a network-based account of this sort is that of the Venetian historian Gaetano Cozzi, who noted back in 1956 that the Englishmen who became interested in Venice in this period tended to be on the Calvinist wing of the Church.[3] These were 'Calvinist', or better, 'Reformed' conformists of the ilk highlighted by Anthony Milton in his seminal study *Catholic and Reformed* (1995): that is to say, they conformed to the practices of the Church of England, while also maintaining strong sympathies for continental Protestant Reformers.[4] This grouping, which I am calling the 'Venetian Connection', continued to bring substantial influence to bear at Court until at least 1619, when some of its members oversaw the publication of Sarpi's *Historia del Concilio tridentino* in three languages in London. Sarpi's *Historia* was deeply critical of the Counter-Reformation papacy and soon became, and remained, one of the most celebrated anti-papal works of the seventeenth century. The Jacobean Venetian Connection developed a distinctive view of politics, rooted above all in a fear of universal papal monarchy. Drawing on a variety of intellectual resources – including Roman Law, Reformed theology and polemic within the Gallican Catholic

---

[1] W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 2000); A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed* (Cambridge, 1995).

[2] F. de Vivo, 'Francia e Inghilterra di fronte all'Interdetto di Venezia', in *Paolo Sarpi: Politique et religion en Europe*, ed. Marie Viallon (Paris, 2010), pp. 163-88; S. Villani, 'Uno scisma mancato: Paolo Sarpi, William Bedell e la prima traduzione in italiano del Book of Common Prayer', *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* 53 (2017), pp. 63-112; S. Maghenzani, 'Giochi di specchi: La Chiesa d'Inghilterra e Venezia tra Cinquecento e Seicento', *Ateneo Veneto* 25, (2018), pp. 67-76; D. Pirillo, *The Refugee-Diplomat: Venice, England, and the Reformation* (Ithaca, NY, 2018), pp. 142-166. J.L. Lievsay, *Venetian Phoenix: Paolo Sarpi and Some of His English Friends (1606-1700)* (Lawrence, KS, 1973) also remains useful for its list of Sarpi's works published in England but is weak on analysis.

[3] G. Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo e la *Historia del Concilio Tridentino'*, *Rivista Storica Italiana* 68 (1956).

[4] For the preferability of 'Reformed' to 'Calvinist', see S. Hampton, *Grace and Conformity: The Reformed Conformist Tradition and the Early Stuart Church of England* (Oxford, 2021), pp. 13–14.

church in France – they promoted a vision of inter-political relations based on unitary sovereign states, that left no conceptual space for the supranational claims of the Papacy.

This was a project which had substantial and lasting influence on understandings of the European political order. The question of what was at stake in the Anglo-Venetian interactions of the early seventeenth century is one that has been posed on numerous occasions, but which is still contested. It is a question linked to broader debates about the period, and in particular to the question of the aims of James VI & I. The most influential account of James's ambitions for Europe remains that of W.B. Patterson in his book *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (1997).[5] For Patterson, James was committed to the irenic ideal of reunion of the Church. A comparable story, but which placed particular emphasis on the significance of Venice for those hopeful for Church reunion was previously told by Enrico de Mas in his *Sovranità politica e unità cristiana nel seicento anglo-veneto* (1975), which painted various members of the Anglo-Venetian network as the forerunners of later seventeenth-century latitudinarianism.[6] However, De Mas's idea of 'latitudinarianism' is poorly defined and unhelpfully anachronistic, even leaving aside recent debate over the usefulness of the term later in the seventeenth century.[7] For De Mas, the 'Seicento anglo-veneto' was characterised by a latitudinarian impulse which looked 'to break down and overcome the blocs between which Europe and Christianity were at that time divided'.[8] Some figures in the Anglo-Venetian network – notably Marc'Antonio de Dominis, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Spalato until his controversial defection to the Church of England in 1616 – certainly aspired (at certain points) to be genuinely irenic thinkers, overcoming pre-existing political alliances.[9] The geopolitical vision of

---

[5] W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997).
[6] E. de Mas, *Sovranità politica e unità cristiana nel seicento anglo-veneto* (Ravenna, 1975).
[7] See especially discussion of the term throughout D. Levitin, *Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science: Histories of Philosophy in England, c. 1640-1700* (Cambridge, 2015), esp. pp. 15–19 and 542–5.
[8] 'di rottura e di superamento dei blocchi fra i quali era divisa allora l'Europa e la Christianità', De Mas, *Sovranità politica e unità cristiana*, p. 28.
[9] N. Malcolm, *De Dominis, 1560-1624: Venetian, Anglican, Ecumenist, and Relapsed Heretic* (London, 1984).

Sarpi, Micanzio and many of the most significant English figures discussed here, however, involved the creation of new, stronger blocs, rather than 'overcoming' such divisions, as De Mas would have us believe.

James made prominent use of the rhetoric of Church reunion, particularly in the early years of his reign. But, *pace* Patterson, it is doubtful how far his intentions can really be described as irenic. Observers at the time – including de Dominis, later in his career – accused James of calling for church reunion on terms which were only acceptable to Protestants, and thus not truly irenic at all. Historians of early seventeenth-century culture more broadly have become increasingly aware of how deeply entrenched confessional divisions were. The republic of letters, once seen as a forum for scholarly cooperation across confessional lines, often provided a new vehicle for confessional division, rather than an answer to it.[10] The question of what James was trying to do, however, is no more satisfactorily answered by seeing his efforts as driven purely by the goal of advancing the cause of Reform. James's foreign policy was never as confessional as some of his critics wanted it to be. James was always interested in alliances with Catholic powers, including the 'swing states' of Venice, Savoy and France, each of which shared some of England's suspicions of the papacy and of Spain. Aware that an alliance of Protestant powers alone was unlikely to triumph in a major European contest, James recognised that support from at least some anti-papal Catholics would be a necessity. The Anglo-Venetian Connection discussed here provided much of the intellectual impetus behind James's foreign policy when it was operating in this mode. While de Dominis was an outlier in the extent of his commitment to Church union, most members of the Venetian Connection, notably Sarpi, Micanzio and Bedell, were driven by a vision of multiple 'particular' churches which would, ideally, be national, with matters of Church government (things indifferent) decided by the sovereign.

Nor, however, can the interpretation offered here of this Venetian Connection be described as a 'Calvinist International', although the network was deeply influenced

[10] For an overview of this development, see N. Hardy, *Criticism and Confession: The Bible in the Seventeenth Century Republic of Letters* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 1–17.

by Calvinism.[11] It was rather an attempt to build a coalition of Erastian states – a coalition of polities, rather than something which overcame national boundaries. It aimed to 'deconfessionalise' controversy but did not think confessional variation between nations could or should be eliminated: the Anglo-Venetian network emphasised that many points disputed between confessions were up to particular churches to decide according to the wishes of the relevant temporal ruler. The Venetian Connection was fundamentally partisan, but along a papalist versus anti-papalist axis, rather than a Catholic versus Protestant one. The Pope's claims to possess temporal jurisdiction, the Venetian Connection contended, were incompatible with true Christianity. There was a true, spiritual Church at Rome, buried beneath these papal excesses, but in their view the continual attempts of the Pope to pry into temporal affairs was the major destabilising factor for European peace.

This vision of politics had implications both for the European political order and for domestic Church-State relations, opening up possibilities for trans-confessional leagues with Catholics who shared a suspicion of papal overreach, and emphasising the importance of temporal control over Church government. A full study of how the Venetian Connection brought their vision to bear at the Court of James VI & I, and beyond, therefore provides a felicitous and consequential window on to the shifting configuration of European politics in the early years of the seventeenth century.

I

A methodological question important to this study is the question of what constitutes a 'network' or an 'interest'. The idea of a 'Venetian Connection' raises the question of how far the group I shall identify was a cohesive unit. We might ask if its members identified as a group, and how clearly they defined a political programme. These are difficult questions to answer, and part of the ongoing debate about the appropriate terms to use when discussing political and religious divisions at the court of James VI & I

[11] Although some of the members of the connection certainly were members of the trans-national community of religious refugees discussed in O.P. Grell, *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, 2011).

more broadly. Before the 1620s (and perhaps even after), a simple division into Calvinists versus Arminians is no longer tenable, and a division into Anglicans and Puritans appears even more outdated. The use of 'anti-Calvinists' and 'avant-garde conformity' helps avoid pre-empting the tensions that encouraged the later Civil War, or of overemphasising attitudes to predestination; such figures can be opposed to 'Reformed conformists', who were less inclined to 'avant-garde' practices. As Anthony Milton has noted in a recent historiographical essay on this theme, however, too strict a division between two categories risks asserting another dialectical battle, in which both positions are treated as a monolith.[12]

Tracing networks has become a popular solution to this sort of conundrum in recent years. Practitioners of Social Network Analysis have explored the application of quantitative methods to intellectual groups, and there have been a number of online projects which aim to catalogue early modern networks of correspondence.[13] In the case of the Venetian Connection, quantitative methods do not seem particularly useful. This was a small knot of individuals, whose papers only survive in part, and about whom, therefore, there is no 'big data' to study. The research presented here is undertaken on a more specific and individual scale, using all identifiable evidence to trace the nature of connections. This is important to avoid the pitfall of assuming that because individuals were socially connected, they therefore shared ideological views. By using the term 'Venetian Connection', I do not want to risk propagating a false sense of cohesion. What I do want to emphasise, however, is the existence of an interconnected network of influential individuals who viewed England and Venice as states which should take a united stance against a perceived papal threat. Though they recognised that the Pope also threatened other European states, the members of this network were convinced that the cases of Venice and England were (and should be) the central *causes célèbres* on which a lasting anti-papal alliance could be build. Throughout this thesis, I have sometimes talked of 'Anglo-Venetian connections' (plural and not capitalised) to

[12] A. Milton, 'Arminians, Laudians, Anglicans, and Revisionists: Back to Which Drawing Board?', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 78 (2015), pp. 723-43.
[13] For discussion of these developments, see, for instance, J. Innes, '"Networks" in British History', *East Asian Journal of British History* 5 (2016), pp. 51–72.

denote interactions between England and Venice in general. But I have used the term 'Anglo-Venetian' or 'Venetian Connection' (singular and capitalised) when referring to the specific network of individuals in England, Venice and elsewhere who were brought into contact in the wake of the Gunpowder Plot and Interdict controversy, and who shared a preoccupation with the dangers of papal power. This was a distinctive 'interest' (in both the general and the political-typological sense of the word), which came to the fore at particular moments during the reigns of James VI & I and his son Charles.

The 'Venetian Connection' discussed here was not, therefore, a party, nor yet a friendship group, and it did not have any formal organisational structure. The individuals discussed often recognised in each other political allies, but they were connected only by loose and shifting bonds. Although their social circles intersected, these are not people who met regularly as a group. There were times when they collaborated (whether in person or by letter) in the production of particular texts and lines of argument, although the cast of contributors was always shifting. It is perhaps most useful to think about these interactions as constituting an anti-papal moment, in which the perceived temporal incursions of the papacy inspired similar responses in individuals in England and Venice, and indeed other locations, notably Paris and Geneva. United by a shared, but independently developed, set of concerns, members of this Venetian Connection were pleased to develop their ideas in exchanges with fellow intellectual travellers. They shared a fascination with – or horror of – particular events, most notably the Gunpowder Plot and the Interdict controversy, or with writings, especially those of Cardinal Bellarmine, which threw their pre-existing concerns about papal power into sharper relief. Discussing intellectual exchange in England and Venice in the early seventeenth century is not, then, a matter of analysing the 'influence' of Venice on England or England on Venice, but rather of exploring the way in which a coalition of like-minded individuals with the power to act could be built. The Venetian Connection formed around particular issues and questions, which came to the fore and receded at different moments. In this sense, the particular Reformed conformist anti-papal attitude which characterised the Venetian Connection might be seen as somewhat

akin to other polarities, such as the Court/Country one which intermittently came to the fore in later seventeenth-century England in response to events, such as the crown's refusal to disband the army in peacetime, or the intermittent returns to the rhetoric of Guelph versus Ghibelline in fifteenth-century Italy.[14]

The members of the Venetian Connection were a mixed group, united by a desire to fuse contemporary Reformed theology, anti-papal polemic and a theory of absolute sovereignty. Jacobean divine-right polemic has long been viewed (in certain quarters) as an unphilosophical poor relation of the philosophy of Thomas Hobbes, and a weak competitor to the 'more systematic' Aristotelian accounts of the origin of power offered by the thinkers of the Catholic second scholastic.[15] This dissertation will offer an alternative view, tracing the respectable intellectual hinterland which underpinned Stuart absolutism, and placing the positions of King James and other advocates of absolutist views within a broader European context.

On a different point, one of the historiographical aims of this study is to reassert the importance of short manuscript texts, polemical pamphlets and correspondence for the study of the history of political thought.[16] Rather than focussing on 'great books', it is important to see how ideas were applied in practice, a process which was often piecemeal and opportunistic. Rather than seeing these writings as of less value because of their lack of systematic content, I view these documents as offering particular insights into the process by which moral conviction could be converted into political action. Most members of the Anglo-Venetian network have not traditionally been central objects of study for historians of political thought, and in particular, my account gives greater prominence to religious polemicists. This is part of an ongoing process of recognising the deeply religious underpinnings of political ideas in the early modern

---

[14] See D.W. Hayton, 'The "Country" Interest and the party system', in *Party and Management in Parliament, 1660-1784* (Leicester, 1984), C. Jones (ed.), pp. 37-85, esp. p. 65. The suggestion of applying this model to Jacobean religion is made in Milton, 'Arminians, Laudians, Anglicans', p. 740. For discussion of Guelphism as an 'ideological constellation', see S. Ferente, 'Guelphs! Factions, Liberty and Sovereignty: Inquiries about the Quattrocento', *History of Political Thought* 28 (2007), pp. 571–98.

[15] For a useful discussion of this tendency, see B. Slingo, 'Civil Power and the Deconstruction of Scholasticism in the Thought of Marc'Antonio de Dominis', *History of European Ideas* 41 (2015), esp. pp. 507–11.

[16] Here I build on work such as N. Millstone, 'Seeing like a Statesman in early Stuart England', *Past & Present* 223 (2014), esp. p. 85.

period.[17] It has increasingly been recognised that seventeenth-century political writings cannot be understood without reference to their religious as well as their political content. Even the most apparently philosophically arcane disputes expressed deep-seated confessional disagreement. However, one can still find a driving assumption that disputes between Church and State were a 'medieval' aspect of seventeenth century thinking, and debate over the relationship between spiritual and temporal power often remained side-lined in histories of early modern political thought. This tendency is particularly visible in Jaska Kainulainen's recent intellectual biography of Paolo Sarpi. Kainulainen rightly challenges accounts of Sarpi's thought which perceive him as a fundamentally 'modern' and secularising figure (most obviously, that of David Wootton). However, he goes too far in the opposite direction with the claim that the 'quintessence of Sarpi's worldview remained medieval'.[18] It is true that the disputes between Venice and the papacy were a continuation of earlier debates between spiritual and temporal powers. But it must be recognised that these debates were no throwback: they played an important constitutive – perhaps even determining – role in discussion of the early modern state. Debates over Church-State relations have not garnered as much attention as those over the nature and limits of royal power – but they are arguably even more important in helping us understand the working of the state in seventeenth-century Europe. One important goal of this dissertation is to evidence and emphasise this point in detail.

The members of the Venetian Connection developed various accommodations between Calvinist theology and an 'absolute' conception of sovereignty. Thus, they might be labelled 'Calvinist', or perhaps better, 'Reformed', absolutists. They constitute an often-overlooked counterpoint to the well-established association between

[17] Important studies in this vein include Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*; J. Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 2011), amongst many others.
[18] J. Kainulainen, *Paolo Sarpi: A Servant of God and State* (Leiden, 2014), esp. p. 7.

Calvinism and theories of political resistance.[19] In the hands of the people studied here, Reformed theology, anti-papal polemic and absolute sovereignty became natural allies.

II

Venice has long held a privileged position in histories of seventeenth-century political thought. The 'mito di Venezia', emphasising the longevity and stability of the Venetian constitution and citing the compatibility of Venetian institutions with Aristotelian and Polybian ideals, had deep Renaissance roots, largely born out of comparisons between tumultuous Florence and the apparently serene Venetian Republic.[20] As a republic amidst a Europe full of royal and princely states, Venice became an important example of a mixed constitution, testifying to the possibility of that ideal being enacted in practice.

It has long been recognised that the Venetian constitution was a source of particular fascination in England. Interest in Venice's constitutional structures can be found at the court of Henry VIII and was amplified by the publication of Lewes Lewkenor's English translation of Gasparo Contarini's *Commonwealth and Government of Venice* (originally published in Latin in 1543) in London in 1599.[21] As Zera Fink noted back in the 1940s, admiration for Venetian political arrangements was widespread in England from the middle of the sixteenth century through to at least the time of the Restoration, playing a significant role in the writings of figures such as James Howell, John Milton and James Harrington.[22]

---

[19] For a reassessment of this tradition, see M. Van Gelderen, '"So meerly humane": Theories of Resistance in Early Modern Europe', in *Rethinking the Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, eds. H.H. Bleakley and A. Brett (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 149–70.

[20] J.G.A. Pocock, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, 1975), esp. pp. 272-330.

[21] Gasparo Contarini, *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice* (London, 1599), trans. Lewes Lewkenor. For the original Latin see Gasparo Contarini, *De Magistratibus et Republica Venetorum* (Paris, 1543).

[22] For Henry VIII's court, see Thomas Mayer's work on Thomas Starkey, e.g. T.F. Mayer, 'Thomas Starkey's Aristocratic Reform Programme', *History of Political Thought* 7 (1986), pp. 439-461; T.F. Mayer, *Thomas Starkey and the Commonwealth: Humanist Politics and Religion in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Cambridge, 2009). Fink first made this case in Z.S. Fink, 'Venice and English Political Thought in the Seventeenth Century', *Modern Philology* 38 (1940), pp. 155-172. He later extended his thesis into *The Classical Republicans: An Essay in the Recovery of a Pattern of Thought in Seventeenth-Century England* (Evanston, 1945).

However, it was not just Venice's status as a model for mixed government which appealed to the English. Indeed, the best-known Venetian author published in England in the seventeenth century, Paolo Sarpi (1552–1623), did not describe Venice's constitution as mixed at all; instead, like Jean Bodin, he viewed the *Repubblica* as an aristocracy, possessed of absolute sovereignty. As more recent scholarship has noted, William Bouwsma was therefore wrong to make his well-known account of the Venetian Interdict controversy all about republicanism.[23] Sarpi was a republican not in the sense of being anti-monarchical, nor in the sense of emphasising the need for political participation. He argued for self-government, without impingements from the papacy; his vision, as we shall see, could support monarchical and aristocratic government even better than it could a more democratic sort.

Any study that considers the figure of Paolo Sarpi, as this one does, must grapple with the vexed question of his religious beliefs.[24] The charge of atheism was a commonplace of papal polemic against Sarpi in the Servite's own lifetime, and his apparent unorthodoxy has been a source of fascination to historians since. The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries saw some attempts to reclaim Sarpi as orthodox, and since the middle of the twentieth century Sarpi's views have been the object of much sustained analysis. The work of Gaetano Cozzi and Boris Ulianich highlighted Sarpi's connections with and interest in Protestant writers.[25] The work of David Wootton and Vittorio Frajese pushed interpretation of Sarpi's religious beliefs even further by suggesting that the Servite's theology was heterodox and sceptical,

---

[23] W. Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty: Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation* (Berkeley, 1968). Despite placing 'republicanism' at the centre of his analysis, Bouwsma does recognise that Sarpi's thought had a strong Bodinian component, see esp. pp. 436–40. Recent scholarship critiquing Bouwsma's account includes G. Baldin, 'Hobbes and Sarpi: Method, Matter and Natural Philosophy', *Galilaeana* 10 (2013), pp. 85–118; Kainulainen, *Paolo Sarpi*; Chiara Petrolini, 'Paolo Sarpi e l'Inghilterra di Giacomo I: Tra aspettative e disincanto' (unpublished PhD thesis, Florence/Pisa, 2007).

[24] Useful overviews of this debate include G. Trebbi, 'Paolo Sarpi in alcune recenti interpretazioni', in *Ripensando Paolo Sarpi: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi nel 450º anniversario della nascita di Paolo Sarpi* (Venice, 2006), ed. C. Pin, pp. 664-9; G. Baldin, 'Irenista, calvinista, scettico, o ateo nascosto? Il dibattito', *Etica & Politica* 20 (2018), pp. 121-61.

[25] This trend began with a pair of articles printed in the *Rivista Storica Italiana* in 1956: G. Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo e la Historia del Concilio Tridentino', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 68 (1956), pp. 559–619; B. Ulianich, 'La lettera di Sarpi allo Heinsius', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 68 (1956), pp. 425-56.

perhaps even atheist.[26] These studies opened up a rich seam of scholarship which explored Sarpi's influence as a part of a broader sceptical tradition. Viewed in this way, Sarpi has also been labelled a Tacitean humanist, interested in a *politique* politics of the court.[27]

While these developments have been fruitful, this 'sceptical turn' in Sarpi's studies has often focussed on his private views, and on writings which were not published (or even distributed in manuscript) until after his death. This emphasis on his personal theology rather than his public ecclesiology has obscured the extent to which he closely engaged with – and, I would argue, promoted – a specifically Jacobean vision of civil religion. This thesis will not pursue the question of whether or not Sarpi should be described as an 'atheist'. Instead, it will focus on Sarpi's views on public religion. I will argue that from the writings Sarpi shared in his lifetime (with allies or with a broader public) it is clear that he advocated 'civil religion' as a social good. This was not civil religion in an anti-Christian sense, like that which might be attributed to Machiavelli, or was later upheld by Rousseau, and which is sometimes still misleadingly treated as the term's only possible signification in modern works of political theory.[28] Sarpi's understanding of civil religion was not merely negative in intent, trying to subtract the religious from the political. In fact, he advocated a particular vision of state religion, which was rooted in Christian theology and his interpretation of the early Church.[29]

Sarpi did aim to distinguish the strictly spiritual sphere of religious belief from the sphere of civil government. But this did not mean a temporal ruler had no religious role. In fact, for Sarpi, external matters of religion (including ceremonies, the ecclesiastical structure and control over Church property) were all civil matters, which

---

[26] D. Wootton, *Paolo Sarpi: Between Renaissance and Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983); V. Frajese, *Sarpi scettico: Stato e Chiesa a Venezia tra Cinque e Seicento* (Bologna, 1994). Frajese holds back from the label atheist, while emphasising Sarpi's place in the sceptical tradition.
[27] Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government 1572–1651* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 94–104.
[28] For a recent discussion critical of this tendency, see A. Walsh, *Civil Religion and the Enlightenment in England, 1707-1800* (Woodbridge, 2020), esp. pp. 1–5.
[29] Here I broadly agree with Boris Ulianich's interpretation as laid out in his 'Paolo Sarpi "Riformatore", "irenico"? Note sulla sua ecclesiologia, sulla sua theologia, sulla sua religione', in *Fra Paolo Sarpi dei Servi di Maria: atti convegno di studio, Venezia, 28-29-30 ottobre 1983* (Venice, 1986), eds. P. Branchesi and C. Pin, pp. 49–100.

fell under temporal ruler's sphere of authority. His public writings aimed to separate this public, civil religion from the spiritual, internal religion, which was between the individual and God and had little relevance to politics. Importantly, Sarpi's view that ecclesiology was a matter for the sovereign complemented (rather than contradicted) his belief that theology was a matter for individuals to work out between themselves and God. The Venetian Connection's stance on the relationship between Church and State can thus be viewed within a longer history of the Royal Supremacy in England. The ecclesiological stance of men like William Bedell, who will play an important role in this dissertation, hewn from the rough stone of earlier Henrician and Elizabethan defences of the Royal Supremacy, was a position closer to that of Sarpi than has often been assumed.[30]

Independence from papal interference for one nation did not mean independence for that nation alone: this goal of independence was, in the words of Isaac Casaubon, the 'cause of all princes in common'.[31] Anti-Catholicism has long been noted as a significant contributor to the development of English nationhood.[32] But it is worth noting that the anti-papal political thought discussed here was by no means just English, nor even British. It grew out of dynamic interactions between England and Venice. The vision of church-state relations discussed here is not, then, a story of British exceptionalism, but rather a story of a plural system of states and of ideas being developed in tandem in different European contexts. It was a vision which defined itself against the Papacy and in favour of a new balance of Church and State, but which was expected to be applied differently according to the particular circumstances of individual states.

The arguments of the Venetian Connection specifically addressed the idea of a state system, and its members paid particular attention to theories of sovereignty and the law of nations, which they developed into tools for denying the Pope any temporal

---

[30] Thus adding a new international significance to the arguments of Rose, *Godly Kingship*.

[31] 'Omnium principum communis haec causa est', [Isaac Casaubon], *De Libertate Ecclesiastica liber singularis* ([Paris], 1607), pp. 16–17.

[32] See, in particular, the work of Linda Colley, especially *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837* (New Haven, CT, 1992), esp. pp. 11–54; and 'Britishness and Otherness: An Argument', *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992), pp. 309-29.

jurisdiction. Recent scholarship has noted that the Reformation precipitated new interpretations of geopolitical relations, in which 'princely sovereignty', which 'implied the supreme authority of princes when acting within or beyond the realm', replaced 'older notions of a hierarchy that bound the whole world together'.[33] The activities of the Venetian Connection were instrumental in developing and promoting this world view. It is my goal here to trace their role and establish its significance.

III

The subject of this thesis is inherently transnational. This is one of the reasons that a study of the Anglo-Venetian network is valuable: it provides an opportunity to broaden out the sometimes insular tendencies of British political and ecclesiastical histories, or of histories of Venice. However, transnational history – which has too often been vaguely and variously defined – also entails substantial practical and methodological challenges. Notable criticisms of transnational history include the contention that 'national' is an anachronistic term in the seventeenth century, as well as concerns that by prioritising connections across borders, it paves a teleological path towards globalisation.[34] Critics have also noted that truly 'transnational' history requires more than a study of the connections between two places, a criticism which is immediately relevant to this study, with its dual focus on England and Venice. It is my ambition here to avoid writing a history which is merely 'bilateral', or one which is driven by an excessive focus on establishing the 'influence' of Venice on England or vice versa.

Taking the broader criticisms of transnational history first, it should be noted that the 'nations' discussed here are not nations in the sense that would come to the fore with nineteenth-century ethno-nationalism. However, they are 'nations' in the sense expressed by the Latin phrase *ius gentium* ('law of nations', or 'of peoples', in a more

---

[33] D. Grant, 'Francisco de Vitoria and Alberico Gentili on the Juridical Status of Native American Polities', *Renaissance Quarterly* 72 (2019), p. 911.

[34] For instance, H.-G. Haupt, 'A New Sensitivity: The "Transnational" Perspective - A Critical Review', *Cahiers Jaurès* 200 (2011), pp. 173–80. See also the interesting discussion between C.A. Bayly et. al. in 'AHR Conversation: On Transnational History', *The American Historical Review* 111 (2006), pp. 1441-64.

literal rendering). The ideal of independent states was an essential part of the Venetian Connection's worldview. This was a transnational exchange which crossed borders, but did not seek to make them obsolete. The question of how to write transnational history which is not merely bilateral or influence-driven is a more difficult one, requiring close attention to the differences between the Venetian and English contexts, and noting a wider web of connections, in this case especially to Paris and Geneva, which also shaped these interactions. It is also important to remember that this need not always be a story of 'influence': it can also be a story of people in both England and Venice becoming interested in the same problems and independently coming up with some of the same solutions. The phenomenon known in the history of science as 'mutual discovery' can also apply in the history of ideas, and the interactions of between England and Venice in this period are characterised by intellectual congruence as well as by intellectual transfer.

This dissertation utilises a range of printed and manuscript sources to flesh out existing accounts of the Venetian Connection. Contrary to assumptions that Anglo-Venetian relations have been the subject of comprehensive study, a significant portion of this material has not previously been discussed by historians. Scholarship on William Bedell, who emerges from this study as an integrating figure, has been particularly patchy. Accounts of Bedell's engagement with Venice have hitherto relied heavily on two long letters he sent to Adam Newton, the tutor to Henry, Prince of Wales, while he was in Venice, and on his printed works. The two letters to Newton were printed as part of a volume containing a selection of Bedell's surviving correspondence, a short treatise on the doctrine of grace, and two seventeenth-century biographies, edited by E.S. Shuckburgh and printed under the title *Two Biographies of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore* in 1902. The text is offered with very little by way of scholarly apparatus and the attempt to list Bedell's print and manuscript works only contains a fragment of the surviving material.[35] The slightly earlier 1872 edition of one of the seventeenth-century biographies (that of Bedell's son, also William), *A True Relation of the Life and Death of the Right Reverend Father in God William Bedell, Lord Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland*,

[35] See *Two Biographies*, pp. xix–xx.

edited by Thomas Wharton Jones, also contains Jones's own 'Life' of Bedell, which is often more reliable and complete than Shuckburgh's, though its strengths lie in Jones's use of Suffolk parish records and printed editions of Bedell's works, rather than Bedell's Venetian activities.[36]

Most accounts of Bedell's life since have been for the most part hagiographical, with little by way of new interpretations.[37] Essays by Marc Caball and John McCafferty stand out as the fullest modern accounts of Bedell's career as a whole, while Stefano Villani has gone the furthest in uncovering the full extent of Bedell's activities in Venice.[38] All of these works, however, rely too heavily on the *Two Biographies*, and consequently miss a large portion of the manuscript evidence for Bedell's activities. During my research, I have endeavoured to stick as closely as possible to Bedell's original manuscripts. A careful reading of Bedell's letters in manuscript form alongside the printed editions has conferred a number of benefits. Firstly, it allowed me to identify several transcription errors, often relatively minor, but which nonetheless allowed me to clarify connections and identify overlooked references.[39] More important than these corrections, however, is the sense I have been able to gain of Bedell's papers as a whole. Getting to grips with Bedell's handwriting, style and networks has allowed me to go beyond the work done by Shuckburgh and others by locating a number of previously overlooked Bedell manuscripts and offering new attributions for some of the known

---

[36] T.W. Jones (ed.), *A True Relation of the Life and Death of the Right Reverend Father in God William Bedell, Lord Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland* (London, 1872).

[37] W. Gamble, *William Bedell: His Life and Times* (London, 1951); G. Rupp, *William Bedell 1571–1642: A Commemorative Lecture given in the Old Library, Emmanuel College on 1 December 1971* (Cambridge, 1972); A. Clarke, 'Bishop William Bedell (1571–1642) and the Irish Reformation', in *Worsted in the game: losers in Irish history*, ed. C. Brady (Dublin, 1989); K.S. Bottigheimer, 'The Hagiography of William Bedell', in *'A miracle of learning': studies in manuscripts and Irish learning* (Aldershot, 1998), eds. T.C. Barnard, D. Ó Cróinín and K. Simms, pp. 201-20; T. McCaughey, *Dr Bedell and Mr King: the making of the Irish Bible* (Dublin, 2001); K.S. Bottigheimer and V. Larminie, 'Bedell, William (bap. 1572, d. 1642)', *ODNB*.

[38] J. McCafferty, 'Venice in Cavan: the career of William Bedell, 1572-1642', in *Culture and Society in Early Modern Breifne/Cavan* (Dublin, 2009), ed. B. Scott, pp. 173–87; M. Caball, '"Solid divine and worthy scholar": William Bedell, Venice and Gaelic culture' in *Irish and English: essays on the Irish linguistic and cultural frontier, 1600–1900*, eds. James Kelly and Ciarán Mac Murchaidh (Dublin, 2012), pp. 43–57; Villani, 'Uno scisma'.

[39] To take one example, Shuckburgh's transcription error of 'Jorkin' for Lorkin has obscured the role of Thomas Lorkin, a longstanding helper and informant of Ward and Bedell. See below, p. 233 n. 94.

material.[40] Thus, during my research, I have been able to put together a much fuller list of Bedell's surviving writings, which I have included in its own separate bibliography at the end of this dissertation. I draw on a number of these neglected manuscript works throughout this study. The first major manuscript work by Bedell that is analysed here is a text entitled (in surviving copies) 'A Defence of the Answer to Mr. Alabaster's Four Demands', a lengthy treatise which has received little scholarly attention.[41] The second is a short treatise on true religion dedicated to Lady Anne Drury, and preserved in Dublin at the National Library of Ireland.[42] I have also been able to identify a number of other valuable manuscript pieces which can be attributed to Bedell which shed light on his political and religious preoccupations, and on his role in a broader Anglo-Venetian project.[43] Close attention to Bedell's manuscripts has allowed me to both confirm and expand our knowledge of his central role in the exchange of ideas and information between England and Venice. The process has also been revealing of Bedell's own intellectual world, furnishing a remarkable case study in the priorities, challenges, and experiences of a Reformed conformist clergyman in the early Stuart era.

Neglected manuscript material also offers new insights into the role of other members of Bedell's circles in the broader Anglo-Venetian network. The papers of Adam Newton and of the first Earl of Salisbury reveal the extent to which those

---

[40] See, for instance, my attribution of [William Bedell], Latin annotations on the Rules of the Jesuits, [1607], TCC, MS R.10.9, fols. 53r–8r, discussed below, p. 233. Tracing these notes, which are briefly mentioned in Bedell's letters to Ward, required a knowledge of where papers sent by Bedell to England were likely to be preserved and familiarity with Bedell's handwriting. Similarly, I have been able to more confidently attribute and explain the significance of other manuscripts, including: [William Bedell], 'A weyghty deliberation… Touching Ceremonyes', [1604], Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 922, fols. 1r–5v and BL, Add MS 38492, fols. 18r-23v; William Bedell, [A view of religion], NLI, MS 471; 'MS. Sermons of Bishop Bedell', QUB, MS 128.

[41] William Bedell, 'A Defence of the Answer to Mr. Alabaster's Four Demands, against a treatise, intituled The Catholic's Reply upon Bedell's Answer to Mr. Alabaster's four Demands', LPL, MS 772, as well as other manuscript copies, discussed in more detail in Chapter 2 and Appendix I. Anthony Milton makes use of this some sections of this work in his *Catholic and Reformed*, but there has never been a full treatment of it.

[42] William Bedell, [A view of religion], NLI, MS 471. I am not aware of any previous scholarly discussions of this manuscript work.

[43] Of particular interest are several papers in Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 922; and William Bedell, 'MS. Sermons of Bishop Bedell', QUB, MS 128. I not aware of any previous discussions of this manuscript by historians either.

responsible for the education of Henry, Prince of Wales, encouraged the heir to the throne to take an interest in Venetian affairs.[44] The letters of Samuel Ward, the long-serving Master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, and Bedell's lifelong friend, are also of particular value.[45] Preserved at his various locations in his college, Ward's papers lay disordered and neglected until the rediscovery of some of them in the Master's Lodge in the 1940s and some others in a cupboard in the Taylor Library in around 1970.[46] Since a catalogue by Margo Todd was published in 1985, these papers have at last become more accessible, but their significance as sources for Anglo-Venetian relations has yet to be recognised.[47] In fact, Ward's draft letters to Bedell and other correspondents paint a detailed picture of the polemical impact of the Venetian Interdict controversy in England, and of the anti-papal activities of the Jacobean Court. Manuscript material relating to the Venetian Connection's activities held in the archives of Venice are better known and have been studied to great effect. However, by drawing on new information from British and Irish sources, I will also offer fresh interpretations of well-known Venetian printed and manuscript works, including Fulgenzio Micanzio's voluminous papers at the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana in Venice and Sarpi's additions to the Italian translation of Edwin Sandys's *Relation of the State of Religion* that was eventually published in Geneva in 1625.[48]

Yet it is also important to stress how much material of relevance to the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian network has been lost. On the Venetian end, Paolo Sarpi, Fulgenzio Micanzio and other leading anti-papal Venetians were careful to destroy any correspondences that could have been incriminating, so we have only one side of their correspondence. Sir Henry Wotton does not seem to have kept correspondence sent to him either, although letters sent to his successor Sir Dudley Carleton have a better

---

[44] The sources for these networks are discussed in Chapter 4.
[45] Particularly notable is Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I.
[46] For the curious history of the collection, see M. Todd, 'The Samuel Ward Papers at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 8 (1985), esp. pp. 582–3 and 591 note 6.
[47] Ibid.
[48] BMV, MS It. XI, 174 [= 6517]; MS It. XI, 175 [= 6518]; Edwin Sandys, *Relatione dello stato della religione, e con quali dissegni et arti ella è stata fabricata e maneggiata in diversi stati di queste occidentali parti del mondo* ([Geneva], 1625), [trans. William Bedell, with additions by Paolo Sarpi].

survival rate. If William Bedell kept any copies of the correspondence he received, then they will have been lost, like most of his other papers, during the Irish Rebellion of 1641. Though Bedell was not killed during the course of the Rebellion itself and received relatively favourable treatment at the hands of the Irish, he was moved out of the episcopal palace at Kilmore and died of illness soon after. Bedell's three-volume Hebrew Bible, purchased in Venice, and the surviving manuscript copies of the first Irish translation of the Old Testament, produced by the Irish Protestant convert Murtagh King (Muircheartach Ó Cionga) and his assistant James Nangle (Séamus de Nógla) under Bedell's aegis in around 1630, are said to have survived only 'by the care of' Bedell's friend Denis Sheridan (an ancestor of the playwright Richard Brinsley Sheridan).[49] Another important manuscript which survived the fallout of the rebellion and reached its intended recipient was the rare and valuable eleventh-century Welsh illuminated manuscript psalter, decorated in the Irish style and known today as the Ricemarch Psalter.[50] Bedell bequeathed this manuscript to James Ussher, archbishop of Armagh, in his will, who in turn donated it to Trinity College Dublin, where it remains today.[51] The rest of Bedell's papers are variously reported as having been lost in a fire at the episcopal palace in Kilmore or seized and dispersed by the rebels and even returning English soldiers.[52] Despite this dispersal and possible destruction, further Bedell papers may well be chanced upon at a later date, especially in Irish archives. In the biography of Bedell written by his son, also William, the author

[49] Emmanuel, MS I.I.5–7, Bedell's Biblia Hebraica; Marsh's Library, Dublin, Marsh Z4.2.3(a–b), 'All the Canonical Bookes of the Old Testament, translated out of Hebrew into the Irish tongue, by the procurement of Doctor Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore', 2 vols; CUL, MS Dd.9.7, [Irish Old Testament: Prophets and Apocrypha]; quote from William Bedell (son), 'Life and Death of William Bedell, in *Two Biographies*, p. 70; see also Jones, *A True Relation*, pp. 187–8.

[50] For a detailed study and reproduction of this manuscript, which remains an important source for eleventh-century British history, see H.J. Lawlor, *The Psalter and Martyrology of Ricemarch* (London, 1914), 2 vols.

[51] TCD, MS 50, Ricemarch Psalter, which contains the autograph signature 'G. Bedelli' on fol. 2. For Bedell's will, see Jones, *A True Relation*, p. 193.

[52] The fire is mentioned in a note later added at the front of Marsh Z4.2.3(a), which asserts Bedell's manuscript Hebrew and Irish Bibles were 'rescued from a fire in the Episcopal Palace at Kilmore by Rev. Denis Sheridan in 1641–42 when the Bishop was arrested'. However, the biography of Bedell by William Bedell (son) merely talks of the papers not saved by Sheridan being 'taken away by friars and by priests' and later as 'booty to the English souldiers', while Bedell's son in law, Alexander Clogie writes, '[Bedell's] library, which was of greatest value of all his good, the rebels had with all the rest', see Bedell (son) and Clogie, in *Two Biographies*, pp. 70–1 and p. 207.

suggests darkly that a number of Bedell's sermons were appropriated by others, who delivered them as their own:

> The bishop's books went every way but the right; and some of his sermons were preach'd in Dublin, and heard there by some of Bishop Bedell's near relations that had formerly heard them by their own mouth: and some of the episcopal order were not innocent in this case; and 'tis more than probable that some of them are still beholding to Bishop Bedell's papers, that never would own his righteous cause when alive.[53]

This might have been written off as a flattering myth, but the existence of the volume of Bedell's sermons in Queen's University Belfast, which features various dates from the 1640s added in the margins, suggests that there may be some truth in the account of sermon borrowing. These dates (e.g. 'Jan 10th 1646)' refer to points after Bedell's death in 1642.[54] Other papers that survive in the Rawlinson collection in the Bodleian Library were preserved thanks to Bedell's son in law Alexander Clogie. Several later-seventeenth century bishops took an interest in procuring and preserving works related to Bedell: William Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury (1678–90) and non-juror, collected those of Bedell's papers and letters now preserved in the Bodleian's Tanner and Rawlinson collections, and in Lambeth Palace Library; Gilbert Burnet, bishop of Sarum (1689–1715), asked Bedell's son in law Alexander Clogie for information he included in his own *Life* of Bedell (1685); Thomas Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury (1694–1715), owned a manuscript copy of 'A Defence of the Answer to Mr. Alablaster's [sic] Four Demands', also preserved at Lambeth Palace; and Narcissus Marsh, archbishop of Armagh (1703–13), worked with the scientist Robert Boyle to secure copies of Bedell's manuscript Irish Old Testament and had it printed in 1685. Despite these survivals, the extant Bedell archive represents only a fraction of the papers that existed in his lifetime.

---

[53] William Bedell (son), 'Life and Death of William Bedell', Bodl., Tanner MS 278, fol. 47v; *Two Biographies*, p. 71.
[54] William Bedell, 'MS. Sermons of Bishop Bedell', QUB, MS 128, unfoliated.

An equally unhappy fate befell a substantial proportion of Sarpi's surviving papers, which were held in the library of the monastery of Santa Maria dei Servi until they were destroyed by a fire in 1769.[55] Despite these losses, the last century has seen a remarkable number of Sarpian manuscripts rediscovered and edited. This wave of new findings started with Gaetano Cozzi's recovery of a variety of unpublished notes (*pensieri*) written by Sarpi, which he published in his and Luisa Cozzi's 1969 edition of Sarpi's works.[56] It has been continued most recently by the chance discovery of a draft of the first three chapters of Sarpi's unfinished treatise on the powers of princes, 'Della potestà de' prencipi' (c. 1611), and by a number of new additions to our knowledge of Sarpi's extant correspondence.[57] Another important development is the painstaking and ongoing work of Corrado Pin on his multi-volume printed edition of Sarpi's *consulti* (statements of advice) to the Venetian government, which has given historians of Sarpi access to a more nuanced picture of how his theoretical writings and political activities interacted.[58] The work of Pin and that of the French scholar Marie Viallon, who has edited an important critical edition of Sarpi's Italian correspondence, now offer the gold standard for the dating of Sarpi's writings and activities during the crucial post-Interdict period.[59] My account will draw on this important work, as well as

[55] The losses included five volumes of (at least partly) autograph material collected by Sarpi's eighteenth-century biographer Giuseppe Giacinto Bergantini. See Paolo Sarpi, *Consulti (1606–1609)* (Pisa, 2001), ed. C. Pin, Vol. 1, Part 1, p. 123–4, esp. n. 2.

[56] A complete edition of the 'Pensieri', including those known about before Cozzi's additions, has since been published as Paolo Sarpi, *Pensieri naturali, metafisici e matematici,* ed. L. Cozzi and L. Sosio (Milan, 1996); see also L. Cozzi, 'I *Pensieri* di fra Paolo Sarpi', in *Fra Paolo Sarpi dei Servi di Maria: atti convegno di studio, Venezia, 28-29-30 ottobre 1983* (Venice, 1986), eds. P. Branchesi and C. Pin, pp. 131–51; L. Cozzi, 'La tradizione settecentesca dei *Pensieri* Sarpiana', *Studi Veneziani* 13 (1971), pp. 393–448.

[57] Paolo Sarpi, *Della potestà de' prencipi* (Venice, 2006), ed. N. Cannizzaro, with an essay by C. Pin; recent additions to Sarpi's correspondence include a new letter to Isaac Casaubon, published in N. Hardy, 'Religion and Politics in the Composition and Reception of Baronius's *Annales Ecclesiastici*: A New Letter from Paolo Sarpi to Isaac Casaubon', in *For the Sake of Learning: Essays in honor of Anthony Grafton* (Leiden, 2016), eds. A. Blair and A.-S. Goeing, pp. 34–8; and several printed for the first time in Paolo Sarpi, *Lettres Italiennes* (Paris, 2017), ed. M. Viallon.

[58] Paolo Sarpi, *Consulti (1606–1609)* (Pisa, 2001), 1 vol, 2 parts, ed. C. Pin.

[59] Sarpi, *Lettres Italiennes*, ed. M. Viallon; see also Viallon's recent valuable biography of Sarpi, co-authored with Bernard Dompnier, which sheds particular light on Sarpi's earlier career and his role in the Servite order: B. Dompnier and M. Viallon, *L'Habit religieux du penseur politique: Une biographie de Paolo Sarpi* (Paris, 2019). Pin's important work on the dating of Sarpi's papers also includes articles including C. Pin, 'Le scritture pubbliche trovate alla morte di fra Paolo Sarpi nel convento dei Servi', *Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 2 (1978), pp. 311–69, and C. Pin, '"Natum ad

the earlier editions of Sarpi's works and correspondence produced by Gaetano and Luisa Cozzi, Libero Sosio and Boris Ulianich, and the large number of specialist studies of aspects of Sarpi's life and work produced by a thriving community of Sarpi scholars, which remains particularly lively in Italy and in Venice itself.[60] With close attention to English ecclesiastical and political history and a range of new sources for Anglo-Venetian relations from archives in the UK and Ireland, I hope to add a new dimension to our understanding of Sarpi and his context, both building on existing interpretations and offering new ones.

While this dissertation aims to expand the account of the activities and significance of the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian network offered in previous scholarship, there are of course some parts of the story which I will not be able to address in full. This study foregrounds the political and religious aspects of Anglo-Venetian exchange, rather than other elements, including the philosophical and scientific. In part, this is a reflection of my view that previous accounts of Sarpi's life and works, especially those written in English, have neglected Sarpi's writings on the problem of Church and State in favour of a focus on his private philosophical musings. To date there has been a risk of treating Sarpi as a unique, isolated figure, rather than recognising how he fitted into the broader early seventeenth-century confessional landscape.[61] My findings suggest that we should take the public Sarpi and his ecclesiology seriously, because it was this Sarpi, rather than the one found in his private writings, who was responsible for his lasting impact on English and European political and intellectual culture. However, there certainly remains an important story to be told about how Anglo-Venetian relations were shaped by a shared interests in problems in natural philosophy including optics, magnetism and the circulation of the blood, a topic which will only briefly be touched on here. Furthermore, while I have noted the significance of several locations

---

encyclopaediam": osservazioni sul Sarpi scienziato e filosofo dopo l'edizione integrale dei "Pensieri"', *Rivista Storica Italiana* (1999), pp. 582–612.

[60] The magnitude of scholarship on Sarpi is such that it is not possible to list every relevant study here, though they will be cited when come up in the course of this dissertation. The most comprehensive bibliography of works on Sarpi is that produced by M. Viallon for her edited volume *Paolo Sarpi: politique et religion en Europe* (Paris, 2010), pp. 417–66.

[61] A tendency displayed most recently in Kainulainen's *Paolo Sarpi*; while David Wootton's Sarpi is 'an isolated figure, between Renaissance and Enlightenment' in his *Paolo Sarpi*, p. 135.

beyond England and Venice for the Anglo-Venetian network, it is clear that more work in the archives of Paris, Geneva and the Venetian Adriatic would allow an even fuller picture of their trans-European contacts to be built. On the British end, future research might also explore the Scottish dimension of the Venetian Connection more explicitly. I have chosen to use the term 'England' in the title of this dissertation, because the unique structures and history of the Church of England formed, in my view, the lynchpin of Jacobean Anglo-Venetian relations. However, the story of the Venetian Connection is also one of a Scottish king recognising the potential of these structures to serve his political ends.

IV

I have taken a broadly chronological approach to the activities of the Venetian Connection, in an effort to draw together a story which has often been told only episodically. My first chapter discusses the polemics which emerged from the Interdict controversy, highlighting aspects that tied it in with English concerns in the wake of the Gunpowder plot. Chapter Two focusses on the English religious context for the formation of the Venetian Connection, with particular concentration on the controversy over subscription to the ecclesiastical Canons of 1604. I discuss the stakes of this controversy, which was a formative experience for William Bedell, who was soon afterwards appointed chaplain to the English ambassador in Venice.

In my third chapter, I trace the interactions between Bedell, Sarpi and Micanzio in Venice between 1607 and 1610. This is the best-studied part of the story of the Venetian Connection, but I draw attention to an important new source for these discussions: a short treatise on religion written by Bedell immediately after he returned to England in 1610. In contrast to certain previous accounts which have emphasised Sarpi's heterodox religious views, I argue that Bedell, Sarpi and Micanzio developed a shared project for religious reform which emphasised conformity to a strong state Church. The fourth chapter traces the activities of the Anglo-Venetian network at the court of James VI & I, offering a fuller account of the breadth and depth of the network's influence. These activities included a sustained effort to interest the heir to

the throne, Henry, Prince of Wales, in Venetian affairs, which was spearheaded by his tutor, Adam Newton.

In the fifth chapter, I examine the significance of Anglo-Venetian relations for Synod of Dort (1618–19). In particular, this chapter probes the reasons for Sarpi and Micanzio's interest in the Synod, elucidating the way in which a particular hostility to Jesuits underpinned the attitudes of the Venetian Connection. The perceived similarities between Jesuits and Arminians were central to the Venetian Connection's diagnosis of the causes of European unrest: by placing too much confidence in human agency, rather than recognising humanity's innate limitations, Jesuits and Arminians paved the way for the usurpation of powers that truly belonged only to the monarch.

In the sixth and final chapter, I consider the later development of the Venetian Connection. I explore how a continued interest in Venice persisted at the court of James until his death in 1625 and even experienced a renewed flourishing in the early years of the reign of Charles I. However, in the later 1620s and 1630s there was a splintering of the Venetian network, which was always composed of a variety of sub-groups, and the growing challenge at the English court from those who viewed European affairs through different lenses. Finally, I briefly consider the ways in which the writings of the Venetian Connection continued to influence later writers, offering a model of Church-State relations of continued value.

Overall, I argue that the Venetian Connection's particular fusion of Reformed theology and absolutist conceptions of sovereignty made a significant contribution to English Church–state Relations. Their distinctive understanding of monarchical authority, sharpened in response to Roman Catholic polemic, was always anti-papal but not always anti-Catholic. It is a chapter of English, and European, intellectual history which is deserving of greater attention.

Chapter 1: The problem of papal interference in England and Venice, 1605–7

The Gunpowder Plot (November 1605) and Venetian Interdict controversy (April 1606–April 1607) were twin crises in the relationship between papal and secular authority. Both the English and the Venetians were inclined to view the authority of the Pope as a dangerously destabilising force in this period, and the events of 1605–7 did much to reinforce this impression. In the wake of the Interdict, the then English ambassador to Venice, Sir Henry Wotton (1568–1639), and his associates, notably his second embassy chaplain, William Bedell (1571–1642), even hoped that the shared interests might be strong enough to effect a Venetian Reformation. Ultimately, this never came to pass. This first chapter will explore what was at stake in the Interdict controversy and how this tied in with the questions raised by the Gunpowder Plot, highlighting some of the areas of debate that will recur throughout this study of Anglo-Venetian relations.

At their core, both the Gunpowder Plot and Interdict crisis drew attention to the danger of papal interference in the temporal sphere. In the case of the Gunpowder Plot, the risk was overt and direct: deposition and assassination of a temporal ruler. The threat the Interdict posed to the temporal authorities was more subtle, but in the view of many anti-papal thinkers, just as pernicious, encouraging disobedience the laws of a secular prince. Both events encouraged sharp assertions of the need for temporal rulers to retain jurisdictional independence from the papacy. The Italian jurist Arturo Carlo Jemolo rightly recognised a certain form of jurisdictionalism (*giurisdizionalismo*) as central to Sarpi's thought.[1] It was the need to defend temporal jurisdiction against papal incursions which underpinned the Anglo-Venetian cooperation of the early seventeenth century. To understand the emergence of the Jacobean Venetian Connection, then, it is necessary to trace the roots of the problem during these two high-profile illustrations of papal overreach.

[1] A.C. Jemolo, *Stato e chiesa, negli scrittori politici italiani del seicento e del settecento* (Milan, 1914).

I

At his English accession, King James VI & I revived the post of ambassador to Venice and appointed Sir Henry Wotton to this new role. Formal Anglo-Venetian diplomatic relations had been in abeyance since the departure of Peter Vannes from the Republic in 1556.[2] During the reign of Elizabeth, largely as a result of pressure from the papacy, both Venice and England had been reluctant to engage in formal relations; on the other hand, James had already sent four representatives to the Republic between 1595–8 as King of Scotland.[3] Steps towards a rapprochement had also come from the Venetian side: the Senate had sent Giovanni Carlo Scaramelli to England to discuss the problem of English piracy in the Adriatic in early 1603, just before the death of Queen Elizabeth in March of that year.[4] James had come to know Wotton shortly before his accession, when Wotton had been sent as an agent of the Grand Duke of Tuscany to warn James of an alleged plot to poison him.[5] A younger son from a Kent family with a history of royal service (his uncle, Nicholas, had been an ambassador under Henry VIII), Wotton had been educated at Oxford, where he became acquainted with the Italian Protestant and civil lawyer Alberico Gentili, who encouraged Wotton's interest in civil law, the Italian language and the role of the ambassador.[6]

After Oxford, Wotton spent five years (1589–94) travelling in Europe, primarily in Germany and Italy, during which time he gained many of the skills required of an early modern ambassador. He sought to study under the leading European civil lawyers of the period, initially hoping to gain the acquaintance of the Huguenot civil lawyer, François Hotman (1524–1590) and 'become the best civilian in Basile [i.e. Basel]', where Hotman was at that time residing.[7] Though this hope was dashed by news of

---

[2] C.M. Bajetta, *Elizabeth I's Italian Letters* (New York, 2017), p. 9; for papal discouragement see 'Preface', in CSPV VII, pp. xi-xxii.
[3] See 'Accredited Diplomatic Agents in Venice', in CSPV I, pp. cxliii-cl.
[4] For Scaramelli's reports, see ASV, Senato, Dispacci, Dispacci degli ambasciatori e residenti, Inghilterra, fol. 2.
[5] Izaak Walton, 'The Life of Sir Henry Wotton', in Sir Henry Wotton, *Reliquiæ Wottonianæ. Or, A collection of lives, letters, poems; with characters of sundry personages...* (London, 1651), b10r–v.
[6] Ibid, b7v. Gentili is often described as having taught Wotton, but the relationship seems likely to have been less formal than that, as Wotton is only recorded as having supplicated for a BA (at Queen's College on 8 June 1588), see J. Foster (ed.), *Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714* Vol. 4 (Oxford, 1891), p. 1683.
[7] Henry Wotton to Edward Wotton, London, 20/30 October 1589, LPS I, p. 228.

Hotman's death, Wotton continued to pursue legal studies. He spent the period December 1589 to April 1590 at the University of Heidelberg, where he studied under the civil lawyers Giulio Pace de Beriga (Pacius, 1550–1635), Heinrich Krefting (Crestingius, 1562–1611), and a third whom Wotton does not name, but is likely to have been Ippolito de' Colli (1561–1612).[8] He then travelled on to Altdorf and Ingolstadt, where he also stayed with civilians.[9] His travels introduced him to several other important scholars too, including Hugo de Bloote (Blotius, 1533–1608), the Imperial Librarian at Vienna, with whom Wotton stayed in 1590–91, and Isaac Casaubon, whom Wotton met at the Frankfurt book fair and then stayed with in Geneva in 1593–4.[10] During this period, Casaubon gave Wotton a copy of his father-in-law Henri Estienne's 1588 edition of Thucydides, in which the Greek was printed alongside Lorenzo Valla's Latin translation. This copy, containing an autograph dedication from Casaubon to Wotton, is preserved at Eton College Library, where Wotton spent his final years in the role of Provost.[11] Wotton left his manuscripts, many of them bought in Venice (a large group from the library of Cardinal Giovanni Delfino, who died in Venice in 1622, at which point Wotton purchased a number of his books, including eleven owned by the Italian scholar Bernardo Bembo) to Eton, but his printed books were dispersed, making the printed *Peloponnesian War* a rarer survival.[12] An unusual aspect of this volume is the fact that unlike most of Wotton's books and manuscripts, it appears to contain some annotations in Wotton's own hand, marking some of

[8] Henry Wotton to Edward Wotton, Heidelberg, 14/24 December 1589, LPS I, p. 234. For Colli see W. Adam and S. Westphal, *Handbuch kultureller Zentren der Frühen Neuzeit: Städte und Residenzen im alten deutschen Sprachraum* (Berlin, 2012), p. 852.

[9] Henry Wotton to Lord Zouche, Ingolstadt, 17/27 October 1590, LPS I, p. 242. The civilian Wotton stayed with in Altdorf is not named in his letters, but in Ingolstadt he stayed with the civil lawyer and Aristotelian scholar, Hubert van Giffen. On Van Giffen, see A.S. Brett, *Changes of State* (Princeton, 2011), p. 66.

[10] For Blotius, see H. Louthan, *The quest for compromise: Peacemakers in Counter-Reformation Vienna* (Cambridge, 1997), esp. Ch. 3, 'Hugo Blotius and the intellectual foundation of Austrian irenicism', pp. 53-66; the first meeting with Casaubon is referred to in Henry Wotton to in Isaac Casaubon, 12/22 December 1596, [London?], LPS I, p. 302.

[11] 'Is. Casaubonus amicissime et nobilissime Henrico Vuottoni d[onum] d[edit]', Eton, Fa.2.05, Thucydides, *De bello peloponnesiaco libri VIII: Iidem Latine, ex interpretatione Laurentii Vallae, ab Henrico Stephano recognita* ([Geneva], 1588), title page.

[12] R. Birley, *The History of Eton College Library* (Eton, 1970), pp. 26–7.

Thucydides' speeches.[13] Perhaps this was preparation for the speeches Wotton made in the Venetian Collegio later in his career.

Wotton's European travels had given him the opportunity to improve his language skills and gain insights into the theory and practice of relations between European states. His itinerary had included a brief trip to Venice, where he did not stay for long, writing to Blotius that the climate had not suited his health, and that 'amongst the Venetian women I do not greatly trust my resolve, for I am not made of stone'.[14] He also visited Rome in disguise as a German, wearing 'a mighty blue feather' in his hat in an effort to hide in plain sight ('no man could think that I desired to be unknown'), in which garb he claimed to have met Robert Bellarmine and engaged in 'talk in matter of learning'.[15] Wotton, staunchly Protestant throughout his career, was not tempted by the enticements of Rome, writing that 'her delights on earth are sweet, and her judgements in heaven heavy'.[16] On his return to England in 1594, he put his European contacts and political knowledge to use by taking up a role in the secretariat of the Earl of Essex.[17] Fortunately for Wotton, he was abroad at the time of Essex's rebellion and fall in 1601, at the Medici Court in Florence. It was here that he was asked by the Duke to deliver the message about the alleged poisoning plot to James; whether or not there really was reliable evidence of such a plot, both the Duke and Wotton must have seen an opportunity to ingratiate themselves with the man who would almost certainly be the next king of England. If this was the intention, it worked just as Wotton hoped. At the death of Elizabeth in 1603, Wotton, who was at that time back in Venice, was recalled to England by James's leading minister Robert Cecil, knighted (as part of a large wave of ennoblement), and sent back to Venice with ambassadorial credentials.

---

[13] Eton, Fa.2.05. Speeches which may be annotated in Wotton's hand include Pericles' funeral oration, the Plataeans' speech after their city is captured (p. 209) and the speech of the Mytilenean ambassadors at Olympia.

[14] 'inter foeminas Venetianas non admodum confidam meis viribus, nam non consto ex lapide', Wotton to Blotius, 20/30 November 1591, ÖNB, Cod. 9737z14-18, IV, fol. 172r.

[15] Henry Wotton to Lord Zouche, Florence, 28 April /8 May 1592, LPS I, p. 272; Henry Wotton to Lord Zouche, Siena, 23 November/3 December 1592, LPS I, p. 294.

[16] Henry Wotton to Lord Zouche, Florence, 28 April /8 May 1592, LPS I, p. 274.

[17] For this period and the terms on which Wotton was employed see P.E.J. Hammer, 'The Use of Scholarship: The Secretariat of Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex, c. 1585–1601', *English Historical Review* 109 (1994), pp. 26-51.

Wotton's appointment as ambassador to Venice was part of a broader rehabilitation of several English courtiers with Essexian connections who James reabsorbed into royal service. These men – Wotton included – had often retained Essex's suspicion of Spain and enthusiasm for a bellicose anti-Spanish foreign policy. In 1604, James signed the Treaty of London, ending the long war with Spain and instituting a peace between the two countries which would last until 1625. But as more recent scholarship has emphasised, the moves towards the treaty were already well underway before the accession, growing out of Elizabeth and Cecil's efforts, rather than constituting a fresh Jacobean initiative.[18] In the early part of James's reign, his patronage of figures associated with the Earl of Essex brought many who suspected that peace with Spain could not and should not last to prominent positions.[19] Wotton, like the majority of others who played a substantial role in Jacobean Anglo-Venetian relations, can be counted a member of this 'war' party. An important impetus behind the English interest in Venice was the hope that the Italian Republic might join England in an anti-Spanish alliance when, inevitably, war broke out again. Concern about the Spanish threat (especially in Flanders) was closely linked to concern about papal supremacy, which was believed to underpin Spanish power. Disentangling the relationship between anti-Spanish and anti-papal politics, and the relationship between these stances and with support for a particular Reformed conformist vision of the Church of England, will be a recurring theme of this enquiry.

The discovery of the Gunpowder Plot and the Pope's decision to place Venice under Interdict, occurring in quick succession in the five months between 5 November 1605 and 17 April 1606, threw the threat posed by papal power into sharp relief, strengthening the position of Reformed sceptics of reconciliation with Spain at the Jacobean Court and providing them with *causes célèbres* which they could continue to draw on into the reign of James's son, Charles. An interest in Venice and an interest in a particular Reformed vision of English foreign policy were established as natural

[18] P. Croft, 'Rex Pacificus, Robert Cecil, and the 1604 Peace with Spain' in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences* (Basingstoke, 2006), eds. G. Burgess, J. Lawrence and R. Wymer, pp. 140-54.
[19] M. King, 'The Essex Myth in Jacobean England', in ibid., pp. 177-86.

bedfellows, setting up terms of debate which would retain their relevance for at least two decades. The years 1605 to 1607 clarified the problems posed by papal power in several important ways, which will be explored in this chapter.

II

Wotton's embassy to Venice was not established purely in the hope of cementing an anti-papal alliance; indeed, in the first year of Wotton's embassy, religious policy often played second fiddle to questions of trade, with much of Wotton's time spent on piracy cases, like those previously brought to English attention by Scaramelli. However, Wotton was alive to the possibility that Venice might prove useful to England in other ways too and was interested in the potential for Venice to ally with Protestant powers from the start. In May 1603, before his ambassadorial appointment but following Elizabeth I's death which, as we have seen, occurred while Wotton was in Venice, Wotton wrote a letter to Cecil offering his services. The letter also contained a few illustrative pieces of information Wotton had collected in Italy, and included the judgement that Venice was 'a Signory that with long neutrality of state is at length (as it seemeth) almost slipped into a neutrality of religion'.[20] As tensions between Venice and the Pope increased, Wotton was well positioned to turn events to England's advantage and encourage Venice to turn away from Rome.

Wotton's embassy was composed of a small circle of individuals, which he referred to as his 'family', composed for the most part of young gentlemen from Kent, Wotton's native county, who probably hoped this would provide them with the necessary education to pursue their own careers at court akin to his own.[21] Wotton also entertained a variety of English visitors.[22] One of the most significant aspects of the embassy, as with many embassies across Europe at this time, was the chaplaincy. Although the Venetians initially hoped that an English Catholic might be appointed

---

[20] Wotton to Sir Robert Cecil, Venice, 13/23 May 1603, LPS I, p. 318.
[21] For the Kentish origins of Wotton's ambassadorial 'famiglia', see J. Stoye, *English Travellers Abroad, 1604-1667: Their Influence in English Society and Politics (Revised Edition)* (New Haven CT, 1989), p. 96; and the relevant biographies in LPS II, Appendix III.
[22] See E. Chaney and T. Wilks, *The Jacobean Grand Tour: Early Stuart Travellers in Europe* (London, 2014), pp. 155–72.

ambassador, they granted Wotton permission to bring with him a chaplain to perform Church of England services in the privacy of the ambassador's residence. These services were supposed to be only for English men and women resident in Venice. Nonetheless, this was difficult to monitor; once these services were instituted, the possibility was opened for others to attend them on Wotton's invitation; here was a potential means for conversion. The first Chaplain to the embassy was Nathaniel Fletcher from 1604 to 1606; he was succeeded by William Bedell, Chaplain from 1607 to 1610.[23]

III

James had come to the English throne hopeful that he could effect a reconciliation of Christendom. He was particularly interested in the idea of a general council of the Church, including both Catholics and Protestants, which – unlike the Council of Trent – would take the doctrinal concerns of the Protestants seriously and find a lasting compromise. James's bold ambitions to reunite the Catholic Church have been most comprehensively studied by W.B. Patterson, in his *James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom*. Patterson presents James as a King with genuinely ecumenical ambitions, going beyond the norm for his contemporaries, and notes that the most striking thing about James's proposal for a general council was his willingness for the Pope to take the lead in convening it. This is surprising, given the emphasis in earlier English Reformed writing (including the text of the Thirty-Nine Articles) on church councils only being legitimate when called by 'emperors', that is to say, secular Princes.[24]

James's willingness to countenance the idea of a council held under the auspices of the papacy is indeed striking. However, it is not clear that James was ever as open to the idea of a council convened by the Pope as Patterson suggests. Certainly many of the key figures around James seem to have stuck strictly to the claim that any council

[23] Fletcher was the son of Richard Fletcher, Bishop of London, and the brother of the playwright, John Fletcher. There is little evidence for his career post-Venice. He was appointed Rector of Barking and Darmsden, Suffolk, in 1619, see Clergy of the Church of England Database, Person ID: 174933.
[24] See Article XXI, Of the Authority of General Councils, BCP; W.B. Patterson, *James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 63.

would have to be called with the consent of secular princes. Patterson relies heavily on Lord Kinloss's claim to Scaramelli that 'if the Pope wished to summon a General Council,… my master… would be extremely willing to take the lead and to prove himself the warm supporter of so great a benefit to Christendom'.[25] It is not clear, however, how accurately Scaramelli records the nuance of the proposal, or how far Kinloss was pushing the instructions he had been given by James. On several other important occasions (many cited by Patterson), we find James's ministers and agents being very clear that a council was only legitimate if it was convened by princes. For instance, the instructions Cecil gave to Sir James Lindsey for his trip to Rome in 1605 told him to tell the Pope that James 'would never refuse any conference in any generall Councill, *which should be lawfully called by the consent of all the Princes of Europe*'.[26] Even if James himself was willing to entertain the idea of a general council under the auspices of the papacy, there was clearly an important body of opinion at the English court that thought councils could only be legitimate means of reconciliation if they were called under the authority of princely jurisdiction, rather than seeming to cede the Pope any authority to bind secular rulers. It was this deeply jurisdictional version of conciliarism which would become a lasting concern of the Anglo-Venetian network that developed following the Gunpowder Plot and the Interdict controversy. But it is clear that even before these two galvanising events, an emphasis on jurisdictional independence from the papacy was an area in which there was some scope for Anglo-Venetian cooperation.

English hopes for Christian reconciliation by the means of a true general council were premised on the idea that the Church of Rome was corrupt and in need of reformation, but at root a true Church as much as the Church of England and other Reformed churches. From the Roman perspective, however, the Council of Trent had already effected all requisite reforms, and the Church of England was merely schismatic. Thus the path to reconciliation was not a council, but rather the conversion

[25] Patterson, *James VI and I,* p. 37; Scaramelli to the Doge and Senate, London, 28 May 1603, translated and printed in CSPV X, p. 22; ASV, Senato, Dispacci degli ambasciatori e residenti, Inghilterra, f. 2.
[26] Patterson, *James VI and I*, p. 55; TNA SP 78/52, Cranbourne to Sir James Lindsey, January 1605, fol. 31v. Emphasis mine.

of James to the one true Roman Catholic church. The clash of these two perspectives can be seen in encounters between James and the Pope's representatives across Europe in the early years of James's reign, as each side tried to convince the other that their solution was the way forward. Wotton's situation in Venice was no different, offering a clear example of the divergent English and Roman approach. The influential Jesuit Antonio Possevino and Wotton took an active interest in each other in 1605, meeting at the Basilica dei Sancti Giovanni e Paolo. Possevino harboured hopes he could convert Wotton (as he had converted the Huguenot French ambassador Philippe Canaye de Fresne), and reported back to Rome his hopes that the conversion of Wotton might be a stepping stone to the conversion of James too.[27] Wotton first contacted Possevino through a Venetian lawyer with whom he was working on questions of piracy. This lawyer was a penitent of Possevino's, and Wotton asked him to send his greetings to the Jesuit, whose book on Moscow he had read. This book documented Possevino's failed attempt to convert Russia; perhaps Wotton read it in the hope of learning something about how to make his own efforts in Venice more successful.[28] Possevino's interactions with Wotton developed as far as a meeting where the Jesuit expressed expectations that James would show an interest in conversion.[29] The papal nuncio in Venice had asked Possevino to put him in contact with Wotton, hoping through Wotton to bring the Pope and James into contact, paving the way for some agreement to be struck.[30] These hopes would be disappointed: Wotton made it clear that though he had personal respect for Possevino, he thought the Jesuits as an Order were a malign influence.[31] By the time of the Jesuits' expulsion from Venice during the Interdict Crisis, Wotton would no longer even respectfully exclude Possevino, whom he denounced in the Venetian Senate for (anonymously) writing a book which blamed

[27] BMV, MS It. XI, 28 [=6790], Antonio Possevino, 'Relazione sopra alcune cose passate in Venezia tra sui ed Arrigo Vottone Ambasciador d'Inghilterra', p. 95. On Possevino's conversion of Canaye, see J. Dalton, 'The Politics of Conversion: Antonio Possevino SJ, Rome and the Conversion of the Family of the French Ambassador to Venice (1601–1607)', *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* 88 (2019), pp. 3–48.
[28] Antonio Possevino, *Moscovia* (Vilnius, 1586).
[29] BMV, MS It. XI, 28 [=6790], Possevino, 'Relazione', pp. 97–8.
[30] Ibid, p. 95.
[31] 'Lettera di Arrigo Wotton', in BMV, MS It. XI, 28 [=6790], p. 107.

Wotton for the expulsion of the Jesuits.[32] Indeed, Possevino was one of the leading polemicists for the Roman side during the controversy.

Possevino's report on his interactions with Wotton also makes clear that James's proposal for a general council was, on Wotton's telling, one in which the leadership of secular rulers was absolutely necessary. According to the account given by the French ambassador Canaye de Fresne, to Possevino, Wotton discussed James's desire for a Church Council with his French counterpart soon after his arrival in Venice. Wotton emphasised the need for any such council to be called by temporal rulers, not popes and legates He maintained that this was what had happened in ancient times, and that for popes and legates to call councils was a later abuse.[33] Wotton and Canaye de Fresne then discussed the doctrine of transubstantiation, which Wotton cited as one of the topics to be decided by such a council. For Wotton, the important point was that Christ's miracles had always been made visible in a way that the sacrament was not, citing the way that he showed the Apostles his resurrected flesh, saying 'palpate et videte'; he cited the authority of the theologian 'Zancus', that is to say, Girolamo Zanchi (1516–90), an Italian who had converted to Protestantism and written extensively on Reformation theology.[34] The French ambassador disputed Wotton's claims, saying that not all of Jesus's miracles were visible, for they included the forgiveness of sins.[35] Here we see Wotton building on a historical narrative of the institutional and doctrinal corruption of the papacy, and positing a return to the purer form of temporal jurisdiction, without papal interference, as a solution.

The English seem to have recognised, even before the Interdict, that this jurisdictional approach to the problem of spiritual–temporal power might have particular appeal to a Venetian audience. In one striking interaction, we find Salisbury making exactly this point to the then Venetion Ambassador to England, Niccolò

---

[32] 24 December 1606, CSPV X.

[33] 'anticamente gl'imperatori erano quei che intimavano i concilii', BMV, MS It. XI, 28 [=6790], Possevino, 'Relazione', p. 91.

[34] For Zanchi's theology, with particular reference to how it was influenced by his Paduan Aristotelian education, see J.P. Donnelly, 'Italian Influences on the Development of Calvinist Scholasticism', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 7 (April 1976), pp. 81-101.

[35] BMV, MS It. XI, 28 [=6790], Possevino, 'Relazione', p. 92.

Molino. On 17 March 1605, Molino reported to the Senate that he had questioned Salisbury on why the English court continued to take harsh measures against Roman Catholic subjects. This led to an intriguing exchange about English and Venetian attitudes to papal power. Cecil reportedly said that

> there is no doubt but that the object of these [anti-Catholic penal] laws is to extinguish the Catholic religion in this kingdom… for there is nothing their preachers insist upon so much as this, that a good Catholic must nurture in himself the firm resolve to be ready, for the preservation of his faith, to attack the life and the government of his natural sovereign. This is a pernicious doctrine, and we shall never admit it here.[36]

Molino responded that he 'could not believe that priests taught any such doctrines, for in fact the Popes did not meddle with such affairs'. Cecil countered that Molino should 'Read history and you will find it full of examples. Your own Republic, was she not excommunicated more than once and her subjects freed from their allegiance?' Molino agreed that this was true but noted that 'our subjects had never risen against the government for all that; for their hearts and wills are bound to us by good government and the good treatment they receive; and that this is so, we have the proofs, in the fact that our people have served the Republic in war against the very Popes that had excommunicated us.' This led Cecil on to a more general point about the problem of papal claims of the right to deposition, to which Molino chose not to respond:

> "That is true enough," said Cecil, "but it does not alter the fact that the Popes claim this unjustifiable right, and exercise it, too, whenever it pleases them, though always on the plea of religion. In short if a way be found to restrict this claim of the Papal authority, which they have usurped,—I know not by what right,—and if the world can be assured that Papal superiority will be confined exclusively to affairs spiritual—this point once established, I assure you that the next day the King would concede liberty of conscience and permit the exercise of the Catholic religion, but on no other terms can it he thought of." This idea Cecil repeated several times. I thought it best to make no reply to it.[37]

---

[36] Nicolo Molino to the Doge and Senate, London, [17 March 1605], CSPV X; original Italian in ASV, Senato, Dispacci degli ambasciatori e residenti, Inghilterra.
[37] Ibid.

Here Cecil makes the striking (and perhaps plausible) claim that if the papacy limited itself to spiritual affairs, rather than claiming temporal jurisdiction, the English would not have difficulties with Catholic toleration. It is also intriguing that Cecil already knew something of the history of interdicts promulgated against Venice in 1483 and 1509, before the declaration of a new Interdict the following year, when this would be the very ground on which the English and Venetians would find (temporary) areas of agreement.

IV

The Interdict controversy revolved around papal claims that Venetian laws were impinging on ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Papal disapproval was focussed on two laws in particular. The first banned the building of churches without a state license. The second banned unlicensed alienation of property to the church. In 1605, the already tense situation was exacerbated when the Venetians imprisoned two clergymen on criminal charges, rather than passing their cases on to the ecclesiastical courts. In April 1606, the Pope declared an Interdict. By 12 May 1606, Wotton's hope for a Venetian break with Rome had grown to such an extent that he wrote to the Earl of Salisbury what looks more like an admonitory note to self: 'I must not be transported with the secret comfort that I take in these things'.[38] He sent numerous full updates on the dispute, and although these letters are more focussed on events than ideas, it is notable that Wotton described the Venetian response as one that had 'stood upon the defence of their civil liberty and jurisdiction (which without recognition of any superior but God himself hath now been on foot 1,200 years)' – a description which concurs with the core arguments put forward repeatedly by Sarpi.[39]

The Interdict seems to have been first introduced to an English readership in the translation of a pamphlet published under the title of *The Popes bull gelded* (London,

[38] Wotton to Salisbury, Venice, 2/12 May 1606, LPS I, p. 347.
[39] Wotton to Salisbury, Venice, 11/21 July 1606, ibid., pp. 356-7.

1606).[40] This was entered in the Stationer's Register on 26 May 1606.[41] A short work written by Giovanni Marsilio (d. 1612) was soon also published as part of another description of the difficulties, entitled *A declaration of the variance* (London, 1606). Like *The Popes bull gelded*, the text of *Declaration* was most likely written and sent to England by Wotton or other members of his embassy.[42] Throughout this work, a direct parallel is drawn between the situation in England and Venice, carefully analysing the similarities and differences between the two states' relationships with the papacy, and offering suggestions as to what Venice should do next.[43] The author (or authors) describes the situation with caution and does not treat a lasting Venetian break with Rome as a very likely outcome. Nonetheless, the author expresses the hope that

> the eyes and the hearts of the Venetians, may by the touch of Gods finger bee opened wider… [so] that they may from that nooke or corner of Italy, become… God's harbengers to make way for him throughout that goodly country.[44]

By emphasising the similarities between the position of England before the Henrician Reformation and that of Venice in 1606, this short work sets up many of the major themes that characterised the writings of the Venetian Connection in subsequent years. The *Declaration* thus went beyond mere translation, placing the Interdict controversy within a longer-term (and specifically Anglo-centric) history of struggles against the papacy. While bringing the Interdict to the attention of the English public, it also set an agenda for future Anglo-Venetian intellectual exchange.

It was, however, Sarpi's own pamphlets which dominated English printed offerings on the Interdict crisis in 1606–7. It is worth outlining some of the particular

---

[40] [Donato, Leonardo,] The Duke and State of Venice, *The Popes bull gelded or An edict published by the Duke and State of Venice, against the late bull of Pope Paulus Quintus, the sixth of May 1606 in the fourth indiction* (London, 1606).
[41] English Short Title Catalogue entry.
[42] [Henry Wotton?], *A declaration of the variance betweene the Pope, and the segniory of Venice… Whereunto is annexed a defence of the Venetians, written by an Italian doctor of Divinitie…* ([London], 1606). For discussion of the authorship of these works, see F. De Vivo, 'Francia e Inghilterra di fronte all'Interdetto di Venezia', in *Paolo Sarpi: Politique et religion en Europe*, ed. M. Viallon (Paris, 2010), p. 184.
[43] See [Wotton?], *A declaration of the variance*, esp. pp. 48–66.
[44] Ibid., p. 52.

elements which appealed to English Reformed conformists. Those of Sarpi's pamphlets that were republished in London in English translation included his *Considerationi sopra le censure*, published as *A full and satisfactorie answer* in 1606, and his *Apologia per le oppositioni fatte*, published as *An Apology… unto the Objections of Cardinal Bellarmine, against… John Gerson* in 1607.[45] The latter was a response to a work by the Jesuit Cardinal, Robert Bellarmine, rebutting the claims of Jean Gerson, the fifteenth-century French conciliar thinker whose works Sarpi had had republished in Venice.[46] These tracts are also likely to have been sent to England by Wotton himself.[47] Sarpi's *Considerationi sopra le censure* discusses the sovereignty of Venice as 'absolute', and argues that by placing Venice under Interdict, the papacy was trying to impinge on the Republic's sovereign rights. Sarpi rejected the Pope's claims that Venice's laws impinge on 'ecclesiastical liberty'. He argued that the concept of 'ecclesiastical liberty' was not biblical but rather an invention of the medieval papacy, designed to usurp the temporal jurisdiction of secular rulers.[48] In his response to Bellarmine, Sarpi took these arguments further. According to Bellarmine, the Pope possessed *indirect* temporal jurisdiction.[49] In the normal course of events, all temporal jurisdiction belonged to the secular ruler. But if a temporal prince uses their authority 'to the hurt' of their own souls and the souls of their subjects, the Pope has the authority to step in and correct their error. In Bellarmine's words, the Pope 'both may and ought to put to his hand, and to bring them into the right way again'.[50] This, according to Bellarmine, was what had been happening in the case of the Venetian interdict.

---

[45] Paolo Sarpi, *A full and satisfactory answer to the late unadvised bull* (London, 1606). Translator uncertain. An English translation of Paolo Sarpi, *Considerationi sopra le censure della santità di Papa Paolo V contra la Serenissima Republica di Venetia* (Venice, 1606).
[46] Paolo Sarpi, *An apology or apologiticall answere, made by father Paule* (London, 1607). Translator uncertain. An English translation of Paolo Sarpi, *Apologia per le oppositioni fatte dall'illustrissimo… Signor cardinale Bellarminio alli trattati… di Giovanni Gersoni* (Venice, 1606).
[47] De Vivo, 'Francia e Inghilterra', p. 184.
[48] Sarpi, *A full and satisfactory answer*, pp. 10–11.
[49] For fullest discussion of Bellarmine's doctrine of indirect papal jurisdiction, see Stefania Tutino, *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth* (Oxford, 2010), especially Ch. 3 which discusses the Interdict.
[50] Bellarmine, as quoted in Paolo Sarpi, *An apology or apologiticall answere*, p. 7 and p. 8.

Sarpi took issue with these claims. According to Sarpi, Bellarmine's words 'do necessarily infer, although they dare not express it in expresse termes', that 'the Pope [is the] supreame temporall Monarch, and the Princes of the world lesse than his vassals'.[51] If, as Bellarmine suggested, the Pope exercised jurisdiction over all sins, and was the judge of what a sin is, then the Pope could claim temporal power whenever he wanted. This paved the way for a total extinction of princely power: as Sarpi summarises: 'there [would be] no Prince but the Pope'.[52] The fact that the Pope was a temporal Prince himself – in the papal states – made the situation in Sarpi's view especially dangerous. Bellarmine's doctrine gave the Pope license to pry further and further into affairs of competing states, on the pretext of establishing whether or not a law has been introduced for sinful reasons. On Sarpi's reading, this meant that if the Pope had occasion to go to war with another Prince, 'it would be an easie matter for him to infeable his enemie, and to get the maistery of him'.[53] Thus, Bellarmine's doctrine of indirect temporal jurisdiction threatened to sweep away all forms of separate princely jurisdiction, and subject the world to universal papal monarchy. By means of such arguments, states Sarpi, 'the kingdoms of the world are disordered and confounded, and the simple people abused, and made to believe, that in all things they are bound to obey the Pope'.[54] The implication of Sarpi's argument was that if the Pope was allowed to interfere in the laws of Venice, the laws of all Princes would be put at risk.

V

Sarpi's arguments gave his pamphlets broad appeal across Europe.[55] One reader who was particularly impressed was the celebrated Genevan scholar Isaac Casaubon, who was by this time living in Paris as a pensioner of Henri IV. In a letter of November 1606, Casaubon can be found recommending Sarpi's *Considerationi* in fulsome terms.

---

[51] Ibid., p. 12.
[52] Ibid., p. 20.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Ibid., p. 19.
[55] G. Cozzi, *Sarpi tra Venezia e l'Europa* (Torino, 1979), pp. 235–81.

As he effused to one correspondent, 'If you read the consideration [Sarpi] has published on the excommunication of the Venetians, I have no doubt that you will be suitably persuaded of the magnitude of his ability'.[56]

Encouraged by the Venetian ambassador to France, Casaubon decided to write his own treatise on the Interdict.[57] Casaubon's text, entitled *De libertate ecclesiastica*, was a longer and more ambitious undertaking than Sarpi's pamphlets. He used many of the same citations from scripture and papal history as Sarpi, and also added further evidence of his own.[58] Casaubon's central claim was the same: that the term 'ecclesiastical liberty' was invented by the papacy to mask its temporal ambitions. He raises the spectre of a universal papal monarchy with even more aplomb than Sarpi, warning ominously that 'whole kingdoms, having been snatched from their legitimate possessors, are being claimed on the pretext of defending the pope'.[59] Other Princes needed to recognise that the cause of the Venetians was in fact the 'cause of all Princes in common' before papal incursions destroyed the foundations of their power too. [60]

Yet not all princes were persuaded. King Henri IV of France feared that French support for the Venetian cause would cement ties between the papacy and Habsburg Spain. He therefore took an active role in facilitating reconciliation between Rome and Venice. The Venetians agreed to hand the two imprisoned clerics over to the French, who in turn handed them over to the papacy: a compromise which pleased the Venetians, who kept their laws, but also allowed the papacy to save face. When the Interdict was lifted in April 1607, Casaubon's *De libertate ecclesiastica* was still unfinished, although printing of the work in Paris had begun. Henri was prevailed upon by the papal nuncio to halt the presses. All surviving printed copies of Casaubon's work

---

[56] 'Si editam ab eo considerationem super excommunication Venetorum legisti, non ambigo, quin de magnitudine illius ingenii satis tibi constet', Isaac Casaubon to Paul Pétau, Paris, 4 November 1606, in *Isaaci Casauboni epistolae* (Rotterdam, 1709), ed. Theodoor Jansson, p. 280.
[57] See De Vivo, 'Francia e Inghilterra', p. 176.
[58] For instance, Casaubon follows Sarpi in citing Romans 6 and Galatians 4 when introducing his definition of 'ecclesiastical liberty', see Sarpi, *Considerationi*, p. 3; [Isaac Casaubon], *De Libertate Ecclesiastica liber singularis. Ad viros politicos qui de controversia inter Paulum V. Pontificem Maximum et Rempublicam Venetam, edoceri cupiunt* ([Paris], 1607), pp. 31–2.
[59] 'regna integra legitimis possessoribus erepta, obtentu huius scuti Pontifici Maximo vindicantur': ibid., p. 16.
[60] 'Omnium principum communis haec caussa est': ibid., pp. 16–7.

consequently stop at page 264, only three chapters in to the eleven projected in the table of contents.[61]

Casaubon never finished the work.[62] Nonetheless, the section of the treatise which was printed had an important afterlife; in 1608, James I & VI was given a copy. According to a contemporary account, he was 'so delighted with it, that for many days he could talk of nothing but Casaubon'.[63] The work appears to have played a crucial role in both interesting James in Casaubon, and Casaubon in England, and in 1610 Casaubon was persuaded to emigrate again across the Channel.[64] It is striking that it was *De libertate ecclesiastica* – a work in which Casaubon took a self-consciously Sarpian line – which smoothed the way for his move to England. For Casaubon, the situation of the English was intimately linked to the predicament of the Venetians, for the Pope was looking to use the claim of ecclesiastical liberty to interfere with their sovereignty too. James, unlike Henri, agreed with Casaubon.

The Venetian Interdict controversy highlighted a line of attack on the papacy which was jurisdictional, and which specifically emphasised that the main objection to the papacy was its claims of temporal jurisdiction – whether direct or indirect. Sarpi and Casaubon's accounts are both absolutist texts, endorsing the right of the secular sovereign to act without external restraint. But what is particularly interesting is the fact that the absolutist element does not necessarily consist in the ruler having unlimited power over men and property *within* their state. Though for both men this seems to be the assumption, this is not the central question. Instead, the term 'absolute' proves most useful to them when they use it to mean 'distinct' or 'independent'. The world is divided into a number of discrete jurisdictions, ruled over by different absolute sovereigns.

---

[61] N. Hardy, *Criticism and Confession: The Bible in the Seventeenth Century Republic of Letters* (Oxford, 2017), p. 71; table of contents to be found in Casaubon, *De libertate ecclesiastica*, pp. 20–21.
[62] Casaubon, *De libertate ecclesiastica*, pp. 20–21; for one of the letters in which Casaubon explained that the work could not be finished, see Casaubon to Joseph Justus Scaliger, Paris, 13 April 1608, in *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger* (Geneva, 2012), eds. P. Botley and D. van Miert, p. 502.
[63] BL, London, Burney MS 366, fol. 256r, Richard Thomson to Isaac Casaubon, Suffolk, 7 July 1608. An edited copy of this letter can be found in P. Botley, *Richard 'Dutch' Thomson, c. 1569-1613: The Life and Letters of a Renaissance Scholar* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 335–7. Quote at p. 336.
[64] Hardy, *Criticism and Confession,* pp. 83–7.

There is no room in this account for indirect temporal jurisdiction of the kind advocated by Bellarmine, which operates between and across these jurisdictional divides.

The twin crises of the Gunpowder Plot and the Venetian Interdict had both furnished examples of the threat the post-Tridentine papacy could pose to the powers of a sovereign. The polemics which emerged from Venice offered a theoretical framework with obvious applicability to English concerns about the papal deposing power, which had been heightened by the recent Gunpowder Plot. In this framework, the claim that the Pope had the authority to depose a heretical monarch was criticised as an illegitimate seizure of secular power. Sarpi and Casaubon's particular brand of absolutism, in which the most important aspect of absolute power was its independence from external jurisdictions, overlapped with the concerns of the English court. This stance on inter-political relations emerged as a natural ally of anti-popery.

VI

By 1607, both the Gunpowder Plot and the Venetian Interdict controversy had thrown concerns about papal interference in secular rule into sharp relief. Observers in England and Venice had been quick to spot the similarities between the two controversies. The pamphlet discussion which followed the papal declaration of an Interdict against Venice revolved around a set of preoccupations around which a post-Interdict Anglo-Venetian network would cohere. The obvious point of agreement was the conviction that papal interference in secular rule was dangerous, upending the correct order of society and risking a descent into papal universal monarchy. This general principle brought with it a constellation of other shared preoccupations. These included an interest in ecclesiastical history, which offered rich proofs of the papacy's corruption, and hostility to the Jesuits, who were viewed as the worst offenders for mixing temporal and spiritual power. Cardinal Bellarmine's doctrine of the Pope's indirect papal jurisdiction provided a particularly authoritative whetstone against which Anglo-Venetian anti-papal ideas could be sharpened.

An interest in blocking papal interference in secular jurisdiction also encouraged both the English and Venetian figures discussed here to think carefully

about the relationship between states. James's interest in convening a council of the whole church was one response to this question. A council interested James and his agents, including Wotton, because – as long as it was called and confirmed by secular rulers – it offered a means of resolving religious disputes without ceding any temporal authority to the Pope. Wotton's interest in the theoretical aspects of the law of ambassadorial relations stemmed from much the same anti-papal impulse: on the reading of men such as Alberico Gentili, ambassadors could mediate between independent, absolute sovereigns, without creating the sort of overlap between jurisdictions which might have legitimised papal interference as an overarching judge. Discussion of how the civil law could be interpreted to block papal claims of jurisdiction, as well as the discussion of how conciliar authority related to secular authority, would be the subject of fruitful Anglo-Venetian exchange into the 1620s. Though similar discussions had been occurring independently in England and Venice before 1606, the Interdict controversy threw the overlapping concerns of anti-papal thinkers in both countries into sharper relief, and thereby paved the way for deeper cooperation over the next twenty years.

Chapter 2: William Bedell, the Subscription Controversy and the cause of European Reform

Since the 1980s, historians of the Church of England have emphasised the difficulties entailed in the terms 'Anglican' and 'Anglicanism', which 'imply that the Church of England had a specific, settled identity (that people were either groping towards, achieving or seeking to re-establish) whereas in fact no such thing existed.'[1] Histories of the links between the Venetian Interdict controversy and the Jacobean Church of England can all too easily elide the contradictions and internal struggles on both sides, suggesting that there is a unitary 'Venetian' or 'English' milieu which participated in the exchange. Foremost amongst the works on Anglo-Venetian relations which suffer from this difficulty is that of Enrico de Mas.[2] For De Mas, the Venetians of the Interdict era and James I's leading courtiers and clerics shared an ecumenist vision of church–state relations, which was the major intellectual influence on Hugo Grotius and later 'latitudinarian' advocates of what De Mas perceives as a philosophy of religious toleration.

De Mas's ecumenist interpretation of Anglo-Venetian relations broke with the account previously offered by Gaetano Cozzi.[3] Cozzi had noted a particular connection between the circles of the 'Calvinist' Archbishop of Canterbury George Abbot. He highlights evidence that Sarpi, Micanzio and their English interlocuters were supporters of the Anti-Remonstrant cause at the Synod of Dort. In many ways, Cozzi's account remains more instructive than De Mas's later suggestions, at least as far as the story of Sarpi's connections are concerned. Yet Cozzi still relies heavily on a binary division between Calvinists and Arminians, the value of which also came under significant historiographical scrutiny in the later twentieth century, especially with reference to the period before 1618. The story of the links between England and Venice in the early

---

[1] A. Milton, 'Introduction', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism* Vol. 1 (Oxford, 2017), ed. A. Milton, p. 7.
[2] E. de Mas, *Sovranità politica e unità Cristiana nel Seicento anglo-veneto* (1975).
[3] G. Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'Anglicanismo e la "Historia del Concilio Tridentino"', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 68 (1956), pp. 559-619.

seventeenth-century is also a story of factional conflict within the Church of England, and at the court of James I more broadly. If De Mas errs in suggesting a united 'Anglicanism', Cozzi's Calvinism (and its Arminian opposite) also requires careful definition. Cozzi is right to emphasise that the major figures of the English circles – William Bedell, Henry Wotton, Dudley Carleton – associated with Sarpi in this period were committed to Reformed theology. But these figures also offer evidence of Reformed sympathies of a particular kind: interested in Italian theology, staunchly conformist and loyal not only to royal but also to episcopal power.

Recent decades have seen a wholesale reconsideration of the role of Reformed theology in the early seventeenth century. Anthony Milton's seminal study of Church of England attitudes to Rome and Geneva, *Catholic and Reformed* (1995), provided decisive evidence that Jacobean history cannot be accurately understood through the prism of Arminianism versus Calvinism. Milton highlights the ambiguities and breadth of the Jacobean consensus and notes that later Laudian mischaracterisations of Jacobean Reformed conformists often distort the flexible and nuanced stances that the Jacobean Reformed took to the Church of Rome. Recognising this depth and flexibility contained within the Jacobean Reformed intellectual tradition had provided an important corrective to earlier accounts. In the wake of Milton and others' reconsiderations of the Reformed tradition in the 1990s, there has been a flourishing of scholarship offering important re-evaluations of Jacobean intellectual and political culture. A particularly notable contribution is that of Jacqueline Rose, who has tracked justifications of the Royal Supremacy from the Break with Rome through to the Revolution of 1688.[4] Rose traces the 'ambiguous, varied, and muddled' legacy of Tudor *imperium*, a concept made up of 'contradictory strands' which proved 'too multivalent to decide later arguments'.[5] The stance taken by Jacobean Reformed conformists, represented in Rose's work by George Carleton and John Donne, emphasised that the King held supreme jurisdiction in externals in Church and state, but did not hold

[4] J. Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 2011).
[5] Ibid., p. 4 and p. 283.

sacerdotal authority – a stance which can be described as 'Erastian' in the original sense of opposition to the excessive use of excommunication used against the state.[6] As we shall see, members of the Venetian Connection and the core members of the anti-papal faction in Venice generally endorsed this distinctive ecclesiology. It was a particular compromise between Church and state which had a significant role to play in early seventeenth-century politics, as well as an intriguing afterlife later in the century. The links between the circles of Paolo Sarpi and the court of James I thus cohered around shared concerns about the relationship between church and state.

The importance of ecclesiology for understanding seventeenth-century English politics has been increasingly emphasised in recent years. In studies of the latter part of the seventeenth century, this has been increasingly accompanied by an interest in the concept of 'civil religion'. A recent book by Ashley Walsh makes the fullest statement of the associated case that it was a distinctive attitude to civil religion which defined the 'English Enlightenment'.[7] The writers, politicians and clergymen who tried to develop an English civil religion in the wake of the revolution of 1688 drew on a wide range of intellectual resources. These included works by Venetian and English members of the Jacobean Venetian Connection discussed here. While Walsh and some of his predecessors have briefly noted the interest in Sarpi's Venice amongst much later English theorists of civil religion, the significance in this respect of the broader Venetian Connection at the court of James VI & I has not yet been recognised.[8] Histories of English religion rightly place substantial emphasis on the ideas of William Chillingworth, and the so-called English 'Arminians'. But this has been accompanied by a neglect of the contributions which Jacobean Reformed conformists also made to the development of visions of civil religion premised on non-sacerdotal royal supremacy. In this sense, the Anglo-Venetian Connection in the reign of James might

[6] Ibid., pp. 61-5. This sense of Erastianism is that set out by Thomas Erastus himself in his writings, and is separate from the complete control of the Church by the state which the term Erastianism later came to denote. For Rose's discussion, see ibid., pp. 203–5; for the original clarification of these two uses, see J.N. Figgis, 'Eratus and Erastianism', *Journal of Theological Studies* 2 (1901), pp. 66-101.
[7] A. Walsh, *Civil Religion and the Enlightenment in England, 1707-1800* (Woodbridge, 2020).
[8] Ibid., pp. 6–7 and p. 150.

be said to constitute an important – but as yet unwritten – early chapter in the story of what J.G.A. Pocock and Brian Young have called the 'Anglican Enlightenment'.[9]

Anglo-Venetian relations in this period were underpinned by shared concerns about papal jurisdiction, but they were also built on shared understandings of what a truly Reformed church might look like. When William Bedell arrived in Venice, he brought with him a vision of the Reformed church which was born of the struggles over Puritan conformity to the Church of England in the early years of James I's reign as much as horror at the Gunpowder Plot. This chapter will explore the significance of English debates over religious conformity for Anglo-Venetian cultural exchange and outline particular strands of Reformed conformist thinking developed in response to the Subscription controversy of 1604, which I will later suggest underpinned the interactions between William Bedell, Paolo Sarpi and Fulgenzio Micanzio in the wake of the Interdict.

William Bedell is an intriguing figure in this story. He has not had a prominent place in the history of the Jacobean Church of England. Yet his particular interpretation of the religious questions disputed in the reign of James makes a powerful case-study for understanding the history of the period. Bedell developed a principled and consistent defence of conformity, which also became a positive programme for reform which interested anti-papal circles in Venice. Peter Lake and Kenneth Fincham, in their influential overview of the ecclesiastical policy of James I, conclude that James's supposed incorporation of both Calvinists and the anti-Calvinists into one church was ultimately a 'marriage of convenience', the successes of which 'owed as much to the personal interests and ambitions of the individuals and religious groups concerned as to any of the arguments employed either at Hampton Court or in the formal exchanges in the Oath of Allegiance controversy'.[10] But this is not true of William Bedell, who built up arguments and a programme of preaching Reformation according to the

---

[9] J.G.A. Pocock, 'Clergy and Commerce: the Conservative Enlightenment in England', in *L'Età dei Lumi: studi storici sul settecento europeo in onore di Franco Venturi* Vol. 1 (Naples, 1985), eds. R. Ajello, E. Cortese and V. Piano Mortari; B.W. Young, *Religion and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century England: Theological Debate from Locke to Burke* (Oxford, 1998).

[10] K. Fincham and P. Lake, 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I', *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985), p. 207.

principles of conformity which he had endorsed in the face of the Subscription controversy of 1604. Bedell might even be seen, therefore, as one of the most successful products of James's religious policies.

In the years before Bedell went to Venice, he was already developing a distinctive theological and political stance, which he would continue to develop throughout his life, and which had the specific goal of converting Roman Catholics to the Reformed religion. Bedell's sojourn in Venice allowed him to develop his methods significantly; it also meant that he had an arsenal of well-developed controversial resources to offer Sarpi and Micanzio, which would influence their own anti-papal polemics. This is therefore not a story of the 'reception' of Venetian ideas in England, or vice versa, but of a productive collaboration, to which both sides made substantial contributions. A fuller picture of Bedell's intellectual interests before his appointment as Wotton's chaplain in Venice will provide an essential background, against which the significance of Bedell's later interactions with Sarpi and Micanzio can be assessed. This will, by necessity, require a deeper dive into English history – and specifically Bedell's career before Venice – for the rest of this chapter, before returning to the Venetian story in the next.

I

The accession of James VI & I to the English throne had opened up an important new phase in the relationship between church and state in that nation. Puritans hoped that the new Scottish king, raised by Presbyterians, would support them in their efforts for further reformation, while Catholics for their part hoped that the new regime would introduce Catholic toleration. James disappointed the most zealous on both sides, not going as far as the most enthusiastic reformers would have liked in the wake of the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, and also resisting calls for Catholic toleration until some covert loosening of restrictions in the early 1620s.

James had set out his own views on the relationship between religion and monarchy in his *Basilikon Doron*, first printed in a private edition of only seven copies in 1599. On James's accession to the English throne in 1603, the book was republished

first in Edinburgh and then, in multiple runs, at London.[11] In these 1603 editions, a new preface set out James's own forthright vision of absolute power and claimed for the monarch the right to decide religious controversies even more clearly than the original. In it, James attacked the 'puritaines' on one side and the 'papistes' on the other, accusing both of subverting monarchical authority.[12] The Catholic question came to a dramatic head in November 1605, but in the earliest months of James's reign it was the challenge of Puritanism into which the King invested the most energy. In the wake of the Millenary Petition, a set of requests for reform submitted to James by puritan ministers, the King called the Hampton Court Conference, which opened on 14 January 1604, to hear the case for further reform of the English Church. The conference has traditionally been seen as a failure for the party of further Reform, encouraged by the most famous account of its proceedings written by William Barlow.[13] Barlow was hostile to the puritan party, and emphasised James's outbursts against them, but other accounts of the conference suggest that James may have been better-disposed to further Reform than Barlow wants to suggest.[14] W.B. Patterson views the Conference as characteristic example of James's ecumenical instincts, arguing that James sought 'a compromise which the two parties would find acceptable' and that 'to a large extent, he succeeded'.[15] There is reason to question some of the optimism of Patterson's account; in a particularly interesting study, Arnold Hunt has used his discovery of Laurence Chaderton's notes on Barlow's *Summe and substance* to suggest that

[11] S. Rypins, 'The Printing of "Basilikòn Dôron", 1603', *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 64 (1970), pp. 393–417.
[12] James VI and I, *Basilikon doron: Or His Maiesties instructions to his dearest sonne, Henry the prince* (London, 1603), sig. A4v–6v.
[13] William Barlow, *The summe and substance of the conference* (London, 1604).
[14] Most notably, the anonymous account by a moderate puritan author: 'Anonymous Account' entitled 'A declaration of the conference', BL, Harl. MS 828, fol. 32, printed in R.G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church* Vol. 2 (New York, 1910), pp. 341–54. Sir Dudley Carleton, later ambassador to Venice, also gave an account of the conference in a letter to John Chamberlain, see Dudley Carleton, TNA, SP 14/6/21. The shift to a more positive view of the puritan party's achievements at Hampton Court began with Mark Curtis's 'Hampton Court Conference and its Aftermath', *History* 46 (1961), pp. 1–16, and has been continued more recently by W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 44–8.
[15] Patterson, *King James VI and I,* p. 48.

Barlow's account of James's hostile interventions was in fact largely accurate.[16] Alan Cromartie has also noted that James's stance was not perceived as a major concession in puritan analyses of the situation in the wake of the conference.[17] Moreover, the concessions supposedly won by the puritans were only patchily implemented.[18]

The King was certainly unpersuaded by the central Puritan complaint of excessive ceremonies. For many puritans – even, as we shall see, those of more conformist inclinations – the stipulation of the Canons of 1604 that 'the Order, Form and Ceremonies shall be duly observed as they are set down and prescribed in the Book of Common-Prayer; without any Omission or Alteration' proved hard to stomach.[19] Many refused to subscribe to the Canons, with ninety ministers deprived in the early months of 1605.[20] Patrick Collinson highlighted this episode of the end as the Elizabethan puritan movement, with its organised Presbyterian demands.[21] Perhaps more accurately, we might talk of a splintering of the Reformed interest. Opponents of subscription went on to become a notable force in Parliament.[22] But a substantial group, including the future Venetian chaplain, William Bedell, chose the path of conformity. Though the ranks of these Reformed conformists were relatively small, they held important positions, with Laurence Chaderton's Emmanuel and John Knewstub's Bury

---

[16] A. Hunt, 'Laurence Chaderton and the Hampton Court Conference', in C. Litzenberger and S. Wabuda, eds., *Belief and Practice in sixteenth-century England* (Ashgate, 1998), pp. 207–28.
[17] Alan Cromartie, 'King James and the Hampton Court Conference', in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government* (Aldershot, 2006), ed. Ralph Anthony Houlbrooke, pp. 61–80. Cromartie's account builds on criticisms of Curtis by F. Shriver in his article 'Hampton Court Re-visited: James I and the Puritans', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33 (1982), pp. 48–71.
[18] Curtis, 'Hampton Court', pp. 14–15.
[19] Canon XVI, *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiasticall* (London, 1604), sig. E3r. However, it is worth noting that subscription was only a civil statement of intent, rather than an oath before God, which was a more significant commitment.
[20] Fincham and Lake, 'Ecclesiastical Policy', p. 177.
[21] See P. Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London, 1967), pp. 448–467. See also Patrick Collinson, 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement: The Hampton Court Conference', in *Before the English Civil War*, ed. H. Tomlinson (London, 1983), pp. 27–51.
[22] See, for instance, M.P. Winship, 'Freeborn (Puritan) Englishmen and Slavish Subjection: Popish Tyranny and Puritan Constitutionalism, c. 1570–1606', *The English Historical Review* 124 (2009), pp. 1065–67. The Parliament of 1604 appears to have been one of the most puritan parliaments seen under James, as one of only two which sat on Ascension Day; however, that vote was won by only nine votes, suggesting there was no substantial puritan majority, see A. Thrush, 'V. The Composition of the House of Commons', in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604–1629* (Cambridge, 2010), ed. A. Thrush and J.P. Ferris.

St Edmunds providing firm bases from which to expand and to gain influence at court. Whether Bedell conformed because he was convinced that James's stance was sufficiently godly, or because of his views on the duty of obedience to the monarch, or as a consequence some other motive is a question that will be examined here.

Bedell's education had been decidedly puritan: he went up to Emmanuel College within a year of its foundation by Sir Walter Mildmay in 1584 and in 1593 was elected the college's fourteenth fellow (including the first three, named by Sir Walter at the foundation).[23] The college had been founded with the express purpose of educating future godly preachers, a mission which Bedell took to heart. Along with his contemporaries Abdias Ashton (St John's College) and Thomas Gataker (Sidney Sussex), Bedell was remembered as part of a group of scholars who 'set on foot, a design of preaching in places adjacent to Cambridge, even to a considerable distance'.[24] In 1602, at the age of 31, Bedell left Cambridge to become a lecturer at St Mary's Church in Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk. Emmanuel's statutes included a stipulation limiting the tenure of fellows to within one year of the date on which they could have proceeded Doctor of Divinity, to ensure that its members did not 'tarry' too long in the university when they could be preaching true religion in a parish role.[25] Under this regulation, Bedell could have stayed to proceed DD in 1604 (five years after he proceeded BD in 1599), but chose instead to leave the University and start his pastoral ministry.[26] He would eventually proceed DD at Trinity College, Dublin, shortly after his appointment as Provost in 1627.[27] As a lecturer at St Mary's, preaching the gospel was the most important part of Bedell's clerical duties. The high stock he placed on the

---

[23] Jones, *A true relation*, p. 93.

[24] See Samuel Clarke, 'The Life and Death of Thomas Gataker', in *A general martyrologie, containing a collection of all the greatest persecutions which have befallen the church of Christ, from the creation to our present times* (London, 1677), p. 250.

[25] For this statute ('De mora sociorum') see F. Stubbings, *The Statutes of Sir Walter Mildmay for Emmanuel College* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 95–6; P. Collinson et al., *A History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 26–30.

[26] T. Wharton Jones, *A true relation*, p. 100; J. and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* Pt. I, Vol. I (Cambridge, 1922), p. 115.

[27] For discussion of this degree, see Bedell to Ward, Horningerth, 24 March 1628, Bodl., Tanner MS 72, fol. 262; *Two Biographies*, p. 283.

act of preaching was a central plank of his worldview, shaping decisions he made throughout his career, a point to which we will return.

Some time before he went to Venice, then, Bedell was a core member of what Peter Lake has labelled 'moderate puritan' circles. Bedell was a 'puritan' according to Lake's definition: he was one of a network of godly individuals who could 'recognise one another in the face of a corrupt and potentially hostile world'.[28] Bedell was also a 'moderate' in the sense that he chose to conform to the Church of England, rather than trying to operate outside it – although as we shall see, the question of conformity was hotly debated in Bedell's circles, and his decision was far from inevitable. The most significant influences on Bedell during his time at Emmanuel were evidently Laurence Chaderton (1536–1640), Master of the college from its foundation in 1584 until his retirement in 1622, and William Perkins (1558–1602), a fellow of Christ's, both of whom commanded wide respect in puritan circles. Bedell expressed his long-running admiration for these two men in his correspondence with another Emmanuel contemporary and lifelong friend, Samuel Ward (1572–1643).[29] Indeed, it seems Bedell purchased Perkins's library at the time of the latter's death in 1602.[30] Bedell and Ward took a shared interest in cementing Perkins's legacy, exchanging letters about Ward's edition of Perkins's *Problema de Romanae fidei ementito Catholicismo* (Cambridge, 1604).[31] This was a text in which Perkins examined the doctrines of Roman Catholicism as set out in the Canons of the Council of Trent, and compared them to the belief and practices of Christian antiquity, analysing historical and patristic sources. Perkins's account – which includes substantial sections attacking claims of papal primacy and

---

[28] P. Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 12.

[29] Ward was elected fellow of Emmanuel in 1595; before that he had been at Christ's. See J. and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* Pt. I, Vol. IV, p. 334; J. Peile, *Biographical Register of Christ's College, 1505-1905* Vol. I (Cambridge, 1910), pp. 195–6. A portion of the Bedell–Ward correspondence is printed in *Two Biographies*, pp. 241–366.

[30] Bedell refers to 'Mr Perkins bookes', strongly implying ownership, in a letter to Ward dated 25 July 1605, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 137r; *Two Biographies*, p. 223. I have not been able to identify any books that might have formed part of the Perkins–Bedell library; they may well be unmarked and were almost certainly scattered at the time of Bedell's death in the wake of the Irish Rebellion of 1641, but it is possible that some positive identifications might be made. Ward reports that Perkins's motto 'verbi minister es, hoc age', which may feature in his books. See Ward's letter to the reader, in William Perkins, *Problema de Romanae fidei ementito Catholicismo* (Cambridge, 1604), ed. Samuel Ward, sig. ¶3v.

[31] Bedell to Ward, 11 March 1604/5, Tanner MSS 75, fol. 132r; *Two Biographies,* p. 221.

papal temporal *dominium* – concludes that 'No apostle, no sacred father, no orthodox believer for 1200 years after Christ ever felt or taught about the principles and foundations of Christianity in the way that the Roman Church now does in the Council of Trent.'[32]

Ward dedicated his edition of Perkins's *Problema* to King James VI & I and also included a preface to the reader dated 2 January 1604.[33] The date is notable, being only days before the first session of the Hampton Court conference on Saturday 14 January.[34] The Conference had been postponed from November because of an outbreak of plague and Ward appears to have used this extra time advisedly to prepare his own contribution to the campaign to persuade James that the Reformed cause offered a strong buttress to royal power. Bedell records that at James's accession, he made 'a paraphrase … of the 72nd psalm', which addresses the theme of godly kingship. Bedell valued this paraphrase sufficiently to ask Ward if he had left it with him in Cambridge when he could not locate it in July 1605: 'Whether I sent, or left it with you at my being in Cambridge I know not, but sure I am I had in purpose to have shewed it you: if you have it send it me I pray'.[35] With the loss of this document we cannot be sure exactly how Bedell interpreted Psalm 72, but its general theme is a prayer for God to give his wisdom to Kings, beginning with the words 'Give the king thy judgments, O God, and thy righteousness unto the king's son.'[36] Bedell and Ward seem to have greeted the new reign with excitement, optimistic that James could prove of great benefit to the Reformed cause.

---

[32] 'Nullus Apostolus, nullus Sanctus Pater, nullus per 1200 a Christo annos Orthodoxus, sic unquam quoad omnia principia vel fundamenta Religionis sensit & docuit, ut iam sentit docetq[ue] Ecclesia Romana, in Concilio Tridentino', Perkins, *Problema*, sig. Hh2v. Discussion of the primacy of the Pope at sigs. Cc1v–Dd3r; discussion of the Pope's temporal jurisdiction at sigs. Ee2r–Ee4v.

[33] '4º Nonas Ianuarii. Anno salutis MDCIIII', ibid., sig. ¶4v. 1604 appears to be 1603/4, as Ward's prefaces to the King and the Reader praise James's pious response to the plague of late 1603 (sig. ¶3r–v), emphasise the King's recent accession (esp. sig. ¶2r and ¶4r) and describes it as 'already a whole year, and increasing, from when Doctor Perkins went to sleep peacefully with the Lord' ('Annus iam integer est, & eo amplius, ex quo D. Perkinsus in Domino placide obdormivit', sig. ¶5r). Perkins had died in 1602; Ward's phrasing suggests a little over a year had passed.

[34] Curtis, 'Hampton Court', p. 8.

[35] Bedell to Ward, 25 July 1605, [Bury St Edmunds], Tanner MS 75, fol. 137r; *Two Biographies*, p. 223.

[36] KJV, Psalm 72.

The Hampton Court Conference itself may therefore have come as something of a disappointment. Bedell was close to two of the four representatives of the puritan party: Chaderton himself and John Knewstub (1544–1624), who was a leading member of the combination lecture at Bury St Edmunds and features regularly in Bedell's letters.[37] Admiration for a third member of the group, John Rainolds, the Master of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, can also be inferred from a letter sent to Bedell by Joseph Hall (1574–1656), lamenting Rainolds' death as the latest in a series of losses of great Reformed divines (a list in which he includes Perkins) and encouraging Bedell – who had just arrived in Venice – to seek not just an 'imitation' but 'an emulation of their worthinesse'.[38] Hall was another of Bedell's Emmanuel contemporaries, and the only alumnus of the College aside from Bedell who would go on to become a bishop before the Civil War.[39] It has been long been noted that the representatives of the puritan party at Hampton Court were government nominees. These were men viewed as moderates, and men who had participated in the vocal petitioning for the puritan cause in the summer of 1603 (rather than just the more carefully worded millenary petition) appear to have been purposely excluded.[40] How much did these men hope to achieve? As Peter Lake emphasises, the puritan representatives at Hampton Court did not make the case that ceremonies were unlawful (as many of their more extreme brethren believed), but rather emphasised concerns about indifferent ceremonies nonetheless causing offence. This strategy may have backfired, as puritan objections were made to look trivial, but from the point of view of moderates like Chaderton, the outcome was

[37] F.J. Bremer, 'Knewstub [Knewstubs], John (1544–1624)', in *ODNB*. The combination lecture was given by a rotating cast of local ministers on a Monday. As the lecturer at St Mary's, Bedell will have given his own weekly lecture, probably on a Wednesday, while the lecturer at St James's preached on Fridays. For discussion of these arrangements, with reference to Bedell and Bury St Edmunds, see P. Collinson, 'Lectures by Combination: Structures and Characteristics of Church Life in Seventeenth-Century England', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 48 (1975), pp. 192–5.
[38] Joseph Hall, *Epistles, the first volume: conteining two decads* (London, 1608), pp. 69–77 (quotation from p. 73).
[39] As noted by P. Collinson et al., *A History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (Woodbridge, 1999), p. 82.
[40] Collinson, *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, p. 455–6.

‘far from a disaster’ and at worst ‘a tie … from which the puritans had emerged to fight another day’.[41]

For Lake, Chaderton is the central figure in the clutch of late sixteenth-century divines whom he has labelled ‘moderate puritans’. Chaderton’s central concern in the wake of the Conference – after the members of the puritan delegation failed to achieve as many concessions as had been hoped and found themselves forced to respond to Bancroft’s drive to conformity – was the question of subscription to the form of worship set out in the Book of Common Prayer. In making a decision as to whether to subscribe or not, puritan divines had to decide whether the ceremonies stipulated by the Church of England were enough to drive them out of the Church, and many puritan ministers turned to Chaderton for advice.[42] Chaderton argued, as the Reformed delegates had previously at the Conference, that ceremonies were not unlawful, but rather *adiaphora*, things indifferent; they could, however, be abused if an individual (whether in the ministry or congregation) enacted them in the wrong spirit, incorrectly treating them as integral to worship.[43]

Chaderton was not concerned by the possibility of ceremonies being unlawful. This did not mean that he endorsed the enforced subscriptions that followed the Hampton Court conference. He argued that ‘being indifferent things [these ceremonies] should be permitted to be used indifferently’.[44] The dictates of subscription were, therefore, unnecessarily strict – but this still need not be a bar to subscribing. A more substantive difficulty, however, was presented by the possibility that ceremonies, though lawful, could nonetheless cause ‘offence and scandal to the weak in faith and therefore hurt others’.[45] By offence, scrupulous precisians meant the risk that a member of the congregation might interpret the ceremony in the wrong way and that this ‘offence’ taken might hinder their path to salvation. For all that Chaderton advocated that his fellow Reformed minsters should conform, he emphasised that the matters

[41] Lake, *Moderate Puritans*, p. 248.
[42] Ibid., p. 249.
[43] See Lake’s discussion of LPL, MS. 2550, fols. 51–60 in *Moderate puritans*, 244–7.
[44] Lake, ‘Moderate puritans’, p. 252, quoting LPL, MS. 2550, f. 4v.
[45] Lake, ‘Moderate puritans’, p. 244, LPL, MS. 2550, f. 54v.

indifferent should be determined according to circumstances. If ceremonies were inexpedient and more likely to give offence, they would be best avoided; thus, though in the current circumstances it was best to conform, that did not close off the possibility of ceremonies being reformed or abolished in future. There was, as Lake notes, a large degree of flexibility at the heart of Chaderton's case, which allowed a commitment to conformity to coexist with disapproval of the ways in which conformity was policed.[46]

Yet it will now become clear that Chaderton came closer to refusing to subscribe than even Lake's description of his ambiguous stance would suggest. And intriguingly for the line of investigation pursued here, Bedell may well have played an influential role in persuading Chaderton to this cause of action. Bedell's position on subscription is set out in a series of letters to Ward and bears substantial similarity to the stance we have seen taken by Chaderton. But this appears not to be simply a case of Chaderton shaping his student's views: Bedell's correspondence suggests that he may have influenced his old teacher. Bedell and Ward's discussions of subscription have been discussed in an article by Margo Todd.[47] As Todd convincingly suggests, these discussions provide a window on to the development of a set of principles which both Bedell and Ward continued to hold throughout their lives, emphasising obedience and the centrality of preaching the gospel over liturgical purity. In their correspondence in 1604–5, however, both men were still uncertain what path to take. Bedell was the more forthright in his arguments for conforming, while Ward (whose side of the correspondence does not survive) seems to have expressed his and Chaderton's continued doubts.

---

[46] Lake, 'Moderate puritans', pp. 251–61.

[47] M. Todd, '"An Act of Discretion": Evangelical Conformity and the Puritan Dons', *Albion* 18 (1986), pp. 581-599. Although this article is the best discussion of Bedell and Ward in relation to the Subscription Controversy, it also contains a number of errors, most notably in its account of Bedell's surviving works (p. 583), amongst which Todd counts only Bedell's correspondence and his notebook on discipline at Trinity College Dublin, failing to note the relatively well-known 'Defence of the Answer to Alabaster', amongst other more understandable omissions. Errors include analysis of the last few lines of Bedell's letter to Ward of 3 December 1604, in which Bedell asks Ward to keep his arguments confidential, rather than vice versa (p. 587) and the date of Bedell's move to Bury St Edmunds (Todd says 1604, rather than 1602, p. 583). The analysis of Bedell's career is also limited by the very brief treatment given to his time in Venice (p. 588).

The argument from 'things indifferent' did not yet seem to Chaderton to provide sufficient reason to subscribe. In November 1604, Ward reported to Bedell that Chaderton was still considering refusing to conform, and thus resigning his post at Emmanuel. Bedell expressed his sorrow at that news, and noted his particular surprise that Chaderton's concerns persisted despite his acceptance that ceremonies were matters indifferent.[48] Chaderton's opposition by this stage apparently hinged solely on the question of 'offence'. Bedell, in his response to Ward, argues firmly that the question of offence should be no bar to Chaderton subscribing, concluding with the words, 'I pray God move our Master's mind to that which may be most to his glory, the College's good and his own comfort.'[49] Bedell also suggested that Ward should use his own powers of persuasion to help the workings of providence along: 'Commend me to our Master whom you should do well to persuade all that may be [i.e. as far as possible] not to yield over his place in such a time.'[50] He adds that Ward might use the arguments that he, Bedell, has set out in his letter, and that Chaderton might also be encouraged by news that 'Mr. Knewstub will not [yield his place] if he be put to the push'.[51] John Knewstub, with whom Bedell worked closely as a lecturer in Bury St Edmunds, was a clergyman of presbyterian sympathies, who like Chaderton had represented the puritan case at the Hampton Court Conference. Like Chaderton, Knewstub was a veteran of numerous Elizabethan struggles over conformity. His decision was an authoritative one, which Bedell clearly thought might have an effect on Chaderton, though he also asks Ward to be cautious in spreading the news too widely, noting that he would not want it 'much divulged'.[52]

Bedell's responses to the subscription controversy concur with Chaderton's views on the central question of the lawfulness of ceremonies, concluding that they are neither lawful nor unlawful but rather indifferent. The argument of indifference was double-edged, and though it meant conformity was permissible, Bedell believed that it

[48] Bedell to Ward, Bury, 3 Dec. 1604, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 130r.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid., fol. 130v.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Bedell to Ward, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 180r.

was better to conform uneasily, but retain the right to preach, rather than lose that right by refusing subscription: 'As for relinquishing the ministry, if nothing impious be required at our hands, I dare not approve it for all the inconveniences in the world.'[53] Preaching, for Bedell, was the route by which the Church was purified, and ceremonies – as long as they were properly explained so that the congregation knew they were adiaphora – posed no substantial threat to this. As Bedell put it, 'the preaching of the Gospell should sway more, than our desire of even our owne liberty'; he summarises this principle with the conventional Ciceronian tag used in a less conventional context: 'salus populi suprema lex'.[54] It was more important to preserve a structure in which preaching could be performed with authority, and this meant continued obedience to the magistrate. Ideally, one would conform as far as one needed to, and avoid subscription itself, which was for Bedell, as for others, more akin to a statement of one's conscience, and risked suggesting that ceremonies were necessary rather than matters indifferent. But, as Bedell himself found when required to confirm his subscription in early 1605, this was not always possible.[55] Bedell told Ward that even in this case, he was ultimately willing to subscribe rather than lose the right to preach.

Bedell's public statements of this case for subscribing had also included a sermon which Bedell had had to preach before his Bishop at some point around early August 1604.[56] Ward had received news of this sermon and seems to have quizzed Bedell on its contents, perhaps suggesting that he had heard rumours that Bedell had gone too far in supporting subscription. In a letter of 16 October 1604, Bedell defends himself by saying that his sermon was carefully moderate in tone, saying that though he sympathised with those who saw ceremonies as a cause of dissension, he 'would desire, that [his] bretheren the Ministers who had stood out against [ceremonies], would even take some burden upon them and *pro bono pacis*, rather than deprive the Church of the fruite, and themselves the comfort of their Ministry, and doe that willingly what

[53] Bedell to Ward, 16 October 1604, Tanner MSS 75, fol. 126r; *Two Biographies,* p. 215.
[54] Ibid., p. 216.
[55] Bedell to Ward, 11 March 1604/5, Tanner MS 75, fol. 132r; *Two Biographies,* p. 220.
[56] Bedell to Ward, 16 October 1604, Tanner MS 75, fol. 127r; *Two Biographies,* p. 217.

they must doe necessaryly'.[57] Bedell was right to feel a need to defend himself against the charge of being one who 'persuade[s] to the Ceremonies': a letter survives from Thomas Daynes to Lady Anne Drury, sent on 20 August 1604, complaining that Bedell's sermon had been unhelpful to the godly cause.[58]

Interestingly, timeline of Chaderton's doubts suggests that Bedell's arguments may have had an impact on him. In the end, Chaderton would change his mind, despite this garnering disapproval from more radical, non-subscribing puritans, such Thomas Brightman. It is quite probable that Ward's reports of Bedell and Knewstub's stances may have helped sway him; in early December 1604, Bedell was still writing of the 'peril' of Chaderton leaving Emmanuel, but by 10 January 1605, Brightman was writing to Chaderton trying to persuade him of the error of conforming.[59] Bedell and Ward were debating conformity at the heart of Cambridge's godly elite, influenced by – but also influencing – some of the most important 'moderate puritans' of the previous generation. Bedell was an active promoter of arguments which legitimised subscription in his Cambridge and Suffolk godly circles. It was not at all inevitable that these men would lend their support to the new King's religious settlement: but Bedell was one of those who saw advantages in doing so, carving out space for a strong Reformed conformist contingent in the post-1604 Church.

Bedell's stance on subscription was a bid to take the Reformed cause in a particular direction. Bedell was part of the new generation of godly preachers which the founding of Emmanuel had made a substantial contribution to forming. But Bedell was also building on a longstanding East Anglian tradition of balancing obedience with calls for further Reform. Collinson has described Suffolk in this period as a 'primitive puritan commonwealth', which more closely resembled the ideal of a godly commonwealth than 'any part of England at any time'.[60] Local gentry and ministers

---

[57] Ibid.
[58] Thomas Daynes to Lady Anne Drury, Bungay, 20 August 1604, University of Chicago Library, USA, Sir Nicholas Bacon Collection, MS 4178 [available online: https://www.lib.uchicago.edu/ead/pdf/bacon-4178.pdf].
[59] Lake, *Moderate puritans,* pp. 252–55.
[60] P. Collinson, 'Magistracy and ministry: a Suffolk Miniature', in *Reformation, Conformity and Dissent: essays in honour of Geoffrey Nuttall* (London, 1977), ed. R.B. Knox, p. 449.

placed a particular emphasis on the reciprocal relationship of 'magistrates and ministers', each of which were reliant on the other.[61] Collinson emphasises the 'mutuality' of these structures, which undermines any account of seventeenth-century religious politics based on dichotomous allegiances to theocratic Calvinism or secular Erastianism (in its cruder meaning of full state control over the Church). Bedell's response to the Subscription controversy was to clarify his own thoughts on the correct relationship between Church and State. His answer, which drew on sixteenth-century thinking about the Royal Supremacy, was that the King had control over the Church in jurisdictional matters, but not in sacerdotal matters.[62] This vision of the Supremacy would shape Bedell's thinking throughout his career. It is therefore worth looking closely at the arguments he made with regard to subscription to see the uncertain and tentative process by which Bedell came to endorse a particular view of obedience and the Royal Supremacy. The set of arguments he developed in the heat of the Subscription controversy thus shaped his later career, providing an important ideological foundation for his interactions with the anti-papal Catholics of Venice.

II

A particularly valuable source for the development of Bedell's stance on subscription is a short manuscript piece arguing against the introduction, a copy of which is preserved amongst some of Bedell's surviving papers in the Bodleian's Rawlinson collection.[63] This short text does not have a title, but its contents is described in the first line as 'a weyghty deliberation… Touching Ceremonyes to be used in the publick service of God'. It is written in Bedell's hand and, as we shall see, can probably be dated to 1604. At the top of the page some words have been scribbled out. In the top left hand corner, it is not possible to make out anything underneath the deletion, but moving to the right, there are a few, still unclear words which may read 'To Mr

[61] Ibid., p. 446.
[62] Cf. Rose, *Godly Kingship*, esp. pp. 50–51 and pp. 63–5.
[63] Bodl., Oxford, Rawlinson C. 922, fols. 1r–5v, 'A weyghty deliberation… Touching Ceremonyes to be used in the publick service of God'. Some of the papers in the Rawlinson volume feature annotations by Archbishop Sancroft, who may have obtained them from Bedell's son in law Alexander Clogie, in whose hand some of the other papers are written.

Bedwell'.[64] The words at the centre of the page are a little clearer, and read '[From/Sir] Edward Lewkenor'.[65] This is significant, as another copy of the treatise can be found amongst the papers of Sir Edward Lewkenor (1542–1605) in the British Library.[66] The British Library copy has tentatively been attributed to Bedell in the online catalogue, but Bedell's authorship has never definitively been established – nor has the text been analysed as evidence of his stance on subscription. This piece of writing sheds light on the milieu in which Bedell formed his opinions and the different paths which could be taken by clergymen with moderate puritan sympathies, and offers us a taste of the ambivalence with which Bedell and his associates approached conformity.

It seems reasonable to assume that Bedell was the author of this 'Weyghty deliberation'. The Bodleian manuscript appears to be Bedell's original copy, written in what seems to be his own hand and featuring *currente calamo* corrections which suggest he was composing as he wrote.[67] By contrast, the British Library copy, which is written in a different hand, appears to be a fair copy, made from the Bodleian MS.[68] It seems most probable, therefore, that Lewkenor borrowed Bedell's original to make a fair copy and returned the text to Bedell at a later date, with the address (afterwards scribbled out) to Bedell added at the top. A delivery by 'Sir Edw. Lewknors man', possibly including this very document, is mentioned in a letter sent by Bedell to Ward on 16 October 1604.[69] Lewkenor was a Suffolk landowner and noted godly patron. He was therefore another important figure in the Emmanuel–Suffolk nexus in which Bedell was operating during his time in Cambridge and following his move to Bury St Edmunds. Evidence of Bedell's close relationship with Lewkenor and other Suffolk puritans is furnished by the inclusion of verses he penned (in both Greek and Latin) for

[64] Bodl., Oxford, Rawlinson C. 922, fol. 1r. The letters 'To M… dwell' are less obscured than the earlier potion of the word. The mistaken use of Bedwell for Bedell is plausible. Bedell was sometimes confused with the noted Arabist William Bedwell by the two men's contemporaries. For example, the Imperial Librarian at Vienna, Sebastian Tengnagel, confuses Bedell with Bedwell in an annotation to a letter of introduction to Bedell given to him by Sir John Harington in 1609, see Harington to Bedell, Vienna, 25 August 1609, ÖNB, Cod. 9737r, fol. 136v.
[65] Ibid.
[66] British Library, Townshend Papers, Add. MS 38492, fols. 18r–23v.
[67] Bodl., Oxford, Rawlinson C 922, fols. 1r–5v.
[68] British Library, Townshend Papers, Add MS 38492, fols. 18r–23v.
[69] Bedell to Ward, 11 March 1604/5, Tanner MSS 75, fol. 132r; *Two Biographies,* p. 222.

a collection of poems published as a memorial to Lewkenor after the latter's death from smallpox in October 1605; other contributors included Joseph Hall.[70]

However, the argument made within the manuscript text of the 'Weyghty deliberation' is somewhat surprising given the line Bedell take in his letters to Ward. The author of the treatise makes a clear argument *against* subscription, as a method which would drive good men out of the Church. Although, as we have seen, Bedell did express his sorrow that good men were leaving the Church because of subscription in his correspondence with Ward, the solution he proposed to Ward was that these men ought to swallow their scruples and subscribe, recognising that ceremonies were matters indifferent and there was more good to be done from *within* the established Church than by protesting on point of principle. The author of the 'Weyghty deliberation', on the other hand, advocates that the compromise should come from the other side, and ministers spared the necessity of subscribing: it is 'inconvenient', the author asserts, that ceremonies which were merely matters indifferent 'should necessarily be urged on ministers, either to use or at least to allow and approve by subscription'.[71] However, these two arguments are not fundamentally incompatible. The author of the text certainly does take a moderate tone, trying to emphasise the common ground. He writes:

> I have never yet heard of any man that would have them [the ceremonies stipulated in the Book of Common Prayer] wholly abandoned, if yet he agree to this description of them, if they be certain solemme outward rites in the service of God. For some such rites (by the ground of Holy Scripture and examples of holy men in them) have a kind of natural derivation from the carriage of the mind in actions of gods service.[72]

The author presents himself as having some sympathy for the arguments of all sides: those who take certain ceremonies (specifically, the wearing of vestments and the sign of the cross in baptism) to be 'remnants of Idolatry and Superstition'; those who instead

[70] Bedell's poems can be found on pp. 27–8 of Sir Edward Lewkenor (son; d. 1618) et al., *Threnodia in obitum D. Edouardi Lewkenor Equitis, & D. Susannae coniugis charissimae* (London, 1606).
[71] Bodl., Rawlinson C 922, fol. 1r.
[72] Ibid.

see such ceremonies 'as ancient, as comely & of ornament'; and finally those who think that such ceremonies 'are not wicked' and 'may be tollerated to heale inconveniences', and that if required by 'the Magistrates and Lawe', they 'ought to be used for obedience'.[73] Having set out all these positions, the author comes down on the side of the final group in judging these ceremonies as 'inconvenient', but not wicked, yet he also judges it 'inconvenient' that those who are more suspicious of the ceremonies should be forced to subscribe: 'for my part weighing in my minde the reasons on all sides, I am enduced to say… they are at least inconvenient to be subscribed unto.'[74] This is the argument of someone who was reluctant to see subscription introduced, but this does not mean the author would have refused to subscribe in the case that it was. This is compatible with the path Bedell followed. Thus, the manuscript offers evidence of Bedell's shifting attitude to subscription, and the careful way in which he closely scrutinised arguments on both sides of the debate. The argument of the 'Weyghty deliberation' thus gives us no reason to doubt the palaeographical evidence that this was a text composed by Bedell himself.

If Bedell was the author, can we establish the occasion for which the 'Weyghty deliberation' was written? The Bodleian text is certainly written with some particular gathering in mind, which the author describes as 'that Honorable Court which is shortly to assemble'.[75] It may be that Bedell was specifically asked to argue this side of the case, in the scholastic fashion, as part of a disputation.[76] In the letter of 16 October 1604 mentioned above, Bedell describes to Ward how in one discussion of subscription, he had been 'enforced' by 'the Chiefe of our company to take the place of the respondent' and hence he had 'assayed to answer the contrary arguments.'[77] By 'company', Bedell seems likely to mean a meeting Bury St Edmunds combination lecture (probably at some point in Autumn 1604), at which points of theology were often debated. This

[73] Ibid., fol. 1v.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Bodl., Rawlinson C 922, fol. 1r.
[76] For an excellent account of what it meant to be a Respondent in a disputation at this time, see W.T. Costello, *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge MA, 1958), pp. 14–31.
[77] Bedell to Ward, 16 October 1604, Tanner MS 75, fol. 127r; *Two Biographies,* p. 217.

means the 'Chiefe' was probably Knewstub.[78] Could the Bodleian manuscript consist of a speech prepared by Bedell for this particular meeting of the combination lecture? Though tempting, this seems an unsatisfactory explanation. The wording of Bedell's letter of 16 October is somewhat ambiguous, and does not make it entirely clear whether the 'Chief' asked him to make the case for or against subscription. However, on balance, it seems more likely that in this letter of 16 October 1604, Bedell is defending himself for having spoken *in favour* of subscribing at the Bury St Edmunds combination lecture. Most of the preceding discussion in the letter is spent offering a defence of other occasions on which Bedell had spoken in favour of subscription. After explaining that he had been required to argue in favour of subscription, Bedell adds, conspiratorially, 'And, be it spoken betweene ourselves, I doe not find any great difficulty so to doe.'[79] Bedell's speech at the Bury St Edmunds combination lecture was part of a separate, later discussion, after the canons of 1604 had been issued, finalising the policy of subscription. By this time, Bedell had decided, as he explained to Ward in the rest of the letter, that godly clergymen should subscribe rather than face deprivation.

The 'Weyghty deliberation' arguing against subscription, on the other hand, must date from an earlier moment, before subscription to ceremonial forms of the Book of Common Prayer had been officially codified in the Canons of 1604. The author refers to the question of subscription to the ceremonies with reference to James's 'Proclamation for the Authorising and Uniformity of the Book of Common Prayer' of 5 March 1603/4, and without reference the Canons of 1604, which were approved only later in the year.[80] Rather than the Bury St Edmunds combination lecture, the language used offers suggestive evidence that that the argument might addressed to a different gathering: the Convocation of the Church of England of 1604, the body responsible for approving the drafting of the Canons. As we have seen, the author refers to his audience

---

[78] Chaderton, as the Master of Emmanuel, or Bedell's bishop, John Jegon, are also possibilities, but these seem far less likely.

[79] Bedell to Ward, 16 October 1604, Tanner MS 75, fol. 127r; *Two Biographies,* p. 217.

[80] Ibid.; James VI/I, 'Proclamation for the Authorising and Uniformity of the Book of Common Prayer', 5 March 1604, in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol. 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I 1603–1625* (Oxford, 1973), eds. J.F. Larkin and P.L. Hughes, pp. 74–7. Convocation passed the canons on 25 June 1604 and James gave them royal approval on 6 September 1604. See R.G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, Vol. 1 (London, 1969), p. 358.

as an 'honourable Court'; and he later adds another comment referring to them as 'Wise men (whereof this court hath the flower of the whole realme)'. Even more conclusively, he adds, 'Neither can my Lords the prelates any way think it indifferent to be judges alone in the case wherein they are parties'.[81] We know from his correspondence that Bedell later attended the Convocation of 1624.[82] Perhaps the 'Weyghty deliberation' formed the basis for a speech he himself gave at the 1604 Convocation. Alternatively, he may have written it to form the basis of someone else's speech. Whether written for himself or to inform someone else, we can conclude with certainty that this was a text produced in the hope of influencing Convocation, and which thus offers a rare and hitherto unrecognised insight into the sort of discussion that went on at this significant gathering of the clergy in early 1604.[83] It is further likely that Bedell gave the text to Sir Edward Lewkenor, who was an MP in the Commons, while both men were in London for the concurrent sessions of Convocation and Parliament, who had a copy made before returning the original to Bedell via the messenger mentioned in the letter of 16 October 1604; here, then, we get a glimpse of collaborative opposition to the introduction of subscription. Bedell once again appears to have had a notable degree of influence in Suffolk Reformed circles, and some influence at the level of national ecclesiastical politics too.

The 'Weyghty deliberation' had argued against the introduction of subscription, but the body of his argument notwithstanding, Bedell ended the text of this speech with an undertaking to subscribe if the King judged this the best course of action.[84] As we have already seen, by the time of his appearance at the Bury St Edmunds combination lecture, and of his correspondence with Ward, Bedell was doing just this, arguing that ministers had a duty to obediently subscribe and conform to the King's wishes. Indeed,

---

[81] Bodl., Rawlinson C. 922, fol. 1r.
[82] Bedell to Ward, 16 April 1624, Tanner MS 73, fol. 425r; *Two Biographies,* p. 261.
[83] Sources for discussion at the Convocation of 1604 are very limited. A copy of speech opposing subscription delivered by the Bishop of St. David's, Anthony Rudd, on 23 May 1604, survives in manuscript, see BL, Harl. MS 7049, fols. 567r–70v; it was later printed in James Pierce, *A Vindication of the Dissenters* (London, 1717), pp. 158–63. A few brief notes on the proceedings of the Convocation of 1604 can also be found in Bodl., Tanner MS 282, fols. 19v–25r; this text is edited and translated in G. Bray (ed.), *Records of Convocation* Vol. 7: Canterbury 1603–1700 (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 1–7.
[84] Bodl., Oxford, Rawlinson C 922, fol. 5v

as we have seen, Bedell – despite some reluctance – gained a reputation for making this case, and persuaded others to adopt the same course.

III

While developing his stance on Subscription, Bedell also drew on his awareness of a broader European context, and a conviction that the intricacies of the Church of England's internal disputes were less important than presenting a united front against Roman Catholicism. Bedell's Emmanuel education had introduced him to a well-established body of Latin anti-Catholic polemic by individuals from the nexus of 'moderate Puritanism' and 'Reformed conformity'. These included the works of Rainolds, William Whittaker, Andrew Willet, Robert Abbot and Perkins (notably his *Problema de Romanæ fidei*, edited by Samuel Ward, which we have discussed above).[85] In the letter of March 1605 in which Bedell informed Ward that he himself had been asked to subscribe, Bedell also records his wish to answer 'a peece of Parsons against Mr Fox, a shamelesse worke of a gracelesse man', referring to the work of the Jesuit polemicist Robert Persons refuting Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*.[86] He then goes on to describe his regret that instead 'we are together by the eares about ceremonies'.[87] For Bedell, the controversy over subscription was a distraction from the more important, European battle against Catholicism. 'Ah Mr Warde,' Bedell wrote in October 1604, 'God grant these mens rigor avayle not more to popery than the others remissnes.'[88] The risk of puritan 'rigor' was that too many otherwise good men would leave the Church of England, leaving it in a weaker position.

---

[85] John Rainolds, *De Romanae Ecclesiae idolatria* (Oxford, 1596); William Whitaker, *Disputatio de sacra scriptura contra hujus temporis Papistas: inprimis Robertum Bellarminum... et Thomam Stapletonum...* (Cambridge, 1588); Andrew Willet, *Synopsis Papismi* (London, 1600); Robert Abbot, *Antichristi demonstratio contra fabulas pontificias* (London, 1603); William Perkins, *Problema de Romanæ fidei* (Cambridge, 1604) and (in English) William Perkins, *A reformed Catholike* (Cambridge, 1598).

[86] Bedell to Ward, 11 March 1605, Tanner MSS 75, fol. 132v; *Two Biographies,* p. 221. The work in question is Robert Persons, *A treatise of three conversions of England from paganisme to Christian religion* ([Saint-Omer], 1603).

[87] Bedell to Ward, 11 March 1605, Tanner MSS 75, fol. 132v.

[88] Bedell to Ward, 16 October 1604, Tanner MSS 75, fol. 127r; *Two Biographies,* p. 218.

In his own writings of this period, Bedell endeavoured to keep the polemical focus on Roman Catholicism. He wrote a lengthy response to a challenge to the Church of England posed by the English convert William Alabaster, a notorious ordained Church of England minister who had converted to Roman Catholicism in the late 1590s. After a period at the English College in Rome, Alabaster returned to England, where he was imprisoned, released, then imprisoned again in 1604. He made arrangements with the earl of Salisbury to pass on information about the activities of the Jesuits and then returned to Rome, but eventually fled, disillusioned, first to Holland and then back to England, where he was reconciled to the Church of England and returned to his former life as a clergyman.[89] Bedell's text addresses four questions about the Church of England, which Alabaster had posed to Bedell and Joseph Hall at a meeting at the house of Sir Robert Drury, probably at some point late in 1604.[90] Alabaster's demands were as follows: whether the Church of England had had a continuous existence since the time of the Apostles; what reason members of the Church of England had for thinking their doctrine superior to that of 'any other sect of Christians'; how Church of England ministers could prove their doctrine to be lawful; and why it should not be lawful to pray to the Saints.[91] Bedell wrote up his responses, which were then questioned in turn by an anonymous Catholic replier, who was later identified as Paul Green, at times also known as Washington or Harris.[92] Bedell wrote Green a fuller

---

[89] For Alabaster, see F.J. Bremer, 'Alabaster, William (1568–1640)', ODNB; and the introduction to William Alabaster, *Unpublished works by William Alabaster (1568-1640)* (Salzburg, 1997), ed. D.S. Sutton, pp. vi–xxx.

[90] The meeting is mentioned at a number of points in the text, but most fully at p. "246" [446]. See also p. 135, p. 252, p. 288; and Hall's to Bedell, letter to Bedell, printed in Joseph Hall, *Epistles, the first volume: conteining two decads* (London, 1608), p. 76. Drury was the husband of Anne, to whom, as we shall see, Bedell would later dedicate another polemical work, and Hall's patron.

[91] William Bedell, 'A Defence of the Answer to Mr. Alabaster's Four Demands; against a Treatise Intituled The Catholic's Reply upon Bedell's Answer to Mr. Alabaster's four Demands', Lambeth Palace Library [hereafter LPL], London, MS 772, p. 16.

[92] See G.M. Murphy, 'Green [alias Harris]', ODNB. Bedell (who called him Washington or Harris) would encounter Green again in Ireland, where Green settled from 1613. I have not found any evidence supporting Bedell's belief that Green had studied at Christ's College, Cambridge (Bedell to Ward, Kilmore, 2 February 1634, *Two Biographies,* p. 333; Bodl., Tanner MS 71, fol. 189), but he was right to say Green was also the author of a confutation of a sermon of Ussher's given at before the King at Wanstead in 1624. See Paul Harris, *A briefe confutation of certaine absurd, hereticall, and damnable doctrines, delivered by Mr. James Usher, in a sermon, preached before King James our late Soueraigne, at Wansted, June 20. anno Domini. 1624* ([Saint-Omer], 1627).

response. The complete work contains a dedication dated '25th February 1604', which is presumably 1604/5, or 1605 according to modern dating conventions.[93] On 11 March 1605, Bedell sent Ward a 58-page section of this response.[94] This appears to have been only the first part of the full text, which in surviving manuscripts runs to hundreds of folios. In the six surviving manuscript copies the work is given the title 'A Defence of the Answer to Mr. Alablaster's Four Demands; against a Treatise Intituled The Catholic's Reply upon Bedel's Answer to Mr. Alabaster's four Demands'.[95] As Bedell reports to Ward, the fourth part of the work is the longest, and deals 'chiefly with Bellarmine' on the question of praying to the saints. The work was never printed; although a number of Bedell's contacts urged him to publish his 'Defence', Bedell refused to do so, both before and after Alabaster had returned to the Church of England.[96] Nonetheless, the survival of multiple manuscript copies suggests that the text enjoyed some manuscript circulation.[97] I shall be citing from the Lambeth Palace Library copy, later owned by Archbishop Thomas Tenison.[98]

This document helps make clear that for Bedell, the controversy over Subscription risked becoming a distraction from the more important battle against Catholicism. As Bedell's refutation of Bellarmine suggests, Bedell was aware that this was a broad European battle, but he also recognised Catholicism as a threat closer to home: he dedicated his response to the replier to 'Mr Ambrose Jermym, one of our

---

[93] LPL, London, MS 772, 'A Defence of the Answer to Mr. Alablaster's Four Demands; against a Treatise Intituled The Catholic's Reply upon Bedel's Answer to Mr. Alabaster's four Demands', p. 4.
[94] Bedell to Ward, 11 October 1604/5, Tanner MSS 75, fol. 132r; *Two Biographies,* p. 221.
[95] This version of the title taken from LPL, London, MS 772. Repeated with minor variations in spelling on all manuscript copies.
[96] See, Hall's suggestion in his letter to Bedell, printed in Joseph Hall, *Epistles, the first volume: conteining two decads* (London, 1608), p. 76; and Bedell's account of Ussher's suggestions that he publish it, in Bedell to Ward, Kilmore, 2 Feb. 1634, Bodl., Tanner MS 76, fol. 111; *Two Biographies,* p. 333 (misdated in heading on p. 331).
[97] Multiple manuscript copies survive, including LPL, London, MS 772; BL, Add. MS 10055; Bodl., MS. Eng. th. C. 65; Bodl., MS Rawlinson C 922, fols. 39r–147r; Emmanuel College Library MS 181; and Corpus Christi Library, Oxford, MS 309, fols. 136r *et seq*. I have included brief descriptions and comparisons of these texts in Appendix II.
[98] The page numbers in this copy are faulty. After p. 347, the next page is numbered p. 148, and all subsequent pages are labelled with a number 200 lower than they should be. I have indicated this by labelling such pages 'p. "number on page" [true page number]', e.g. p. "148" [348]. I have chosen to cite this manuscript as it is the version most frequently cited by other historians, as discussed in Appendix II.

Popish recusants, a good and courteous gentleman who took it in very good worth.'[99] Bedell's interest in local recusants was long-lasting; he later wrote a short book on the topic, entitled *An examination of certaine motives to recusancie* (Cambridge, 1628). In his letter to Ward describing his 'Defence', Bedell expresses curiosity about how the work would be received in the parish's Catholic community more broadly, saying 'how it is accepted among them I shall hear more hereafter'.[100]

The text of Bedell's 'Defence' provides evidence that he already had a well-developed stance on the Church of Rome, which he allows to be a true Church, writing:

> Wee confesse that under the Papacy there is much Christian good, yea there is all Christian good, & that from thence also it came to us, for wee acknowledge that in the Papacy there is the true holy Scripture, true Baptisme, the true Sacrament of the Altar, the true keyes to remission of Sinns, the true office of preaching, the true catchisme, as the Lord's Prayer, the 10 Commandments, the Articles of Faith. I say further under the Papacy is true Christianity, yea the true kernell of Christianity.[101]

However, Bedell also draws a clear distinction between the 'Roman Church' and the 'Roman Court', teasing his interlocuter about his failure to distinguish the two: 'You are I perceive but a stranger in these Controversies if you know not, that we wee are wont to distinguish betwixt Popery and Christianity.'[102] Bedell even calls on Bellarmine in support of the idea that the true Church is composed of individual faithful believers, rather than visible Church structures.[103] While the Roman Church contains the Christian truth and all necessary to salvation, it is subject to the 'tyranny' of the Roman Court ruling over it:

> even under his [the Pope's] tyranny, the Churches do remaine, but such, as with sacrilegious impiety hee hath profaned, which with cruell Masterlynesse hee hath

[99] Bedell to Ward, 11 March 1604/5, Tanner MSS 75, fol. 132r; *Two Biographies,* p. 221
[100] Ibid.
[101] Bedell, 'A Defence', LPL, MS 772, p. 36.
[102] Ibid., p. 35.
[103] Ibid., p. 34.

> afflicted, which with wicked and deadly doctrines as with poysoned potions hee hath corrupted, & almost killed.[104]

For Bedell, the fact that the Roman Church is indeed a true Church makes the corruption of it by the papacy all the worse. Bedell suggests that this is the clearest sign that the Pope is the Antichrist. As he puts it, nothing can properly be called Antichristian 'but that which usurpeth the name of it'.[105] The papacy's 'tyranny', 'usurpation' and 'hypocrisy' were its most important attributes in Bedell's eyes.

The text is long, detailed and rigorous, and places itself squarely within a longer English Reformed tradition of anti-papal polemic already mentioned in this chapter. Bedell's authorities include William Perkins, William Fulke, William Whitaker and John Rainolds.[106] In one striking example of such a citation, he advises the Replier to:

> take in hand the last sentence of a little book of Mr Perkins, which lately came forth against your pretended universality. The sentence is this. Nullus Apostolus &c. Noe Apostle, noe holy father, noe Sound Christian for 1200 yeares after Christ, did ever soe think & teach concerning all the principles & grounds of religion, as now the Church of Rome thinketh and teacheth in the Councell of Trent.[107]

As we have seen, the book referred to here is Ward's 1604 edition of Perkins's *Problema de Romanae fidei ementito Catholicismo*, published a about a year earlier and quoted above. Bedell's keen interest in this book is demonstrated in his letters to Ward too, and though it is clear that Bedell thought very highly of Perkins and his work, he did not treat the book with undue reverence. In fact, Bedell wrote to Ward with suggestions for additions to Perkins's arguments and suggested that Perkins's case was not as strong as it might be in certain places.[108] Bedell, indeed, is careful even when

---

[104] Ibid., p. 36.
[105] Ibid.
[106] Examples include ibid., p. 38, p. 50 and p. 329 [529] (Perkins), p. 74, p. 254 and p. 277 (Fulke), p. 71 (Whitaker), p. 318 (Rainolds).
[107] Ibid., p. 50.
[108] Bedell says of a book of Perkins's (most likely the *Problema de Romanae fidei*) that 'truly in my mind that book doth not in some places take the most defensible course that might be, and I think more might be yielded to them [i.e. additions to Perkins's arguments?]', in Bedell to Ward, Bury, 3 Dec. 1604, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 130v. It is not clear to what exactly Bedell's objections refer, but from the context it

talking about Luther and Calvin to note that they were not beyond reproach. In the 'Defence', he makes this lack of reliance on a single man's vision a defining feature of the Church of England, saying to the Replier:

> As to the names you give our Church either Lutheran or Calvinian or Anabaptisticall etc you forgett yourselfe, we speak of the Church of England, which hath learned to call noe man Father upon earth, not the Pope or any other Sect-Master, not Luther or Calvin though it honoureth them both, as worthy men raised upp of God for the information of his Church.[109]

For Bedell and Ward, the work of earlier Reformed polemicists was not a set of canonical arguments which were beyond reproach, but rather a set of arguments which were still alive and ready to be improved upon. These were confident young men, taking on the mantle of their forebears and ready to lead the charge with fresh vigour. As with the questions posed by Subscription, Ward and Bedell debated their differing ideas with a frankness they might not have used in public, testing out each other's arguments. It is clear that both men considered themselves friends and allies, and they give the impression of training each other up for battle with a shared enemy. This is also the impression given by a letter Hall sent to Bedell on the latter's arrival in Venice in 1607, which mentions Fulke, Whitaker, Richard Greenham,[110] Perkins and Rainolds as sad recent losses to the Church, and adjures Bedell to continue their work in Venice.[111] Ward had made a similar comments in the Preface to his edition of *Problema de Romanae fidei*, lamenting how the University of Cambridge 'had been deprived of its Williams' (Fulke, Whitaker and Perkins) in such quick succession.[112] The scholars of Emmanuel saw themselves as a new generation, perpetuating and expanding a lively Reformed tradition. It is also worth noting that this tradition was by no means an exclusively English one. Hall's list of recently departed divines also listed Franciscus

---

may be the fact that Perkins takes the innocence of Mary from sin as the fixed doctrine of the Roman Church, or the fact that Perkins did address clearly enough the case for considering Rome a true Church.

[109] Bedell, 'A Defence', LPL, MS 772, p. 27.

[110] Another noted Reformed conformist minister in the reign of Elizabeth, see ODNB.

[111] Joseph Hall, *Epistles, the first volume: conteining two decads* (London, 1608), pp. 69–72.

[112] 'Guilielmis suis… orbata est', Ward, 'Lectori benevolos', in Perkins, *Problema de Romanae fidei*, sig. ¶5r.

Junius, whom he calls 'the glory of Leiden', and 'his companion in labours', Lucas Trelcatius, as well as Theodore Beza of Geneva, 'a long-fixed starre in this firmament of the Church'.[113] All three men were noted European Reformers, and the same cast of Reformed theologians also regularly feature in Ward and Bedell's correspondence.[114]

In the 'Defence', Bedell presents Roman Catholicism as an extended and distorted version of the truly 'catholic' church. This argument is repeated and explained in response to questioning in his exchange with Ward, where Bedell summaries its core principles succinctly: 'The Apostles Creed & 10 Commandments do contain all doctrine necessary to salvation.'[115] The same point is set out in greater length in the 'Defence', where Bedell explains that all the essentials are set out in the creed and commandments, the correct interpretation of which is set out in the Scriptures.[116] The other traditions defended by the Church of Rome were unnecessary innovations, which could 'never be proved by Scripture' yet was treated as if 'of equal quality with Scripture'.[117] This was a line of argument which, as we shall see, he would also repeat in many later works, fine-tuning it and adding much material, including much that he picked up in Venice.

IV

The presence of continental Reformers in Bedell's early works is not particularly surprising; more intriguing is the detailed awareness Bedell shows of Roman Catholic arguments. In his early writings, Bedell already displays some of the nuance and interest in approaching potential converts on their own terms which would characterise his missionary work in Venice and Ireland.

---

[113] Ibid., p. 71.
[114] For example, Bedell cites Beza in his comments on subscription in Bedell to Ward, Bury St Edmunds, 16 October 1604, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 126v; *Two Biographies*, pp. 217.
[115] Bedell to Ward, Bury, 3 Dec. 1604, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 130r.
[116] Bedell, 'A Defence', p. 78. Here Bedell sets this out as a syllogism:
'All things contained in the Tenn Commandments, Articles of the Creed and the Lords Prayer are plainly laid down in the Scriptures.
But all things necessary to Salvation are contained in these.
Therefore all things necessary to Salvation are plainly laid down in the Scriptures.'
[117] Ibid., p. 110.

Bedell's interest in Bellarmine is already clear, and much of the 'Defence' is spent refuting the most authoritative Jesuit theologian in the world. But it is not just as a target that we find Bedell deploying Bellarmine; a polemical move which Bedell deploys quite frequently in the text is the use of Bellarmine's arguments to undermine those of the 'Replier'. Most useful, as far as Bedell is concerned, is Bellarmine's contention that membership of the true Church is not coterminous with membership of the visible Church, a doctrine which helps Bedell argue that the Church of England (like the Church of Rome) has had a continuous existence since the time of the apostles.[118] He cites other Roman Catholic authors, notably Erasmus, in a similar way, noting similarities to his own arguments to defuse accusations of factionalism.[119] He also emphasises the divisions within the Roman Church, mentioning disputes between the Dominicans and Franciscans in his letters to Ward.[120]

Pre-Reformation critics of the papacy also feature amongst Bedell's sources in the 'Defence'. Bedell spends a substantial portion of the text setting out a narrative of the corruption of the Church, highlighting the process by which the Bishop of Rome claimed first spiritual primacy, and then temporal powers too, to produce the present complete confusion of spiritual and temporal power:

> Now [the Popes] claime… power, to give & take away the Empire, to sett up and to depose kings, to change lawes & times, to doe all their owne pleasure in Churches and States in heaven and Earth.[121]

---

[118] Ibid., p. 34.

[119] See ibid., p. 157. Erasmus was also a figure of particular interest to the defenders of the doctrine of things indifferent during the Subscription controversy. In 1606 a Church of England clergyman, William Burton, published a translation of seven of Erasmus's *Colloquia*, starting with the debate between a butcher and a fishmonger about matters indifferent ('A dialogue of Fish-eating, both pleasant and profitable, wherein are many excellent poyntes of Divinitie discussed, but chiefly that of the right use of thyngs indifferent, very necessary for these times'). Burton's editing is notable for its silent addition of stringent criticisms of the Pope to Erasmus's arguments, and the book's dedication to the 'Major, Shiriffes and Aldermen' of the city of Norwich suggests it was targeted at the Reformed inhabitants of Norwich who were fiercely debating subscription. See Desiderius Erasmus, *Seven dialogues both pithie and profitable* (London, 1606), ed. William Burton.

[120] Bedell to Ward, Bury, 3 Dec. 1604, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 130r.

[121] Bedell, 'A Defence', p. 203.

As we shall see, a historical understanding of papal corruption would become a central theme of Bedell's rapport with Sarpi and Micanzio in Venice. But it is clear that Bedell's interest in anti-papal ecclesiastical history developed before his trip to Venice. Bedell's well-developed knowledge of pre-Reformation critics of the Papacy will certainly have acted as a good basis for cooperation in Venice, and it is particularly intriguing to note how far the authorities Bedell drew on his 'Defence' overlap with those upon which Sarpi and other Venetians were drawing on at the same time, during their defences of Venice during the Interdict controversy. Bedell writes that offering full evidence for his narrative of papal corruption was a task that 'would aske a very long tyme, and require a just volume to sett downe the testimonies of learned and godly men from these Foure or five Ages past'.[122] As a substitute, however, Bedell proposes to focus on 'but three or foure', and proceeds to offer detailed analysis of the evidence offered by Bernard of Clairvaux, Nicolaus de Clemangiis, Jean Gerson and the unknown author of a manuscript tract entitled 'De Hierarchia Subcoelestis', held in the library at Emmanuel College.[123] An edition of two short tracts by Gerson, published first in Latin and then a short time later in Italian translation, under the anonymous editorship by Sarpi, was the first work printed in Venice in 1606 in defence of the Venetian case in the Interdict controversy, and prompted a further exchange of pamphlets between Bellarmine and Sarpi; meanwhile, an Italian translation of Bernard of Clairvaux's *De consideratione* (a letter from Bernard to Pope Eugenius, written in c. 1150, criticising the papacy's increasing entanglement in temporal affairs) had followed soon after the edition of Gerson.[124] Bedell also highlights perceived criticism

---

[122] Ibid., p. 204.
[123] Ibid., pp. 204–47.
[124] Jean Gerson, *De Excommunicationis valore Opuscula duo* ([Venice], [1606]), ed. [Paolo Sarpi]; Jean Gerson, *Trattato e ressolutione sopra la validità delle scommuniche* ([Venice], [1606]), ed. [Paolo Sarpi]; Robert Bellarmine, *Risposta del Card. Bellarmino a due libretti, uno de quali s'intitola Risposta di un Dottore di Theologia... Et l'altro, Trattato, & Resolutione… di Gio. Gersone Theologo* (Rome, 1606); Paolo Sarpi, *Apologia per le oppositioni fatte Dall'Illustrissimo, & Reverendissinio Signor Cardinale Bellarminio alti trattati, et risolutioni di Gio. Gersone* (Venice, 1606); Bernard of Clairvaux, *Trattato della Consideratione, nel quale considera l'autorità, carico, & ufficio del Sommo Pontefice* (Venice, 1606). For discussion of the printing of these works, see De Vivo, *Information & Communication*, pp. 204–6. For discussion of Bernard's critique of the growth of papal temporal power, see G. Silano, 'Of sleep and sleeplessness: the Papacy and the Law, 1150-1300', in *The Religious Roles of the Papacy: Ideals and Realities, 1150-1300* (Toronto, 1989), ed. C. Ryan, pp. 343–61.

of the papacy by figures such as Catherine of Siena and Savonarola, indicating an interest in the medieval Italian Dominican tradition.[125] He also mentions Lorenzo Valla's debunking of the Donation of Constantine 'and that which is built upon it[:] the presumption of the Popes pretended Primacie, his coveteousnesse, Symony, Sowing of discord amonge Christian Princes, the corruption of religion with leasings and fables for gaines sake'.[126] It is therefore no exaggeration to say that even before his departure for Venice, Bedell had acquired a view of Italian history in which anti-papal writing and preaching featured prominently, and which drew on many of the same authorities to which Sarpi and his Venetian allies would turn during the Interdict.

Bedell's interest in the manuscript tract 'De Hierarchia Subcoelestis' is worthy of particular note as evidence of the lengths Bedell went to in his investigations of ecclesiastical history in this early period, and also of how this interest remained steady through his life. This anonymous Latin manuscript tract had been donated to Emmanuel College at its inception, but little about it was known.[127] Bedell evidently came across it in the library, recognised its powerful criticisms of the contemporary papacy, and sought to find out more about it. The fruits of his investigations to 1604 are recorded at length in his 'Defence', but as will be discussed in later chapters, he would also continue to make further enquiries about the tract in subsequent years. Bedell's notes on the work in his 'Defence' were careful and accurate. He noted the marks of ownership on the manuscript and provided English translations of the chapter-headings of all four of the treatise's books.[128] This was a valuable service, as the headings are detailed enough to provide an effective summary of the tract's major arguments. Bedell also recognised that the text was written as a proposal for reforms to be enacted by the French king, Charles VI (the tract appears to have been composed in around 1388).[129] In modern

[125] For Savonarola, see ibid., p. 120–21 and p. 177; for Catherine (on whom Bedell cites Antoninus of Florence, a celebrated Dominican preacher of the following century), see pp. 179–80. The source for Catherine is Antoninus's *Chronicorum opus*. See Antoninus Florentinus, *Chronicorum in tres partes diuisum* (Leiden, 1586), Pt 3, p. 702, for an account of Catherine seeing the corruption afflicting the Church and prophesying renewal, which Bedell interprets as a premonition of the Reformation.
[126] Ibid., p. 182.
[127] The manuscript is still preserved at Emmanuel today: Emmanuel, MS 9, 'Liber dialogorum hierarchiae subcoelestis', fols. 176r–205v.
[128] Bedell, 'A Defence', pp. 228–47.
[129] Ibid., pp. 245–6.

times, this manuscript treatise, which survives in multiple copies beyond Emmanuel, has been recognised by historians of the late medieval period as an important, but long overlooked, source for the political and ecclesiastical debates of the period, and of particular interest because of its assertion that the Donation of Constantine was a forgery, before Lorenzo Valla's more famous statement of the same that argument in 1440.[130] Bedell's study of the 'De Hierarchia Subcoelestis' appears to have been the fullest of anyone before the twentieth century. Though his ambition to publish the work would never be realised, he did (as we shall see) make important steps in that direction.[131] Bedell's interest in this tract is striking evidence of the seriousness of his interest in ecclesiastical history.

Bedell's discussions with Ward also provide evidence of the pains he took – unusual, by the standards of Jacobean polemic – to interpret Roman arguments fairly and accurately, even as he refuted them in forthright terms. Responding to Ward's assertion that the Roman Church disregards the second commandment (on idols), Bedell offers a more nuanced view. He notes the Roman Catholic argument that idolatry 'may be avoided by any Papist that holds the verse: *Hanc recolas sed mente colas quod cernis in ipsa* [you should revere this image, but with your mind worship that which you discern within it]'.[132] According to this precept, Roman Catholics believed themselves to be avoiding idolatry by focussing on the worship of God himself through the image, thus still respecting the terms of the commandment. For Bedell, this is still not an ideal approach to images (which have no value in themselves and may mislead so would be best avoided). Nonetheless, as a mere misinterpretation, such a stance would not necessarily 'debar from salvation'.[133] Bedell likens this to a misinterpretation of the seventh commandment (on adultery), which one might misinterpret to think that

---

[130] For the interest of the treatise for the debate over the Donation of Constantine, see D. Menozzi, Cristianesimo nella storia', *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 1 (1980), pp. 123-54; for more recent discussion questioning earlier assumptions about its authorship, see H. Millet, 'Le «Liber dialogorum hierarchiae subcoelestis» (1388)', in *Vaticana et medievalia Etudes en l'honneur de Louis Duval-Arnould* (Florence, 2008), eds. J.-M. Martin, B. Martin-Hisard and A. Paravicini Bagliani, pp. 367-94.

[131] The most interesting evidence of this is the copy is TCD, MS 329, Transcription of the 'Dialogi hierarchiae subcoelestis de reformation ecclesiae militantis', [date unknown], which will be discussed further later.

[132] Bedell to Ward, Bury, 3 Dec. 1604, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 130r.

[133] Ibid.

it did not include polygamy. As idolatry was so central to the Reformed critique of popery, this was a bold argument.

Bedell refuted at even greater length Ward's claim that Roman doctrine contravenes the tenth commandment (on coveting), Bedell contradicts him, and challenges Ward's associated claim that Roman Catholics deny the doctrine of original sin, which for Ward, but not for Bedell, forms the substance of prohibitions set out in the tenth commandment. Responding to these claims briefly in an earlier letter, Bedell writes, 'I do not think Papists hold the depravation of our nature to be no sin, but at most to be no sin *in renatis* [in the regenerate]. I would that they were as sound in all points else.'[134] Ward, whose response does not survive, presumably pushed back, as Bedell includes a longer discussion of the same point in his next letter. He accuses Ward of accepting a nonsensical view of the Roman argument:

> Where you write that Bellarmine & Gregor[y] de Valent[ia] do hold that the depravation of nature is no sin, no not in the unregenerate, and add, that they hold it to flow from the principles of pure nature; I should wonder if they should be so absurd as to think that depravation of nature doth flow from the principles of pure nature.[135]

Bedell suggests that Ward might in fact mean that papists think that the depravation of nature consists in 'the inclination of sensuality to sensual objects'.[136] But even this, says Bedell, would be inaccurate, as

> they will say the depravation of nature stands not in this, but in the want of that which should always have ordered the same [i.e. nature], and kept it within compass of temperance, justice and piety: wherein methinks truly they say true.[137]

Bedell's endorsement of Bellarmine and Gregory of Valencia over Ward's objections is stark, and rather surprising. Bedell goes on to justify the statement by comparing humans to 'brute animals', who for all their sensual inclinations, have no original sin,

---

[134] Bedell to Ward, Bury, 26 Nov. 1604, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 129r.
[135] Bedell to Ward, Bury, 3 Dec. 1604, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 130r.
[136] Ibid.
[137] Ibid.

'because they were never otherwise created'. Humans, however, have fallen from a purer, earlier state. Thus original sin consists in the 'want of original justice', which humans used to have to bridle their sensuality, rather than in these sensual inclinations in and of themselves.[138] On this point, Bedell cites the Lutheran philosopher Nicolaus Taurellus – another interesting choice, as Taurellus's work was controversial even amongst his fellow Lutherans.[139] This discussion taps into debates being had across Europe about 'nature' and how humans were to be distinguished from animals. As Annabel Brett has shown, these debates had complex confessional overtones.[140] It is not easy to categorise Bedell's stance exactly within these debates from this brief and incomplete letter, especially when we lack Ward's replies. But it is clear that Bedell had read broadly in recent theological literature, paying close attention to how understandings of 'nature' varied across confessional lines.

Bedell concludes that if original sin is taken as 'want of original justice', as he and the Roman theologians suggest, then 'this opinion doth not overturn original sin, but makes it stand on another ground than you set it upon, & is nothing to the 10th commandment'.[141] The whole discussion is an interesting mix of forthright argument and academic caution. Summarising his view, Bedell adds, 'Yet if I err in it I will be no heretic if you can yield me better reason.'[142] Bedell then turns, in a final paragraph, to the question of the need of remission of sin to all. Ward had suggested that the Roman Church denied this article of faith, citing their belief in the sinlessness of the Virgin Mary. Bedell denied that this latter doctrine was an article of faith amongst Romanists, noting that the Council of Trent had merely forbidden Dominicans and Franciscans to 'account and preach each other for heretics' on this point, rather than asserting any fixed doctrine.[143] As with the question of the second commandment, Bedell suggests that papists may merely misunderstand, rather than entirely disavow, the necessity of

---

[138] Ibid.
[139] A. Blank, 'Protestant Natural Philosophy and the Question of Emergence, 1540–1615', *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle* 61 (2017), pp. 7–22.
[140] See A. Brett, *Changes of State: Nature and the Limits of the City in Early Modern Natural Law* (Princeton, 2014), pp. 37–61.
[141] Bedell to Ward, Bury, 3 Dec. 1604, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 130r.
[142] Ibid.
[143] Ibid.

remission of sin to all. Bedell then pushes the point even further, highlighting some more (potentially explosive) implications of his argument that misunderstanding doctrine did not necessarily debar a believer from salvation:

> But truly for my part thinking well on the matter it seems to me that if a Pelagian should have been of the mind that children have no original sin, yet finding himself a sinner should have reposed his affiance [i.e. trust] in him, he should be saved notwithstanding his other error.[144]

He continues the point by suggesting that the Pelagians might therefore, like the Novatians and Luciferians, be 'counted heretics… more for pertinac[it]y than, than for opinions overthrowing main grounds of religion to the debarring of them from salvation'. To this charitable hope that Pelagians might be saved, Bedell adds a similarly optimistic interpretation of Arianism:

> And I dare not but think well of many poor, ignorant and seduced Arians, that would confess Christ the son of God, though they thought there was when he was not, for not discerning a difference between the generation *in divinis* & in other things.[145]

But, with a final return to caution, Bedell adds, in brackets, '(But this *inter nos dictum* [said between us], to see what you can object.)'[146] The caution is understandable; Bedell was edging ever closer to a widened latitude of salvation. His case might have been misunderstood by a hostile reader, although it in fact contained important caveats, disbarring from salvation those who knowingly disavowed the core tenets of Christian doctrine. Bedell evidently felt safe with Ward to push his arguments as far as possible, though still thought it worth emphasising that this was a section of the correspondence which he wanted to remain private.

The correspondence is evidence of how Ward and Bedell took the opportunities presented by the intimacy of their longstanding friendship to polish up each other's

---

[144] Ibid.
[145] Ibid.
[146] Ibid.

arguments without fear of repercussions. It is striking how frankly – sometimes, indeed, bluntly – Bedell is willing to rebut Ward's arguments. On the question of whether the Romanists deny the need for universal remission of sin, Bedell states firmly, 'I think they teach no such thing, but only you would inforce them so to say, because they are of another mind touching the formal reason of original sin than you are &c.'[147] He here seems keen to make sure Ward's criticisms of Rome are as accurate as possible, and is not afraid that Ward will take offence. Another sign of the relaxed relationship between the two men is Bedell's comment at one point that he is writing 'in haste without any leisure to think thoroughly on this matter'.[148] Forging powerful arguments to convince papists of their errors was a task that had to take place alongside Bedell's everyday duties in Bury St Edmunds.

These two letters from Bedell in late 1604 contain a flurry of refutations of criticisms from Ward and seem to have helped Bedell develop his own thinking in the period in which he must have been writing his 'Defence'. At stake in this epistolary debate was not, however, a matter of mere theological detail. Bedell's insistence that doctrinal misunderstanding need not be a bar to salvation had a broader polemical purpose. It would underpin his argument that, *pace* Alabaster in his first demand, the Church of England had always been a true Church, even when it had laboured under the misapprehensions emanating from Rome prior to the Reformation.[149] Ward appeared to have questioned the wisdom of taking this tack, noting that the same could then be said of the Church of Rome. Bedell responded by saying this was indeed the case:

> I say, there hath been in England since K. Lucius' time, a church visible, holding all truth that is necessary to salvation; whereupon you think it will follow, that in Popedome, the same is to be taught. I grant it will, and so for my part I think.[150]

---

[147] Ibid.
[148] Ibid.
[149] For this discussion, see Bedell, 'Defence', esp. pp. 31–42.
[150] Bedell to Ward, Bury, 3 Dec. 1604, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 130r. For further discussion of the role of King Lucius in English Reformed polemic, see F. Heal, 'What Can King Lucius Do for You? The Reformation and the Early British Church', *English Historical Review* 120 (2005), pp. 593–614.

And yet this did not mean that the Roman Church was without flaws; Bedell adds, 'the same [Roman Church], by many erroneous conclusions in faith is overthrown again', emphasising, as he would again in the 'Defence', that Rome's faults lay in its additions to true Christianity. Crucially, however, these papal corruptions did not necessarily mean that members of the Roman Church could not be saved, as long as they followed these principles out of misunderstanding rather than wilful disobedience. By defending this stance to Ward, Bedell was exploring the stakes of his argument to Alabaster; he was also staking out his own position in the varied and contested ground inhabited by Reformed (and indeed Catholic) polemicists.

Bedell's insistence that Rome was a true Church had roots in earlier Reformed polemic, but the thesis was heavily debated and certainly not one on which there was a Reformed consensus; there was, as Anthony Milton notes, an 'ambiguous tradition'.[151] We can see this from Ward's scepticism in 1604, and he was evidently not fully convinced, as he and Bedell would rehearse their disagreement on this point again in letters of 1619. By this time, Bedell's own increased personal experience of Roman Catholics saw him restate his case with fresh clarity and authority. 'I dare not say,' he asserted, 'that many of the Popish Clergy, being members of the [Roman] Court, be not also members of the true Church yea and saved also.' He adds that papal corruptions of doctrine should only be a bar to salvation 'if wilfully and obstinately and selfe condemnedly a man persist in such opinions, which I am perswaded a great number under the Papacy doe not.'[152] Bedell was unusual in supporting the idea that individuals who endorsed Reformed doctrine in the Church of Rome might still be saved, although this was a possibility which a wider range of divines were willing to endorse when discussing rival Protestant churches.[153] Bedell's commitment to the possibility of salvation within the Roman Church thus means that his arguments in the first decade of the seventeenth century are more compatible with those of Laudian polemics of the 1630s than many of Bedell's fellow Reformed polemicists. Yet in 1604 and 1619,

[151] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 141.
[152] Bedell to Ward, Bury, 17 February 1619, *Two Biographies*, p. 257; Bodl., Tanner MS 74, fol. 164r–v.
[153] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 159–62.

before the polarisation of the 1620s, it is important not to read too much into this distinction; Bedell was, by and large, operating within the range of opinions viewed as legitimate by the Reformed of the early Jacobean period, and his holding them does not call into question his Reformed orthodoxy.

Furthermore, Bedell's assertion that salvation was possible within the Church of Rome cannot be separated from his belief that the Pope was the Antichrist. This apocalyptic undercurrent in Bedell's thought marks a distinction between his view of the Roman Church and that of later authors such as Peter Heylyn and Robert Shelford. For Bedell, the fact that Rome was a true Church confirmed the identification of the Pope as the Antichrist, marking his influence out as more insidious than overt attackers of the Church like the prophet Mohammad; for Heylyn and Shelford, by contrast, the fact that Rome was a true Church was instead a major obstacle to this identification.[154] Yet Bedell's argument has an anti-dogmatic quality, characterised by an emphasis on sincerity of belief over content of that belief alone, which bears comparison to that of later writers, and perhaps most interestingly, William Chillingworth in his *Religion of the Protestants*.[155] This is a comparison it will be worth keeping in mind. Chillingworth is often noted as a major figure in the development of English civil religion, a story in which Bedell and his Venetian contacts also have a place.

Bedell's epistolary debates with Ward appear to have helped to firm up the basis on which he defended the Church of England to Alabaster. They also give a good indication of the breath of opinion available to Reformed polemicists and provide an insight into the level of detail at which Bedell and Ward could debate Roman Catholic doctrine. It is also worth noting Bedell's interest in Bellarmine's arguments for the invisibility of the true Church, which he thought could be turned to the advantage of the Reformed cause. These were themes and arguments that Bedell would continue to pursue and develop in Venice. But it is clear that the roots of his interest lay earlier.

---

[154] See, for instance, Bedell, 'Defence', p. 35–6. For more Bedell's stance on the papal Antichrist, see Chapter 4; Heylyn, *Briefe Answer*, pp. 128–9; Shelford, *Discourses*, p. 296; compared to Reformed polemic in Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 150.

[155] For Chillingworth on this topic, see Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 166–7. It is worth noting that Chillingworth took its epigraph from Casaubon, another member of the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian network.

V

Bedell's appointment as Sir Henry Wotton's chaplain in 1607 was also a product of his Suffolk connections. Sir Henry Wotton, too, was a peripheral member of Suffolk's godly circles through his connection to Edmund Bacon (*c*. 1570–1649). Bacon, who would succeed his father as 2nd Baronet of Redgrave in 1624, was a member of an influential and wealthy local family in Suffolk. He was a half-nephew (and correspondent) of Sir Francis Bacon. Edmund Bacon had married Henry Wotton's niece, Philippa (son of Wotton's half-brother, Edward, 1st Baron Wotton of Marley, and his first wife, Hester). Bacon seems to have sympathised with the goals of Chaderton's Emmanuel and in 1605, Bacon travelled to the Dutch Republic with Joseph Hall.[156] Soon afterwards, Bacon recommended Bedell to Wotton as an ambassadorial chaplain.[157]

Bedell's appointment to Venice coincided with similar appointments for others amongst his Emmanuel contemporaries. James Wadsworth, with whom Bedell had shared a chamber, was appointed chaplain to the English ambassador in Spain. Wadsworth would later convert to Roman Catholicism, sparking a correspondence between Bedell, Wadsworth and Hall which Bedell arranged to be published in 1624.[158] Another of Bedell's friends at Emmanuel, Samuel Sotheby, travelled to Russia as chaplain to Sir Thomas Smith, the influential merchant and trading company director, who James has appointed special ambassador to the Tsar, 1604–5.[159] Smith's embassy had coincided with the seizure of power by the Romanov pretender known as False Dmitry I, who confirmed the Muscovy Company's privileges in early 1605. Dmitry was a relatively effective ruler, who may indeed have been trained from birth as a viable

---

[156] Edmund Bacon, ODNB.

[157] See Henry Wotton to Sir Edmund Bacon, London, 2 April 1611, printed in *Letters of Sir Henry Wotton to Sir Edmund Bacon* (London, 1661), pp. 1–3. This is a letter Wotton sent with Bedell back to Suffolk, in which he thanks Bacon for such a good recommendation.

[158] William Bedell, *The Copies of Certaine Letters which Have Passed Betweene Spaine and England in Matter of Religion* (London, 1624).

[159] Bedell's would later appoint Sotheby, as well as Ward and Jasper Despotine, as executors of his will, see Bedell to Ward, Horningerth, 13 May 1628, Bodl., Tanner MS 72, fol. 282r; *Two Biographies*, p. 292. Sir Thomas Smith, *Sir Thomas Smithes voiage and entertainment in Rushia* (London, 1605), sig. D3v.

claimant to the throne, and the English embraced his rule.[160] In 1606, Dmitry's murder brought a swift end to the reign. An anonymous account of Dmitry's fall, printed in 1607 for Samuel Macham, must be attributed to Sotheby.[161] Macham was a printer that Bedell knew well, and in a letter to Ward from 1605, he described how he had previously acted as an intermediary between Sotheby and Macham: 'I thinck I should rather use Mr Macham of the Tigers heade in Paules Churchyard… with whome in some affaires of Mr Sothebyes I have had entercourse by letters these 2 yeares.'[162] The following year, Bedell would draw on his connection to Macham to get his own foreign intelligence printed: a series of English translations of Italian proclamations relating to the assassination attempt on Paolo Sarpi, which must be attributed to Bedell, would also be printed anonymously for Macham in 1608.[163] Other relevant examples of an Emmanuel man who travelled in Europe in this period, which will be discussed in later chapters, included Bedell's cousin, Joseph Alliston (also called Aliston or Elliston, matric. 1595), who spent time in Paris and Geneva in the early 1610s.[164]

Emmanuel College had been founded with the aim of furnishing the Church of England with well-educated godly preachers. But by the first decade of the seventeenth century, it was not only the English who were the targets of Emmanuel men's evangelical efforts; they were also establishing themselves as players on a European

---

[160] For the debate over Dmitry's identity and the possibility that he was taught that he was indeed a Romanov from childhood, see C. Dunning, 'Who Was Tsar Dmitrii?', *Slavic Review* 60 (2001), pp. 705-29, esp. 718–19.

[161] Anon., *The reporte of a bloudie and terrible massacre in the citty of Mosco with the fearefull and tragicall end of Demetrius the last Duke, before him raigning at this present* (London, 1607), 'Printed by Val. Sims, for Samuel Macham, and Mathew Cooke'. Evidence of Sotheby's authorship includes a letter from Joseph Hall to Sotheby, published in *Epistles*, pp. 151–60, which Hall gives the title 'A preface to his [Sotheby's] relation of the Russian affaires'. Macham was also the publisher of Hall's *Epistles*, as well as many of Hall's other works and the *Threnodia in obitum D. Edouardi Lewkenor Equitis, & D. Susannae coniugis charissimae* (London, 1606), to which, as we have seen, many in the Emmanuel Reformed circle contributed verses.

[162] Bedell to Ward, 25 July 1605, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 137r; *Two Biographies*, p. 223. See also *Two Biographies*, p. 257.

[163] Anon., *A true copie of the sentence of the high Councell of tenne iudges in the state of Venice against Ridolfo Poma, Michael Viti priest, Alessandro Parrasio, Iohn of Florence the sonne of Paul and Pasquall of Bitonto, who of late most trayterously attempted a bloudy and horrible murder upon the person of the reverend Father Dr. Paolo Servite* (London, 1608). These documents seem to be those mentioned by Bedell in the postscript of Bedell to Ward, Venice, 26 December/5 January 1607/8, Bodl., Tanner MS

[164] J. and J. A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* Pt I, Vol. I (Cambridge, 1922), p. 22; T. Wharton Jones, in *A true relation*, p. 99.

religious stage. Bedell was at the heart of this increasingly international web of connections, and well-placed to take up a similar role in Venice.

VI

It has been important to trace the nature and development of Bedell's thinking in order to understand the preconceptions and abilities he brought with him to Venice. By the time of his appointment as Chaplain to the English ambassador in Venice, Bedell was already a seasoned participant in the religious controversies of Suffolk. His contributions to the English debates of the period, also show a sustained interest in European debate and controversy. By 1607, Bedell had already carved out a niche for himself within an increasingly mobile network of Emmanuel divines and their patrons at court. His place within this network offered Bedell the opportunity and means for political and ecclesiastical influence at the highest levels, and it seems that Bedell's opinions on subscription carried sufficient weight to shape the responses of a number of more senior figures, including Chaderton and Lewkenor. This period also furnished Bedell with relationships of clear practical value during his time in Venice, such as his relationship with the bookseller Samuel Macham.

Bedell's response to the Subscription controversy also provided an important intellectual foundation for his efforts in Venice, encouraging him to develop and articulate a carefully thought-through stance on the relationship between reforming principle and obedience to the secular prince. As we will see in the next chapter, this would become an important basis for his relationship with anti-papal Venetians such as Sarpi and Micanzio, who sought to expunge the papalist elements of Venice's ecclesiastical establishment, while maintaining absolute loyalty to the state.

Chapter 3: Bedell, Sarpi and Micanzio's doctrinal discussions

The high point of English ambitions for religious change in Venice occurred not while the Interdict was in force (April 1606–7), but rather during the months and years that immediately followed its lifting. Sir Henry Wotton had had ambitions for the conversion of Venice even before the Interdict was declared. But it was only after the arrival of his new chaplain, William Bedell, 'a few days' after the Interdict was lifted in April 1607, that the English embassy built a substantive relationship with the Venetian anti-papal party.[1]

Venetian law banned Senators and other high-ranking state officials from meeting socially with foreign diplomats.[2] This stipulation ensured that Wotton could not openly meet Sarpi or other members of his anti-papal circles, although he may have had limited contact with the Servite at informal gatherings in shops, notably the *bottega* Secchini at the sign of the *Nave d'oro* in the Mercerie, or at noble *ridotti* (salon-like gatherings) in Venice or Padua.[3] Wotton had arrived in Venice on 23 September 1604. Within three months, he already had to defend himself in the Collegio against the rumours that Italians were attending services in his house. The rumours had been brought to the Collegio by the papal Nuncio, who on 5 November 1604 informed it of a report, which he had heard 'from the mouth of those of [Wotton's] own family', that Wotton had hosted 'a Calvinist dinner, at which a great quantity of people that were not

[1] Wotton's activities in Venice before Bedell's arrival are discussed in the previous chapter; William Bedell to Adam Newton, Venice, 1/11 January 1608, BL, Lansdowne 90, fol. 18v; *Two Biographies*, p. 230.

[2] Filippo de Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice: Rethinking Politics in Early Modern Politics* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 70–74.

[3] Fulgenzio Micanzio discusses these networks in his *Vita del Padre Paolo* (Leiden, 1646), p. 74; an account of conversations held in the *bottega* Secchini written by Christoph von Dohna can be found in Christoph von Dohna, 'Conzept der Relation an Fürst Christian von Anhalt aus Venedig Juli, August 1608', printed in B. Ulianich, 'Il principe Christian von Anhalt e Paolo Sarpi: dalla missione veneziana del Dohna alla relazione Diodati (1608)', *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 8 (1976), pp. 494–7; an account of a conversation in a stationer's shop recorded by William Bedell can be found in William Bedell, *The Copies of Certaine Letters which Have Passed Betweene Spaine and England* (London, 1624), p. 41. See also De Vivo, *Information and Communication*, pp. 94–6.

of [Wotton's] own country could be found'.[4] Wotton was asked about these rumours in the Collegio on 18 November 1604. He denied them, gave his assurances that he had no intention of causing scandal and suggested – like the nuncio – that the rumour came 'from one of [his] own', for the inhabitants of his residence were 'not all of one faction'. Thus, a member of his household might 'through devotion or jealousy' have wanted 'by these means to bring [him] into ill repute in this city'.[5] It seems Wotton suspected a mole had infiltrated his family; he may have known their identity. The Doge reported the denial of these claims to the Nuncio on 23 November, passing on Wotton's assurance that 'no one had entered his house on the days and hours of his sermon other than those of his own family'.[6] Concerns about Wotton were repeated on 1 September 1605, when the new Nuncio, Orazio Mattei, described how he had been warned to watch Wotton and his preacher (at that time Nathaniel Fletcher rather than Bedell) closely before leaving Rome for Venice.[7]

Nonetheless, although he was under observation, Bedell, as a lower-profile member of the ambassador's household, had more freedom. He regularly visited Sarpi and his fellow Servite friar and closest associate, Fulgenzio Micanzio (1570–1654), on the pretext of teaching the two men English.[8] Their monastery was conveniently located in Cannaregio, only a short walk from the English ambassador's house, located in the same *sestiere* next to the Church of San Girolamo.[9] Sarpi chose to continue living in the monastery in Cannaregio, even when he and Micanzio were offered alternative

---

[4] 'per bocca de quelli della suo proprio famiglia', 'una cena alla calvinista, vi si trovò gran quantità di persone, che non erano della sua gente': ASV, Collegio, Esposizioni Roma, reg. 12, c. 38v–39r, 5 November 1604. Quotes from 39r. 'Famiglia' was the term used to describe an ambassadorial household.
[5] 'da alcuno di noi stessi', 'non siamo tutti di un colore', 'per devotione, o per invidia', 'di poner me per queste vie in mala opinione in questa città': ASV, Collegio, Esposizioni Principi, f. 14, 18 November 1604 [the date has been modified to read 18 Dec., but this cannot be right when read alongside Esposizioni Roma, reg. 12], unfoliated; CSPV X (1603–7), entry 304 (here the meeting is mistakenly dated 8 December).
[6] 'non entrevà nella sua casa nelli giorni et hore della sua oratione alcun' altro, che quelli della sua famiglia': ASV, Collegio, Esposizioni Roma, reg. 12, c. 42r, 23 Nov. 1604.
[7] ASV, Collegio, Esposizioni Roma, reg. 12, c. 72r, 1 Sept. 1605.
[8] Yet this was not *only* a pretext. Bedell spent at least some of his time teaching Sarpi and Micanzio English. Micanzio mentions his limited experience of English to William Cavendish in letters of 24 February 1617 and 12 January 1618: 'in truth the want of exercise maketh me to loose that little of the English tongue that I had learned' (12 Jan 1618). See Fulgenzio Micanzio, *Lettere a William Cavendish* (Rome, 1987), ed. R. Ferrini, trans. Thomas Hobbes, pp. 63 and 79.
[9] LPS I, p. 345, n. 1.

housing in the Piazza di San Marco following an assassination attempt against Sarpi (blamed by some on papal agents) of 5 October 1607; the fact that it was easier to conduct low-profile meetings in peripheral Cannaregio than it would have been at the heart of the Venetian government in the Piazza is likely to have been a factor.[10] The post-Interdict papal Nuncio, Berlinghiero Gessi, renewed the complaints to the Collegio, but did not succeed in persuading the Doge to assert that Wotton or his household had gone too far.[11]

The meetings between Bedell, Sarpi and Micanzio have long been a source of great fascination to historians. The meetings produced a number of notable translations as well as a cycle of controversial Lent sermons, delivered by Micanzio in the Spring of 1609. They have been the subject of numerous excellent studies. The classic account of the encounter is that of Gaetano Cozzi, who traced the link between Sarpi and the 'Calvinist' wing of the Church of England for the first time.[12] Later accounts by Gino Benzoni and Germano Rosa substantially enhanced our knowledge of the role of Micanzio, bringing him out of Sarpi's shadow as a political actor in his own right.[13] More recently, Stefano Villani and Chiara Petrolini have explored the reasons behind Sarpi and Micanzio's fascination with England in greater depth.[14] Despite this wealth of scholarship however, the sources for Bedell's side of the exchange remain relatively

---

[10] For the offer of alternative housing, see Cozzi and Cozzi, *Opere*, p. 224; ASV, Senato secreta, Deliberazioni Roma, reg. 16, fols. 101v–102v.

[11] For the fullest accounts Gessi's campaign against the efforts of English in Venice in this period, see T.F. Mayer, *The Roman Inquisition on the Stage of Italy, c. 1590-1640* (Philadelphia, 2014), pp. 64–114; V. Frajese, 'Visti da Roma. Paolo Sarpi e Fulgenzio Micanzio nel triennio protestant (1606–1609)', *Nuova rivista storica* 103 (2019), pp. 178–87.

[12] G. Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo e la Historia del Concilio Tridentino', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 68 (1956); G. Cozzi, 'Sir Edwin Sandys e la *Relazione dello Stato della Religione'*, *Rivista Storica Italiana* 79 (I967), pp. 1095-121.

[13] G. Benzoni, 'Nota introduttiva' in *Storici e politici veneti del Cinquecento e del Seicento* (Milan, 1982), eds. G. Benzoni and T. Zanato, pp. 733–56; G. Rosa, 'Politica e religione nella vita e nel pensiero di fra Fulgenzio Micanzio' (Tesi di Laurea, Università Ca'Foscari, Venezia, 1993).

[14] S. Villani, 'Uno scisma mancato: Paolo Sarpi, William Bedell e la prima traduzione in italiano del Book of Common Prayer', *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* 53 (2017), pp. 63-112; Chiara Petrolini, 'Paolo Sarpi e l'Inghilterra di Giacomo I: Tra aspettative e disincanto' (unpublished PhD thesis, Florence/Pisa, 2007). A succinct but valuable overview of recent work is provided by C. Petrolini and D. Pirillo, 'Anglo-Venetian networks: Paolo Sarpi in early modern England' in *The Routledge Research Companion to Anglo-Italian Renaissance Literature and Culture* (London, 2019), ed. M. Marrapodi, pp. 434–49.

underexplored.[15] Indeed, one document of particular importance – a short treatise on Christian doctrine, written by Bedell just after he returned from Venice – has not been discussed by any previous scholar.[16] By bringing together new sources for Bedell's thought and fresh interpretations of Sarpi and Micanzio's numerous papers, my goal is to provide a more detailed account of the Anglo-Venetian discussions that took place in 1607–10, and their significance for the religious debates then raging across early modern Europe.

It is a commonplace of scholarship on the English attempt to convert Venice that the English overestimated the depth of anti-papal feeling in Venice, assuming that the Venetians would be open to doctrinal arguments against the papacy, when really the Interdict controversy was a more narrowly political dispute. Vittorio Frajese, who has done so much to expand our understanding of Sarpi's scepticism, has recently argued that we should be wary of ascribing a 'Calvinist' tenor to Sarpi and Micanzio's thought in the period 1606–9.[17] He warns that this is a misinterpretation, which has been sustained by the seemingly unanimous view from both the contemporary Roman and the contemporary English sources that Micanzio's 1609 sermon cycle took a Calvinist stance. In fact, according to Frajese, both Rome and England overestimated the doctrinal content of sermons and writings which really supported a jurisdictional, political interpretation of religion, with the ultimate goal of reducing the Church's political role.[18] Sarpi and Micanzio certainly did want to use jurisdictional arguments to strengthen the authority of the state by increasing its control over the Church. But Frajese in his turn underestimates the extent to which this was the intention of William Bedell, too. The category of 'Calvinism' was not one generally used by the English.[19]

---

[15] Although Villani's 'Uno scisma mancato' and Diego Pirillo's *The Refugee-Diplomat: Venice, England, and the Reformation* (Cornell, 2018), esp. p. 161, draw attention to a greater range of sources for Bedell's experiences in Venice than previous accounts.
[16] William Bedell, [A view religion], NLI, MS 471, 23 fols.
[17] Frajese, 'Visti da Roma', pp. 178–87. Frajese's account builds on the arguments of his seminal *Sarpi scettico: Stato e Chiesa a Venezia tra Cinque e Seicento* (Bologna, 1994).
[18] Ibid., p. 191.
[19] A category on which Frajese heavily relies in his analysis in 'Visti da Roma', passim; see esp. pp. 177, 191 and 193.

To properly understand Bedell's position (and that of Sarpi and Micanzio), we must instead turn to the looser category of 'Reform'.[20]

Bedell's vision of a Reformed Church was also one which recognised that supreme authority in ecclesiastical matters ultimately resided in a divinely-appointed sovereign. This jurisdictional English reading of Church–State relations was more similar to Sarpi and Micanzio's views than Frajese and others have assumed. Sarpi, Bedell and Micanzio's objections to the papacy were all rooted in a particular distrust of its claims to temporal jurisdiction, which they feared would pave the way for a universal papal monarchy. All three thought that the best defence against this papal *totatus* (the term Sarpi used to describe the papacy's claims of total universality) was an ecclesiological structure which closely resembled that of the Church of England: one in which the visible, juridical functions of the Church had no independent authority beyond that granted by the temporal sovereign.[21] This was, to borrow Frajese's phrasing, a quest for a 'civil religion' of sorts.[22] But this was civil religion not in the sceptical sense emphasised by Frajese, nor the atheistic sense described by David Wootton, nor again in the *politique* sense discussed in the work of Richard Tuck.[23] Whatever their private beliefs, Sarpi and Micanzio appear – like Bedell – to have advocated forms of public religion which were of a particularly Christian and, indeed, a Reformed character. This view is therefore more in keeping with the interpretation put forward by Boris Ulianich, who emphasised that Sarpi's politics cannot be disentangled from support for religious Reform, to rectify papal abuses.[24] In public at

[20] Simone Maghenzani has recently made the convincing argument that Sarpi would have recognised in the Church of England a particular manifestation of 'Reform', amongst a number of options, rather than any sort of Anglican 'middle way', see S. Maghenzani, 'Giochi di specchi: La Chiesa d'Inghilterra e Venezia tra Cinquecento e Seicento', in *Ateneo Veneto* 25, (2018), pp. 67-76. For a historiographical discussion on the use of 'Reformed' as opposed to 'Calvinist', see S. Hampton, *Anti-Arminians: The Anglican Reformed Tradition from Charles II to George I* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 6–7. In the English context, Anthony Milton's *Catholic and Reformed* (Cambridge, 1995) remains the foundational work on 'Reformed' polemic.
[21] For the significance of papal 'totatus' for Sarpi's vision of inter-political relations, see chapter 5.
[22] Frajese, *Sarpi scettico*, *passim*, e.g. pp. 168–9.
[23] D. Wootton, *Paolo Sarpi: Between Renaissance and Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983); Richard Tuck, *Philosophy and Government:1572–1651* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 94–104.
[24] B. Ulianich, 'Paolo Sarpi "Riformatore", "irenico"? Note sulla sua ecclesiologia, sulla sua theologia, sulla sua religione', in *Fra Paolo Sarpi dei Servi di Maria* (Venice, 1986), pp. 49–100. See also B.

least, Sarpi defended an ecclesiology (though not necessarily a soteriology) consistent with English Reformed conformist views, in which power was vested (by God) in secular princes, but these princes were also responsible (in the eyes of God) for reforming the Church in such a way as to support true religion. A Church based on the principles of Christ and the Scriptures, without the damaging innovations and usurpations introduced by the Pope: Sarpi's vision of a true Church here sounds strikingly like that which we saw described by Bedell in his 'Defence' of 1604.[25] Their similar ecclesiological visions underpinned their similar political goals.

This is not to elide all differences between Bedell and the Servites' thought. Sarpi and Micanzio can reasonably be said to have been more influenced by figures such as Charron, Montaigne and Pomponazzi – all of whom might be identified with a 'sceptical tradition' – than Bedell, who was in turn better versed in Reformed theology than the Venetians.[26] But the point is that this made little difference to their public pronouncements on the relationship between Church and State. Publicly, all three supported an ecclesiological arrangement compatible with the structures of the Church of England. The intractable question of Sarpi's heterodox theology continues to be much debated.[27] But it may be that it is more useful to set aside Sarpi's private theology (doubts and speculations about which he did not circulate in his lifetime), and instead approach his works through an 'ecclesiological prism', that is to say, his thought on the correct relationship between Church and state.[28] Ultimately, Sarpi's public ecclesiology, rather than his private theology, is of greatest relevance if we want to understand his political significance within his own lifetime, and the significance of the

---

Ulianich, 'Considerazioni e documenti per una ecclesiologia di Paolo Sarpi', in *Festgabe Joseph Lortz* II (Baden-Baden, 1958), pp. 363–444.

[25] William Bedell, 'A Defence of the Answer to Mr. Alabaster's Four Demands, against a treatise, intituled The Catholic's Reply upon Bedell's Answer to Mr. Alabaster's four Demands', Lambeth Palace Library, London, MS 772. See previous chapter for full discussion of this text.

[26] For a powerful assertion of Sarpi's place in this 'sceptical tradition', see V. Frajese, 'Sarpi e la tradizione scettica', *Studi Storici* 29 (1988), pp. 1029-50.

[27] A useful summary of the ongoing discussion is Gregorio Baldin, 'Irenista, calvinista, scettico, o ateo nascosto? Il dibattito', *Etica & Politica* 20 (2018), pp. 121-61.

[28] To borrow the phrasing of J. Rose in *Godly Kingship in Restoration England* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 3, one of best of a number of recent works on British history which advocates an ecclesiological approach to the history of politics and political thought.

events of 1607–10 for English and Venetian political thought. On this front, at least, Sarpi, Micanzio and Bedell were in mutual sympathy, and all of them were participants in a larger network which spanned Reformed Europe.

This chapter will first address Micanzio's sermons, noting the similarity between the ideas Micanzio expressed (as well as the means by which he expressed them) to those advocated by Bedell in response to the English Subscription controversy of 1604. I will then turn to another product of Bedell's meetings with the Servites: the Italian translation (with annotations), made in 1608, of Edwin Sandys's *Relation of the State of Religion* (MS 1599; printed 1605), comparing it with a short view of religion written by Bedell on his return to England in 1610. This comparison will shed light on the shared jurisdictional polemic against the Pope developed by the three men. I will pay particular attention to the question of the identification of the Pope with the Antichrist, the issue most likely to have been a source of disagreement, noting that there is by no means so sharp a division between the Englishman and the Venetians as might be expected. Finally, I shall highlight a case-study which demonstrates how Bedell, Micanzio and Sarpi fed information (in this case, an engraving thought to exemplify the arrogance of the papacy) to a wider Reformed network. Comparison of Bedell, Sarpi and Micanzio's writings suggests that the aim on both sides was to promote a form of civil religion modelled on the Church of England; this is why Anglo-Venetian exchange in the period was so fruitful, and why Sarpi's works would inspire such lasting interest in England.

I

The documentary evidence of the meetings between Sarpi, Micanzio and Bedell attests to the similar way in which the three men dealt with the challenge of balancing loyalty to the state with hope for reform of the Church. When faced with the question of whether to subscribe to the Canons of 1604 despite his conviction that some of ceremonies of the Church of England were not integral to Christianity, William Bedell had – after much deliberation – decided to do so. Prominent amongst his reasons for this decision was the importance of preaching: better to conform and preach that

ceremonies were matters indifferent, than to scrupulously refuse to subscribe and lose the opportunity to edify people with the truth and save their souls. In 1604, Bedell chose the path he would pursue for the rest of his career: the path of conscientious Reformed conformity. The similarity between the predicament faced by Bedell in the English subscription controversy and that in which Sarpi and Micanzio found themselves after the Interdict has never been addressed in any depth.[29] But Micanzio's sermons of 1609 can and should be seen as a practical manifestation of very similar principles to those which Bedell had articulated in 1604. Viewed in this light, Bedell's interactions with Sarpi and Micanzio become less a failed project for conversion, and instead an episode which substantially strengthened a network with shared ecclesiological and political goals.

The best-known account of the meetings between Bedell, Sarpi and Micanzio are two long letters sent by Bedell to Adam Newton (d. 1630), the Scottish tutor to Henry, Prince of Wales, back in England.[30] In these letters Bedell describes his efforts in substantial detail, listing, for instance, the various Reformed and Church of England texts which he showed to the two Servites. These included Martin Chemnitz's *Examen Concilii Tridentini* and Calvin's *Institutio Christianae Religionis* (although Sarpi said

[29] Margo Todd, though she emphasises the role of sermons in Bedell's thought, does not make a connection to Micanzio's sermons in Venice, see M. Todd, '"An Act of Discretion": Evangelical Conformity and the Puritan Dons', *Albion* 18 (1986), pp. 581-99.

[30] The first of these two letters is dated 1 January 1608, seemingly in Old Style, so 1/11 January. The second is undated, but Bedell stating that it was sent a year later than his previous let, so c. January 1609; this date is confirmed by the fact that the bearer was Giovanni Francesco Biondi, who also delivered a letter written in January 1609 by Wotton to London at the same time. These two letters survive in three copies. The original letters written by Bedell (in his own hand) and sent to Newton can be found in BL, MS Lansdowne 90, fols. 106r–10v and fols. 133r–38v; copies of the Lansdowne letters in another hand can be found in Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fols. 242–46 and fols. 18–23; and copies made by James Ussher (probably from Bedell's own drafts, which do not survive) are held at TCD, MS 580, fols. 64r–74v. Ussher's transcript also includes one short reply from Newton and two further short replies from Bedell. The letters have been printed on two occasions: *Some Original Letters of Bishop Bedell, Concerning the Steps Taken Toward a Reformation of Religion at Venice, Upon Occasion of the Quarrel Between That State, and the Pope Paul V* (Dublin, 1752) ed. Edward Hudson, with text transcribed from the Ussher transcript, including the three additional letters from Bedell and Newton; and in *Two Biographies of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, with a selection of letters and an unpublished treatise* (Cambridge, 1902), ed. E.S. Shuckburgh, pp. 226–51, with text transcribed from the Tanner transcripts and thus only the two longer letters included.

that he had already seen a copy of the latter).[31] Chemnitz's *Examen* immediately demands attention as a work which is likely to have influenced Sarpi's thinking when he wrote his own *Historia* of the Council of Trent a few years later. But it is also clear that this was a work with immediate relevance to the questions being discussed in 1607–10, too. For instance, Chemnitz's work contains a lengthy disquisition on the question of traditions, arguing against traditions which he saw as based on papal innovation alone, without any scriptural support.[32] This is a theme which is also addressed prominently in Sarpi and Micanzio's writings in this period.[33]

Bedell also describes how he agreed with Sarpi a range of books which he would show to Fulgenzio Manfredi, a Franciscan with a reputation for preaching a much more virulent variety of anti-papal polemic, but who would in fact defect to the Papalist side soon after his and Bedell's discussions.[34] The books shown to Manfredi included Gabriel Powell's *Disputationum Theologicarum et Scholasticarum de Antichristo et eius ecclesia Libri duo* (London, 1605) and William Perkins's *Problema de Romanae fidei ementito Catholicismo* (Cambridge, 1604), the posthumously-published work edited by Bedell's close friend Samuel Ward that we have already encountered in the previous chapter.[35] Perkins's work is in certain of its themes similar to Chemnitz's, emphasising the contrast between the pure Christianity of the early Church with the corrupt, tradition-laden Christianity of the Council of Trent. Powell's was a more doctrinally controversial piece, which asserted as a certainty that the Pope

---

[31] William Bedell to Adam Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL, MS Lansdowne 90, fol. 135v; *Two Biographies*, p. 244.
[32] Martin Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridentini* ([Frankfurt],1566), Vol. I, pp. 296–425.
[33] In Sarpi's case, in his *aggiunte* added to Edwin Sandys, *Relation of the State of Religion* (London, 1605) (attribution discussed below); see, for instance, Sarpi, *Opere*, pp. 297–300. In Micanzio's case, in his notes on Bellarmine's *Tractatus de potestate summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus adversus Gulielmum Barclaium* (Rome, 1610), also discussed below; see Fulgenzio Micanzio, 'Annotazioni and pensieri', ed. G. Benzoni, in *Storici e politici veneti del Cinquecento e del Seicento* (Milan, 1982), eds. G. Benzoni and T. Zanato, for instance pp. 757–8.
[34] Manfredi was eventually burnt at Rome as a relapsed heretic. A relation of his death survives in several manuscript copies. A transcription is appended to C. Petrolini, 'Paolo Sarpi e l'Inghilterra', and is discussed in detail in C. Petrolini, 'Un salvacondotto e un incendio: la morte di Fulgenzio Manfredi in una relazione del 1610', *Bruniana & Campanelliana* 18 (2012), pp. 161–85.
[35] William Bedell to Adam Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL, MS Lansdowne 90, fol. 135v; *Two Biographies*, p. 245.

was the Antichrist, and that none who died in his Church could be saved.[36] His work was controversial even within the Church of England, provoking (for instance) the disapproval of the young William Laud, but – as I will discuss further later in this chapter – its fervent and detailed criticisms of the Jesuits (the 'blasphemous monks of the Loyolan sect', as Powell addresses them throughout the text) will have had some appeal to the Venetian anti-papal party.[37]

With Sarpi and Micanzio, therefore, Bedell was able to discuss a variety of works, including those which were deeply doctrinally controversial. They assessed the usefulness of different texts for different audiences. The fiery Fulgenzio Manfredi was introduced to more clearly polemical works. To teach a broader swathe of the Venetian nobility 'the truth', however, something milder was needed.[38] Bedell describes to Newton how he identified Sir Edwin Sandys's *Relation of the state of religion* (1605) as an ideal work for the task, describing it as 'a work soe proper to that purpose [of 'furthering the knowledge of the truth' amongst the Venetian nobility], as if God had directed the pen of the author to that special end, to doe him service in this place'.[39] The *Relation*, which couples an account of Sandys's travels through Europe with commentary on the Churches he encountered, discussed Catholic Italy in a relatively restrained tone, but was nonetheless critical of Roman Catholic superstition and other 'popish' excesses.[40] Bedell produced an Italian translation of the book in the summer of 1608, with 'the Fathers [Sarpi and Micanzio] correcting my Errours in the language'. The original text was then adapted further for evangelical purposes, with the addition of chapter divisions and the addition of annotations at the end of these chapters 'to declare some things therein touched'.[41] Bedell's translation along with a series of

---

[36] Gabriel Powell, *Disputationum Theologicarum et Scholasticarum de Antichristo et eius ecclesia Libri duo* (London, 1605), p. 451 and *passim*.
[37] For English criticisms of the work, see N. Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism c. 1530-1700* (Manchester, 2001), pp. 268–9; for instance, 'Loiolanae factionis blasphemis Monachis', Gabriel Powell, *De Antichristo* (London, 1605), p. 58 and *passim*.
[38] Bedell's phrasing, William Bedell to Adam Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL, MS Lansdowne 90, fol. 136v; *Two Biographies*, p. 247.
[39] Ibid.
[40] For further discussion of this text, see below.
[41] William Bedell to Adam Newton, [January 1609], Venice, BL, MS Lansdowne 90, fol. 136v; *Two Biographies*, p. 247.

additions (*aggiunte*), usually attributed to Sarpi, were printed without attribution in Geneva in 1625, after the Servite's death.[42] This work will be discussed further below. During this period Bedell also worked on an Italian translation of the Book of Common Prayer – an endeavour that may also be seen as a precursor to his later work as a Bishop in Ireland in the 1630s, where he spearheaded efforts to produce an Irish translation of the Old Testament – but is also striking in its own right, given Bedell's suspicion of subscribing to the Canons of 1604 just a few years earlier.[43] As we saw, however, once the Canons were made law, Bedell reconciled himself to them, and worked to persuade other members of his network to subscribe and to use their opportunities to preach to propagate a correct understanding of ceremonies. His translation of the Book of Common Prayer into Italian also facilitated spreading the Gospel in a convenient manner in Venice, turning the services held in the English Ambassador's house into an opportunity to convert Venetians, while not bending the rules allowing a Church of England service too far (though bend the rules it certainly did). However, Bedell evidently continued to believe that worshipping according to the particulars of the Book of Common Prayer was a matter of convenience rather than necessity. When he was party to discussions between Diodati, Sarpi and Micanzio about a possible liturgy for a Venetian Reformed congregation, he suggested that the Venetians might use the liturgy of the French Reformed Churches, which had already been translated into Italian, unless

[42] Bedell's account does not specify the author of the annotations, merely noting that they were added; the tone is Sarpian, but the text was surely produced in close collaboration with Micanzio and Bedell too, ibid.; Edwin Sandys, *Relatione dello stato della religione, e con quali dissegni et arti ella è stata fabricata e maneggiata in diversi stati di queste occidentali parti del mondo* ([Geneva], 1625), [trans. William Bedell, with additions by Paolo Sarpi]; printed in Sarpi, *Opere*, pp. 295–330. See also G. Cozzi, 'Edwin Sandys e la *Relazione dello stato della religione*', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 79 (1967).

[43] It further interesting to note that the sermons in William Bedell, 'MS. Sermons of Bishop Bedell', QUB, MS 128 are mostly based on psalms that appear in the BCP. Bedell's Italian translation of the BCP is mentioned in two of his letters: Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL Lansdowne 90, fol. 137v; Bedell to Ward, [Bury St Edmunds?], 30 November 1613, Bodl., Tanner MS 74, fol. 31r. See also S. Villani, 'La prima edizione italiana del Book of Common Prayer (1685) tra propaganda protestante e memoria sarpiana', *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 44 (2008), pp. 24–45; S. Villani, 'Italian Translations of the Book of Common Prayer', in *Travels and Translations*, ed. A. Yarrington, S. Villani, and J. Kelly (Amsterdam, 2013), pp. 303–19; S. Villani, 'Uno scisma mancato: Paolo Sarpi, William Bedell e la prima traduzione in italiano del Book of Common Prayer', *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* 53 (2017), pp. 63-112.

'they [Sarpi and Micanzio] thought ours [i.e. the BCP] fitter'.[44] Bedell himself saw no need to be dogmatic about it.

Bedell's work with the Venetians was also a continuation of the emphasis he placed on sermons as a means for spreading true religion, even when one did not agree with every aspect the ruling authority's religious prescriptions. The most dramatic fruit of the collaboration between Sarpi, Bedell and Micanzio was the series of Lent sermons Micanzio gave in the Church of San Lorenzo between 9 March and 17 April 1609, to the delight of the English and the horror of Rome. The Huguenot doctor Pierre Asselineau, who lived in Venice and was a close friend of Sarpi's, declared that Micanzio had preached the 'the pure word of the gospel', while Henry Wotton wrote enthusiastically to James I that 'his sermons are fully orthodoxal'.[45] The papal nuncio, Berlingherio Gessi, did not attend the sermons and had trouble establishing their content, but he focussed his reports to Rome and complaints to the Venetian senate on Micanzio's supposed challenge to papal authority.[46] Sarpi, however, wrote to Cristoph von Dohna that the sermons were restrained: he had 'not offended anyone, nor discussed contrary opinions' but simply 'preached Christ, and our misery when we are deprived of him'.[47] Sarpi also reported with glee that during his audience at the Collegio, Gessi was unable to point to any solid evidence of Micanzio's wrongdoing, having to fall back on the fact that Flemings and Greeks had attended the sermon in an attempt to bolster his complaint.[48] On Sarpi's account, this feeble effort merely encouraged even more members of the Venetian nobility to attend the sermons that the nuncio had so transparently tried to keep them from.

---

[44] Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL Lansdowne 90, fol. 137v.
[45] 'la pura parola evangelica', quoted in G. Benzoni, *Storici e politici veneti del Cinquecento e del Seicento* (Milan, 1982), eds. G. Benzoni and T. Zanato, p. 743; Wotton to James VI/I, 20 March 1609, in LPS I, p. 448.
[46] T. F. Mayer, *The Roman Inquisition on the Stage of Italy*, c. 1590-1640 (Philadelphia, 2014), p. 98.
[47] 'Non ha offeso alcuno, né disputate le contrarie opinioni', 'ha predicato Christo, e le miserie nostre quando siamo senza lui': Sarpi to Christoph von Dohna. Venice, 28 April 1609, in Sarpi, *Lettres italiennes,* p. 380; Benzoni, *Storici e politici veneti*, pp. 743–5.
[48] Sarpi to Groslot de L'Isle, Venice, 17 March 1609, *Lettres italiennes,* p. 352.

Micanzio's autograph notes from this period, held at the Biblioteca Marciana, include notes made for these sermons.[49] They largely consist of biblical commentary, written in discontinuous (and often barely legible) prose and without obvious polemical implications. They do, however, contain some references to the correct 'ordering' of society. In the notes for the sermon for the second Sunday of Lent, Micanzio addresses the role of the clergy, citing Hosea 5 ('Hear ye this, O priests…') in his second paragraph.[50] The subsequent discussion, labelled 'Order necessary in Church and state' in the margin, could be read as implying criticism of the papacy, which asserted primacy in both the spiritual and (in some circumstances) temporal spheres. Micanzio lays bare the dangers of a disordered society, asserting that: 'As all the things from God [in the House of Israel, described in Ezekiel 40] are ordered in number, weight and measure, how much more these should be in his commonwealth.' He compares the disordered state to the dry bones brought together to form a body by God at the start of Ezekiel 37, but which have no spirit in them: 'A spirit does not animate the body if its limbs do not have their distinctions, places, seats … Such is the state of a commonwealth, where the feet stand at the head'.[51] While not an explicit criticism of the papacy, in the context of the polemics published during the Interdict controversy, listeners could (and should) easily have interpreted Micanzio's words as such, and – as we shall see – Micanzio did accuse the papacy of disordering society elsewhere in his writings. Other themes of the sermons that could be interpreted similarly include criticisms of hypocrisy (through a citation of Matthew 6 in the final paragraph of notes for the sermon on the role of the clergy) and ambitions for temporal power (via a discussion of the attempt by Joseph's brothers to murder him because of dream that he

[49] Micanzio's notes are contained in two large volumes: BMV, Venice, MS It. XI, 174 [= 6517]; and MS It. XI, 175 [= 6518]. The notes pertaining to the Lent Sermons are MS It. XI, 175 [= 6518], fols. 153r–194r.
[50] 'Audite hoc, sacerdotes', BMV, MS It. XI, 175 [= 6518], fol. 177r.
[51] 'ordine nec[essari]o nella Chiesa et politica', 'Che essendo le cose da Dio ordinate in numero peso et misura, tanto maggiormente questo deve essere nella repub[lic]a sua', 'un sp[rit]o non an[im]a il corpo si li membri non hanno la sua dist[inction]e; lochi; seggi… tale è lo stato d'una republica, ove li piedi stano al capo', ibid.; there is a brief but extremely useful discussion of this section in G. Rosa, 'Politica e religione nella vita e nel pensiero di fra Fulgenzio Micanzio' (Tesi di Laurea, Università Ca'Foscari, Venezia, 1993), p. 39, note 49.

would rule over them).[52] Micanzio also repeatedly cites Old Testament stories of Jewish idolatry, and emphasises that these ceremonies and sacrifices were meaningless, and that the truth lies only in God's word.[53]

Another set of notes amongst Micanzio's papers give a clearer sense of how these themes fitted in to a more direct anti-papal polemic: a set of observations on and refutations of a text by Cardinal Bellarmine on the spiritual and temporal powers of the papacy, written in late 1610 and early 1611 (that is, during the last months and immediate aftermath of Bedell's visit).[54] The notes are in Micanzio's hand. This work by Bellarmine was itself a refutation of a work by the Scottish Catholic William Barclay, which had been posthumously published by his son at the request of King James.[55] This is yet more evidence of how deeply entwined the concerns of English and Venetian anti-papal polemic had become by 1610: Barclay's work was published as part of James's effort to defend the measures he had taken against Catholics in the wake of the Gunpowder Plot during the Oath of Allegiance controversy.[56] The text on which Micanzio's notes primarily focus is Bellarmine's *Tractatus de potestate summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus* (1609), which Bellarmine had written as a rebuttal of Barclay's claims for the absolute power of the monarch in temporal matters. Instead, Bellarmine asserted his doctrine of *potestas indirecta*, according to which the Pope had possessed indirect temporal power over secular rulers who threatened the spiritual well-being of the Church. Bellarmine had first set out this argument in his *Disputationes de controversiis Christianae Fidei adversus huius temporis Haereticos*, published between 1586 and 1593 and, as we have seen, the doctrine had already been attacked

[52] BMV, MS It. XI, 175 [= 6518], fol. 181v and fol. 193v.
[53] Criticisms of idolatry are particularly prominent in the notes for Micanzio's first sermon, delivered on Ash Wednesday, but they can also be found throughout, see ibid., esp. fols. 153r–61v.
[54] Ibid., fols. 4-53. Abridged version published as Fulgenzio Micanzio, 'Annotazioni and pensieri', ed. G. Benzoni, in *Storici e politici veneti del Cinquecento e del Seicento* (Milan, 1982), eds. G. Benzoni and T. Zanato. I will cite the printed text here.
[55] Robert Bellarmine, *Tractatus de potestate summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus adversus Gulielmum Barclaium* (Rome, 1610); William Barclay (1543–1608), *De potestate papae* (London, 1607). Barclay's work defended the divine right of kings, and was written while he lived in France, before being repurposed in an English context by James and his son; it was placed on the Index in 1613.
[56] For more on the Oath of Allegiance controversy, see the next chapter.

by Sarpi during the Interdict controversy.[57] Bellarmine's response to Barclay, however, was a longer and more systematic exposition of the *potestas indirecta* than any that had come before.

As we saw in the previous chapter, during the Interdict controversy, Bellarmine had claimed that Venetian law was impinging on 'ecclesiastical liberty' [*libertas ecclesiastica*], which the Pope had a duty to defend. Sarpi, on the other hand, saw 'ecclesiastical liberty' as a pretext for the Pope to claim temporal jurisdiction to which he had no right. This set a dangerous precedent: if the Pope could overrule a temporal ruler in matters which had 'spiritual end', and the Pope was the judge of what counted as a 'spiritual' matter, then Bellarmine's arguments lay the foundations for a papal universal monarchy.[58] These concerns about the implications of papal *potestas indirecta* in temporal affairs were heightened by the publication of the *Tractatus de potestate summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus*. The Interdict pamphlets had applied Bellarmine's doctrine to a particular case; the 1609 *Tractatus* turned it into a general theory. It is no surprise at all, therefore, to find Micanzio making detailed notes cataloguing his objections to Bellarmine's *Tractatus*. His notes are structured as a series of *pensieri*, some directly related to Bellarmine's text, others more general. Micanzio's eighth *pensiero* offers a detailed critique of the doctrine of *potestas indirecta*. As part of this discussion, Micanzio sets out his ideas on the correct ordering of society in greater depth. He separates out the 'spiritual' into two categories, 'faith' and 'discipline', and argues that 'discipline' is 'accidental' and 'variable'; or, in another phrasing Micanzio uses, a matter of 'things indifferent'.[59] Discipline is to be decided by the ruler who, as the superior, has a duty to give orders to the inferior. If the superior does not, it 'causes harm'. This in turn would mean that society is incorrectly 'ordered'. Micanzio argues that in the time of the Hebrews, God ruled and ordered the polity

[57] Robert Bellarmine, 'Controversia de summo Pontifice' in Vol. 1 (Ingolstadt, 1586) of his *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae fidei*, (Ingolstadt, 1586–93) 3 vols; for detailed account of the development of this argument, see S. Tutino, *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth* (Oxford, 2010), pp. 9–47.
[58] For a more detailed discussion of the Interdict debate, see Chapter 1.
[59] 'Convien distinguer nella spirituale, la fede dalla disciplina', 'accidentale', 'variabile', 'cose…indifferenti', Micanzio, *Annotazioni*, p. 765.

himself.[60] But since the coming of Christ, it was not the clergy's role to order a polity in this way. They should instead 'use the polity as they find it', bringing their influence to bear not through political power but through preaching and teaching.[61] Micanzio deploys the language of 'things indifferent' to emphasise the inviolable jurisdiction of a temporal sovereign, in a remarkable similar way to the Bedell's use of 'things indifferent' to justify conforming to James's wishes in the Subscription controversy of 1604.

Micanzio defends the supremacy of the temporal ruler to decide questions related to the form of public worship. While a good monarch will choose ceremonies which correctly reflect Christian doctrine, this is not necessary for the flourishing of the true Church. Bedell, Micanzio and Sarpi agreed on the necessity of loyalty to the prince in matters of religious ceremony. For all of them, these were matters indifferent, and did not justify an individual breaking away from an established church; it was better to reform the Church from within, ideally with the support of a godly prince. This in turn would provide part of the explanation of why Micanzio and Sarpi did not wish to convert to Protestantism, despite their sympathies with some aspects of the cause of Reform. Bedell, in his letters from Venice to Adam Newton describing his hopes for conversion, did not express disquiet at their reluctance to convert; he – like Sarpi and Micanzio – believed that swift changes in religion could only be effected by sovereign decision. As Bedell puts it: 'All changes in religion seem to me to come from reasons of conscience, or of state.' By reasons of state, Bedell explains that he means the possibility of a war against the papacy which would push the Venetians into finding an alternative religion. By conscience, Bedell meant the slower process of persuasion of a large swathe of the nobility that Reformed doctrines were superior to Roman ones. War over Venice seemed unlikely to Bedell, as it did to Micanzio and Sarpi, now that the crisis point of the Interdict had passed and the Senate had been reminded of the geopolitical advantages of peace. However, Bedell concluded that there was still hope for conversion by that second means: 'Reformation by that bye way of persuasion of

[60] 'fa male', 'ordinò', 'ci erano sì varie sorte di polizia', ibid., p. 764.
[61] 'tale usarla quale la ritrovasse', ibid., p. 765.

the conscience that though slowlyer, seemes no way to be despaired off.'[62] Bedell and Micanzio both placed particular value on sermons as a means by which existing Church practice could be challenged, without challenging the authority of the sovereign. One of the great benefits of this species of Venetian absolutism, then, was the potential to reconcile these disparate concerns. On this understanding, an absolutist conception of sovereignty provided sufficient freedom in the areas that mattered – the pastoral guidance of churchgoers – and protected these freedoms against the risk of papal usurpation.

In many ways, then, Bedell's internal and external debates during the English controversy over Subscription to the Canons of 1604 had prepared him especially well to engage with the predicament of the anti-papal party in Venice in the wake of the Interdict. How could they emphasise their loyalty to the state while also expressing hope that religion might be further reformed? Bedell had come to Venice with a loose theory of how a Reformed interpretation of absolutism, built around the doctrine of things indifferent, might offer a solution to this conundrum. His distinctly Reformed concerns about ceremonies appear to have helped shape the thinking of Sarpi and Micanzio. And the Venetians in turn offered Bedell more exposure to the implications of Jesuit arguments about the Pope's indirect papal jurisdiction, against which his own jurisdictional worldview could be sharpened.

It is already clear that the dispute between Bellarmine and Barclay had encouraged Micanzio to clarify the exact nature of his objections to Bellarmine's interpretation of Church–State relations. We also have clear evidence that Sarpi took a particular interest in this exchange. In a well-known letter to the French Gallican, Jacques Gillot, dated 29 September 1609, Sarpi sets out his analysis of Barclay's book (which Gillot had sent him) in particular detail. This letter represents one of the most precise statements of Sarpi's beliefs about Church–State relations. Importantly, rather than just setting out his objections to Bellarmine, Sarpi also critiques the work of his fellow anti-papal Catholic, and Bellarmine's target, William Barclay. Though Sarpi

[62] Bedell to Newton, 1/11 January 1608, Venice, BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 109r; printed in *Two Biographies,* p. 232.

praises Barclay's learning, he catalogues his particular objections to the doctrine set out in Chapter XII of Barclay's text, which describes the ecclesiastical and secular powers as 'separate but equal' authorities, both directly given by God.[63] Both exercise coercive powers in their own spheres, but never need to clash, as Church and State are entirely separate. As Stefania Tutino has noted, this was an argument with particular appeal to ecclesiastical Gallicans who wanted to defend the liberty of the French Church from both papal *and* royal interference.[64]

In Venice, however, Sarpi did not find this French argument persuasive. Taking a line similar to Bodin's attack on mixed constitutions, he denounced Barclay's model as 'a monster with two heads'.[65] Instead, Sarpi argued – as he had previously done elsewhere – that the true Church, defined as 'the kingdom of Christ' and 'congregation of the faithful', does not possess coercive power at all. Its role was to do battle with Satan; a task to which temporal coercion was entirely irrelevant. The earthly Church, and its claims to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, was something entirely different. This earthly jurisdiction was only possessed by the clergy as a grant from the temporal sovereign, who had entire authority over matters of ecclesiastical discipline.[66] This was an argument which, as we have seen, was similar to the understanding of the Royal Supremacy set out with increasing confidence by James VI & I, and defended by William Bedell during the subscription controversy: a Supremacy in which the temporal sovereign was the source of all ecclesiastical authority, and was the final judge of all matters relating to Church government.

There was thus a fundamental similarity between Bedell's position and that of Sarpi and Micanzio. They articulated a distinct stance in which the temporal ruler was appointed by God to rule absolutely, including in matters of Church government. This view was very different from that of Bellarmine, for whom the Pope possessed only spiritual jurisdiction, but could intervene in temporal affairs if the secular ruler turned heretic and the wellbeing of souls was at stake: on Sarpi, Micanzio and Bedell's

[63] Sarpi to Gillot, 29 September 1609, in *Lettere ai Gallicani*, pp. 136–8.
[64] Tutino, *Empire of Souls*, p. 153.
[65] 'monstrum biceps', Sarpi to Gillot, 29 September 1609, in *Lettere ai Gallicani*, p. 137.
[66] Ibid.

reading, a secular ruler could never really imperil souls, as salvation was a matter between the individual and God. It was also very different to that of Barclay, in which both the Church and the State received a share of earthly jurisdiction direct from God, each operating in a separate sphere which should not impinge on the other: to Sarpi, Bedell and Micanzio, however, having two sources of temporal authority in this way could only lead to civil dissension. There was therefore substantial ecclesiological agreement between the three men, agreement which marked them out against various Catholic (and some Protestant) rivals.

The extent to which the Sarpian and English Reformed conformist visions of the political and ecclesiastical order overlapped has often been understated. For instance, Stefania Tutino, in her important recent book on Bellarmine's political thought, emphasises what she sees as a clear distinction between the position advocated by Sarpi and that of King James VI & I. For Tutino, James's aim was to mix temporal and spiritual authority, while Sarpi advocated a radical separation of the two.[67] But here, I would suggest, Tutino fails to recognise how far Sarpi's views did indeed involve the temporal ruler making theological decisions. Certainly, Sarpi's vision did not involve the sovereign making decisions over any truly 'spiritual' matters. But nor did James's. Tutino draws attention to James's instruction to Prince Henry in his *Basilikon Doron* to 'study to be well seene in the Scriptures' so that 'ye may be able to contain your Church in their calling'.[68] Bellarmine strongly objected to this claim in his response to James, the unpublished *Hieratikon Doron* (written between 1604 and 1605), in which he accused James of a 'most grave and most dangerous' attempt to mix temporal and spiritual authority when, in fact, 'the earthly city and the heavenly city are distinct'.[69] Tutino connects Bellarmine's complaints with a similar complaint made by Sarpi about a different work of James's, the *Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance*

---

[67] S. Tutino, *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth* (Oxford, 2010), pp. 125–7.
[68] James VI & I, *Basilikon Doron* (London, 1603), printed in J.P. Sommerville (ed.), *King James VI and I: Political Writings* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 45.
[69] 'gravissima et periculosissima','distincta sunt… civitas terrena et civitas coelestis': Robert Bellarmine, *Hieratikon Doron,* in X.M. Le Bachelet, *Auctarium Bellarminianum* (Paris, 1913), p. 234 and 235; Tutino, *Empire of Souls*, p. 125.

(first printed 1608 and reissued in 1609), in a letter to the French Gallican jurist Jacques Leschassier, dated 5 January 1610:

> If the English Oath, put to Catholics by the King, had come to us plain, not mixed with the controversies of these times, it would have been approved by the knowledgeable. But because both the King and the others who wrote about it exceeded the limits of the Oath, it thus transpired that anyone who approves its articles, is judged to accept their entire doctrine, and for that reason gains a bad reputation. If only that King had just debated about royal matters and abstained from theological things! I think he acted prudently, because perhaps it was thus conducive to his own affairs, and it had had to be argued in this way with his own subjects; but in our matters it must be done differently. We do not want to mix heaven with earth, nor divine with human things. We want to keep the sacraments and other religious things in their place; it is only permissible to assert for Princes their power as set out in the divine Scriptures and the doctrine of the Fathers.[70]

But though Sarpi's insistence on not mixing heaven and earth looks on the surface similar to Bellarmine's objections to James, Tutino goes too far in suggesting that these comments suggest a fundamental disjuncture between James's and Sarpi's politico-religious projects, or the greater proximity of Sarpi's to Bellarmine's.[71]

In the first place, this interpretation overstates how far James *did* aim to mix heaven and earth. While that is how Bellarmine wanted to characterise James's argument in the *Basilikon Doron* in his rebuttal of it, James's argument in the original text was more subtle. James did tell Henry that it was good to study the Scriptures, both for his own salvation and because 'ruling [the clergy] well, is no small part of your office'.[72] Importantly, however, James emphasised that in matters that were clearly and scripturally-defined as spiritual, a king should follow clerical judgements: 'When any

---

[70] 'Si iuramentum anglicum, catholicis a rege propositum, ad nos nudum venisset, non permixtum controversiis huius saeculi, fuisset a peritoribus probabtum. Sed quoniam, et rex, et qui alii de eo scripsere, limites excesserunt iuramenti, hinc fit, ut qui articulos eius probat, censeatur eorum doctrinam omnem recipere, et propterea male audiat. Utinam rex ille regia tantum tractasset, et a theologicis abstinuisset! Prudenter illum fecisse arbitror, quia forte rebus suis ita conducebat, et cum subditis suis ita tractandum erat; verum pro rebus nostris aliter agendum est. Caelum terrae miscere nolumus, nec humanis divina. Sacramenta et religiosa alia suis locis manere volumus; tantum principibus potestatem suam asserere per divinas scripturas, et patrum doctrinam licet.' Sarpi to Jacques Leschassier, Venice, 5 January 1610, in *Lettere ai Gallicani*, p. 66–7.

[71] Tutino, *Empire of Souls*, p. 130.

[72] James VI & I, *Basilikon Doron*, p. 45.

of the spirituall office-bearers in the Church, speak unto you any thing that is well-warranted by the word, reverence and obey them as the heralds of the most high God.' It was only if clergymen 'exceed[ed] the bounds of their calling' that a king should, 'according to [his] office, gravely and with authority redact them in order again'.[73] James also makes the perhaps surprising statement that a King need not have a detailed knowledge of scriptural exegesis, warning Henry 'reason not much with them [the clergy]: for I have over-much surfeited them with that, and it is not their fashion to yield'.[74] Although ideally a King's interventions in religious affairs would be guided by personal piety and a good grasp of Scripture, irreligion did not take away a King's right to rule.[75] Ultimately, for James, the King had a scripturally-defined role as an authoritative governor of the visible Church, chosen by God to judge in matters indifferent. But for James, as much as for Sarpi, matters of a properly 'spiritual' nature (that is to say, doctrines clearly asserted in Scripture), were rightly left to the clergy to decide. A King who failed to do this would have God to answer to in the next life.

Tutino's interpretation also fails to sufficiently capture the full extent of Sarpi's meaning in the letter to Leschassier. While Bellarmine's objection was an attack on the substance of James's project, Sarpi's comments – written in a very different context – seem better described as a criticism of James's tactics.[76] Sarpi's approval of the substance of the Oath, and his careful recognition of the domestic factors that might have encouraged James to write as he did, do not suggest wholesale disapproval. Furthermore, though Sarpi is careful to place the sacraments outside the range of the secular ruler's authority, this still left space for them to play a significant role in the government of the Church, just as they could in James's account. The somewhat ambiguous final clause of Sarpi's comment, in which he states that 'it is only permissible to assert for Princes their power as set out the divine Scriptures and the

[73] Ibid., p. 19.
[74] Ibid., p. 45. For further discussion of this limit to the King's theological role, see A. Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 322–3.
[75] On this theme, James notes that there are both good and bad kings recorded in the Bible, see *Basilikon Doron*, p. 15.
[76] Here I agree with the interpretation put forward by Ulianich in his 'Considerazioni e documenti per una ecclesiologia di Paolo Sarpi', Appendix IV, p. 434.

doctrine of the Fathers', seems to mean that princes should not go beyond the power granted to them by Scriptural and patristic authority: however, the Scriptures and Fathers do still grant the Prince full control over matters of Church government.[77] Sarpi came to see James's decision to set out a statement of his beliefs alongside the Oath of Allegiance as a tactical mistake, leaving him open to criticism from Roman critics.[78] However, James did not claim to be making authoritative doctrinal statements (as he could make authoritative decisions about Church government), but rather setting out his own beliefs, in response to Roman accusations of his apostacy.[79] It does not seem, therefore, that the substance of the Church–State relationship which James had described was the source of Sarpi's objection, and Sarpi immediately goes on in the same letter to note that there was praise in Venice for Lancelot Andrewes's *Tortura Torti*, which made a similar case in less controversial terms.[80] Sarpi's secular ruler could – as he had set out in his letter to Gillot about Barclay, and repeated on a number of occasions – govern the Church in matters indifferent.[81]

The extent of the overlap between Sarpi and James's positions is further underscored by comparison to Bedell's writings on the office of the King. Bedell's clearest statement of his stance is made in a book he published in 1624, *The Copies of Certaine Letters,* in which Bedell published his correspondence with an Emmanuel contemporary who had converted to Catholicism in Spain in 1605, James Wadsworth (1572–1623). In these letters Bedell, like Sarpi, sets a clear limit on the King's ability to interfere with matters such as the sacrament which were purely spiritual, while endorsing the strong authority of the temporal ruler in other matters of Church government. He states that, 'as it was by *Calvin*', he would consider it 'monstrous' if

[77] 'tantum principibus potestatem suam asserere per divinas scripturas, et patrum doctrinam licet.' Sarpi to Jacques Leschassier, Venice, 5 January 1610, in *Lettere ai Gallicani*, p. 66–7.
[78] 'Nihil magis pro Romanis facit, quam ubi dicere licet, quod non ipsi, sed religio impetatur', ibid., p. 67. See also Sarpi to Castrino, Venice, 21 July 1609, *Lettres italiennes,* p. 447.
[79] See James VI&I, *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* (London, 1609), pp. 33–5.
[80] 'Auctor Tortura Torti commendatur hic, quoniam a controversiis abstinent quantum potest', Sarpi to Jacques Leschassier, Venice, 5 January 1610, *Lettere ai Gallicani*, p. 67
[81] For an overview of Sarpi's statements on this point, see Ulianich, 'Considerazioni e documenti per una ecclesiologia di Paolo Sarpi', pp. 387–90.

kings were given authority to judge as they liked in all aspects of religion.[82] In particular, he criticises the doctrines of the Six Articles of 1539, which Stephen Gardiner had been influential in drafting for Henry VIII.[83] The aspect of the Articles of which Bedell most disapproves is Gardiner's statement that the cup (i.e. wine) could be withheld from the laity in communion. Communion in one kind is, for Bedell, beyond the pale, for it directly contradicts the word of God in a sacramental matter: 'This was to make the King as absolute a tyrant in the Church, as the Pope claimed to bee.'[84] Gardiner was a regular subject of Reformed criticism for taking the powers of the monarch too far, and Bedell here positions himself within a longer tradition of defences of the Royal Supremacy. It had been common in Elizabethan England to state that the monarch was the jurisdictional head or governor of the Church, but to emphasise that this was not a sacerdotal role.[85] It did not involve the right to administer the sacraments, preach, or teach, all offices which were reserved to the clergy.

But this caveat aside, Bedell goes on to defend the right of a monarch to make laws which pertain to matters spiritual as well as temporal, writing that, 'Princes which obey the truth, have commandment from God, to command good things, and forbid evill, not onely in matters pertaining to humane societie, but also the religion of God.'[86] Here Bedell is quoting and translating Augustine's discussion of the role of the king in Book III of the *Contra Cresconium*.[87] He also explicitly asserts the support of Calvin, citing the famous final chapter (Book IV, Ch. 20) of the *Institutio Christianae Religionis*, insisting that, 'This is no new strange doctrine, but Calvins, and ours and S. Augustines, in so many words.'[88] Augustine's *Contra Cresconium* was an anti-

---

[82] William Bedell, *The Copies of Certaine Letters which have passed between Spaine and England in matter of Religion* (London, 1624), p. 56.
[83] J. Barrington Bates, 'Stephen Gardiner's *Explication* and the Identity of the Church', *Anglican and Episcopal History* (2003), p. 23.
[84] Bedell, *Certaine Letters*, p. 56.
[85] See discussion in J. Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: the Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 2011), esp. pp. 50–51 and pp. 63–5.
[86] Bedell, *Certaine Letters*, p. 56.
[87] Augustine, *Contra Cresconium*, in CSEL 52 (Vienna, 1909), LI, p. 462. Augustine's original Latin, the first half of which Bedell slightly adapts, is 'In hoc enim reges, sicut eis divinitus praecipitur, Deo serviunt in quantum reges sunt, si in suo regno bona iubeant, mala prohibeant, non solum quae pertinent ad humanam societatem, verum etiam quae ad divinam religionem'.
[88] Bedell, *Certaine Letters*, p. 56.

Donatist tract, in which he took pains to discredit Donatist claims that the Church should be left to discipline itself, without a role for the magistrate.[89] The citation from Calvin discusses a similar threat, in this case that of Anabaptists who argued that Christians, who obeyed a higher law, should have nothing to do with magistrates and no need for temporal government.[90] Both Calvin and Augustine make use in their analyses of the example of Nebuchadnezzar, who made 'bad' laws, contrary to the scriptures, but nonetheless remained (as they are at pains to emphasise) a legitimate monarch. Bedell underlines the distinction between the jurisdictional role of the temporal ruler and the sacerdotal role of the clergy by noting that a 'Queene is as well capable as a King [of exercising the English Royal Supremacy], since it is an Act of *authoritie,* not Ecclesiasticall *Ministery*'.[91] Viewed in light of these comments, Sarpi's insistence that Princes should not interfere with the sacraments in his letter to Leschassier looks less like a view which marks a radical break with Jacobean ecclesiology, and more like something compatible with Bedell's idea of a non-sacerdotal Royal Supremacy. This is also the same sentiment to which we saw James motioning with his comments about the need for Princes to 'reverence and obey' the 'spirituall office-bearers' of the Church when they 'speak… any thing that is well-warranted by the word'.[92]

Indeed, it is tempting to read Sarpi's letter to Leschassier as having been written with conversations with Bedell, or at least another well-informed English interlocutor, in mind. Sarpi does not often mention Bedell in his surviving letters.[93] This is not

---

[89] P.R.L. Brown, 'St. Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 54 (1964), p. 114.
[90] Jean Calvin, *Institutio Christianae Religionis* (Geneva, 1559), Book IV, Ch. 20, 19, p. 557.
[91] Bedell, *Certaine Letters*, p. 56. Emphasis original.
[92] James VI & I, *Basilikon Doron*, p. 19. See discussion above.
[93] Bedell is mentioned in Sarpi's correspondence with Jérôme Groslot de L'Isle and Jacques Auguste de Thou in the 1610s as someone from whom De Thou could procure a copy of Sarpi's history of the Interdict, without Sarpi having to smuggle a copy out of Venice. In a first letter to Groslot, Sarpi described Bedell as a 'remarkable person' (*persona singolare*), and also included a letter addressed to Bedell which he asked Groslot to send on. See Sarpi to Groslot de L'Isle, Venice, 25 September 1612, *Lettres italiennes*, p. 887. Either Groslot did not succeed in doing this, or Bedell did not reply, as De Thou was still asking after his copy in 1617, by which time Sarpi found another way to get him a copy of his history, via the Venetian ambassador to France. See Sarpi to De Thou, Venice, 9 April 1617, *Lettres italiennes*, p. 1103.

surprising, as their meetings were covert and mention of them risked damaging both parties if the letter was intercepted. However, Sarpi's thoughtful comments about how James's decision to discuss theology might have been driven by considerations of English domestic policy could plausibly have been picked up during discussions with Bedell. It is even possible that Sarpi's statement that things 'had had to be argued in this way with [James's] own subjects' was a direct reference to the events of the Hampton Court conference and the theological debate which ensued over Subscription.

In summary, then, James, Bedell, Sarpi and (looking back to his manuscript notes on Bellarmine) also Micanzio all emerge as having explored the idea of non-sacerdotal supremacy for the temporal ruler in the earthly Church. This is not to say they agreed on every point; Sarpi came to disapprove of James's attempts to try and persuade people that the details of his doctrinal views were correct, rather than simply defining and exercising his ecclesiastical authority. Sarpi would, as he put it, have liked James to be 'more King than doctor'.[94] But a King still had power over many Church affairs – and the implication of the Venetians' interest in the situation in Britain was that perhaps a Doge should too.

II

One of the fundamental questions about Anglo-Venetian interactions in the post-Interdict period is what the English and Venetian participants in these discussions thought a Reformed Venice might look like. The evidence discussed here has given reason to think that both members of the English embassy and their anti-papal Venetian contacts hoped it would look a lot like Jacobean Royal Supremacy, but with the King's control of matters of Church government replaced by the authority of the Doge and Senate. This was a vision of Church–State relations in which any form of religious reform had to come from the top, and thus their hopes for the removal of papalist corruption within the Church were dependent on support from the sovereign power. However, the members of the Venetian connection also recognised that a wider group

[94] 'vorrei il re d'Inghilterra piú che dotto', Sarpi to Cristoph von Dohna, Venice, 21 July 1609, *Lettres italiennes*, p. 449.

of people could help their cause by propagating information that would make it as politically appealing as possible. As we have seen, this was the thinking behind the translation of Edwin Sandys's *Relation of the State of Religion.* The same way of thinking underpinned the most systematic summary of the Anglo-Venetian network's hopes for a Reformed Venice: a proposal for further actions to take in Venice presented to King James in early 1609 by Giovanni Francesco Biondi, along with Wotton's dispatch of 6/10 January 1609, which explained that the plan was the work of 'Maestro Paolo'.[95] Biondi's text itself did not name the author of the plan, merely describing him as a 'person of great learning, faith, [and] zeal'.[96]

Biondi was a Dalmatian-born convert to Protestantism, who had developed close links with the English embassy in Venice, and Biondi carried Sarpi's proposals and Wotton's letter to England on the same occasion that he delivered Bedell's January 1609 letter to Newton. Bedell described how this plan had been produced following meetings between Sarpi, Micanzio, Bedell, 'this bearer' (Biondi) and Giovanni Diodati, a Italian-Genevan theologian and translator who travelled to Venice at Wotton's request in 1608, in the hope of 'the imminent reformation (*reformationem*) of the Venetian Church.'[97] Diodati's visit had not been a complete success; while he had hoped to help establish a Reformed congregation in Venice, he found the position on the ground less favourable than expected, and soon departed back to Geneva, convinced he could do more good in his roles as Reader of Divinity and Hebrew there than by spending longer in Venice.[98] Diodati wrote an account of the trip, in which he emphasises Sarpi's lack of spirit, noting with disappointment that though Micanzio was more zealous for

---

[95] TNA, SP 99/5, fol. 74r–81v; printed in G. Rein, *Paolo Sarpi und die Protestanten: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reformationsbewegung in Venedig im Anfang des Siebzehnten* (Helsinki, 1904), pp. 209–17.

[96] 'persona di gran dottrina, fedele, zelante', TNA, SP 99/5, fol. 74r.

[97] For Biondi, see G. Benzoni, 'Giovanni Francesco Biondi: un avventuroso dalmata del '600', *Archivio Veneto* 80 (1967), pp. 19-37; C. Petrolini, 'Per un regesto delle carte diplomatiche di Giovan Francesco Biondi (1609-1619 ca.)', in *Storie inglesi: L'Inghilterra vista dall'Italia tra storia e romanzo (XVII secolo)*, eds. S. Villani and C. Carminati (Pisa, 2011), pp. 35–42. For the meetings, see Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 137r. 'Ecclesiae venetae reformationem brevi speramus', Diodati to Duplessis-Mornay, [Geneva?], 22 April [1608], *Mémoires et correspondance de Duplessis-Mornay* X (Paris, 1824), p. 81.

[98] Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 137v.

reform, he followed Sarpi's lead too closely.[99] Bedell records that he had himself pushed for the formation of some sort of congregation, even if it was only of a very small number of faithful persons, 'which like a little snow falling from the top of a hill, would gather more and more to it in time'. However, given that 'none of the nobility did joyne', and given also that the merchants would only want to get involved if the Senate approved, Diodati judged that it was not worth the risk. Furthermore, there was the problem of who would act as the minister, as Diodati thought he was needed in Geneva, and Sarpi and Micanzio turned down Bedell's offer of himself as 'not fit nor easy in regard of jealousies of state'.[100] As ever, it was essential, in the Servites' view, in no way to compromise loyalty to the state. Importantly, however, the firm decision that Bedell could not be the minister to lead a Reformed congregation in Venice did not represent an effort by Sarpi and Micanzio to distance themselves from Bedell. In his very next paragraph, discussing the aftermath of the trip, Bedell described how there now 'passeth allmost noe day, wherein we [he and Micanzio] are not for an houre together', discussing Micanzio's plans for his Lent sermons.[101] Reform in Venice had to occur within the existing Church, rather than appearing to be a novelty brought in from outside.

Even after Diodati's trip proved fruitless, then, Sarpi and Micanzio continued to be interested in collaborating with Bedell. The plan Biondi presented to James offers evidence of this continued cooperation. The plan called on James to act as a counterweight to the Pope and his doctrine of 'Papismo', to enable the 'light of the true faith' to grow.[102] It emphasised that only Princes could successfully oppose papal

---

[99] Diodati's relation is held at Geneva, Musée Historique de la Réformation, Archive du Musée Historique de la Réformation, Mss. Suppl. 11/16, Giovanni Diodati, 'Briève relation de mon voyage à Venise en septembre 1608', fols. 1r-6v; printed as Jean Diodati, 'Briève relation de mon voyage à Venise en septembre 1608' in E. de Budé, *La Semaine Religieuse* (Geneva, 1863); discussed in S. Maghenzani, 'The Protestant Reformation in Counter-Reformation Italy, c. 1550–1660: An Overview of New Evidence', *Church History* 83 (2014), pp. 571–89. Bedell thought that Diodati's presence had at least had the positive effect of putting 'more spirit and courage' in Sarpi, see Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 137v; *Two Biographies*, p. 247.

[100] Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 137v; *Two Biographies*, p. 249.

[101] Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fols. 137v–8r; *Two Biographies*, p. 250.

[102] 'il lume della vera fede', TNA, SP 99/5, fols. 75r and 74r.

ambitions, and that James was particularly well placed to lead these efforts, 'being the foremost prince in the Church of God, free, independent, in possession a great estate, power and riches; and, something that matters no less than the rest, having an Ambassador to Italy, the opportune place for our purpose'.[103] It notes – in similar language to that of Bedell – that 'the people' could be helpful in supporting religious reform, but is careful only to describe this as occurring by a process of believers seeking 'liberty of conscience' and then being supported in throwing off papal corruptions by their rulers.[104] Echoing Bedell in the discussions with Diodati, the plan emphasises how a few good men placed in Venice could do a lot of good (as Bedell had already been instructing 'two friends' of the author, inspiring them by his own 'gentleness' as much as by 'his doctrine'),[105] but also, echoing Sarpi and Micanzio, suggests that this should involve training Italians in two Colleges (modelled, boldly, on those of the Jesuits' two English Colleges, with one in England for Italian exiles and the other in the Valtellina to support the dissemination of godly propaganda).[106] Finally, it urges that there should be formed a 'Union' of Princes, working together 'in a defensive league against the usurpers of the jurisdiction of the Princes'.[107] Once such a league had been formed, Venice would be able to join, while 'avoiding the appearance of any religious pretext'.[108] The ultimate aim was to create an environment which would give the Venetian elite somewhere else to turn when they next got into a dispute with the papacy, and the theological tools to explain why breaking with Rome is the right course. As part of the account of the discussions with Diodati, Bedell had written (apparently reporting comments made by Sarpi) that 'among the nobility nothing could be moved

[103] 'l'essere il primo Prencipe nella Chiesa di Dio, libero, independente, grande di Stato, di forze et di ricchezze; et quello che importa non meno del resto, l'haver Ambasciatore in Italia, luogo opportuno al nostro fine', ibid., fol. 75r.
[104] Ibid., fol. 80v. For similar comments by Bedell, see Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 135r; *Two Biographies,* p. 244.
[105] 'la mansuetudine', 'la sua dottrina', TNA, SP 99/5, fol. 76v, It is not entirely clear if these 'two friends' are Sarpi and Micanzio (as Biondi's 'friends') or Micanzio and Manfredi (as Sarpi's 'friends'). The former is probably more likely, as Manfredi's defection was already known when Biondi left Venice.
[106] Ibid., fols. 76r–v and fols. 78r–9r.
[107] 'lega divensiva contra gli Usurpatori della Giuriditione de' Prencipi', ibid., fol. 79v.
[108] 'fuggendo in apparenza ogni pretesto di Religione', ibid.

until there were some Civill occasion of breach with the Pope'.[109] The plan of 1609 was an effort to make such an occasion more likely. The view of its author was that such an anti-papal league was the best way to secure peace in Europe, and would be of clear benefit to James, consolidating his power both at 'home and abroad'.[110]

At the same time as the Anglo-Venetian network around the English embassy were pitching this vision to James, they were also seeking support for it amongst the Venetian elite. Sarpi had a number of allies amongst anti-Spanish members of the Venetian nobility, including Doge Leonardo Donà (Doge from January 1606), and several members of the nobility, notably Nicolo Contarini, Antonio Foscarini, Gregorio Barbarigo and Domenico Molino.[111] Molino corresponded with Casaubon in the period 1609–13, during the period in which Casaubon moved to England, while Foscarini was later ambassador to England.[112] Donà's family papers, now held at the Biblioteca Correr, furnish further intriguing evidence of the circle's interest in England. They include an Italian translation of the first book of Jean Hotman de Villiers's French translation of James I's *Basilikon Doron*.[113] The text includes the section of the 1603 Preface in which James set out his own conviction that ceremonies are matters indifferent.[114] Donà's stance was never as firmly anti-papal as Sarpi's, and as memories of the Interdict started to fade, Donà seems to have increasingly believed that better relations with the papacy were necessary for Venetian political stability. There was probably some truth in this: many of the inhabitants of the Venetian *terra firma* had suffered disruption and financial loss as a consequence of the Interdict, and were probably less convinced by Sarpi's jurisdictional defences than those in the City of

---

[109] Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 137r; *Two Biographies*, p. 248.
[110] 'in casa et fuori', TNA, SP 99/5, fol. 79r–v.
[111] These networks are explored in detail in the work of Cozzi. See especially G. Cozzi, *Il Doge Nicolò Contarini: Ricerche sul patriziato veneziano agli inizi del Seicento* (Venice, 1958).
[112] See the letters from Molino to Casaubon in BL Burney MS 367, printed in S. Signaroli, *Domenico Molino e Isaac Casaubon: Con l'edizione di sette lettere da Venezia a Parigi (1609–1610)* (Milan, 2017); for Foscarini, see S. Secchi, *Antonio Foscarini: un patrizio veneziano del '600* (Firenze, 1969).
[113] Correr, Fondo Donà dalle Rose, MS 167, 'Basilikon doron', fols. 65r–107v. This document is discussed in Petrolini, 'Paolo Sarpi e l'Inghilterra', p. 28.
[114] The translation reads 'Io son nondimeno contrario a coloro, che disputano di cotai cose leguali io tengo per indifferenti'. Correr, Venice, Fondo Donà dalle Rosa, MS 167, fol. 70r.

Venice itself, or his readers abroad.[115] Nonetheless, it seems that Donà may have at least explored the possibility of taking James religious settlement as a model for Venice's own, with Sarpi's assistance.

Several hints in the fragmentary surviving evidence suggest that there was an appetite for information about England in Sarpi and Micanzio's circles. One such hint is a one-page summary of the events leading up to the Gunpowder Plot of 1605, written in Micanzio's hand and tucked in between the pages of his notes on Bellarmine at the Marciana. The text involves an account of the plotter's actions in the run-up to the 5 November, written in Italian, as well as a brief Latin poem attacking the Jesuits.[116] This appears to be an Italian summary of the Latin *Narratio fidelis et succincta*, a summary of the events of the Gunpowder Plot based on 'English commentaries, edited by public authorities', printed by the Leiden printer Jan Orlers.[117] Micanzio starts his own even more succinct summary with Thomas Winter's trip to Spain in December 1601, mentioned on the fifth page of Orlers's account, and ends it with the Latin poem entitled 'Ad Jesuitarum gregem' ('To the herd of Jesuits'), which Orlers prints on his twenty-eighth page.[118] This four-line epigram mocks Catholic claims that at the time of the Jesuit Henry Garnet's execution for involvement in the plot, a drop of his blood miraculously splashed the image of his face on to a stalk of straw. According to the epigram's author, this was no surprise: 'You cry out in wonder that a drop of blood / Fallen by chance on a straw, gave Garnet's face! / But for us it is no wonder, that he who spilt much blood / And thirsted for more, could be painted in blood himself.'[119] Bedell may well have been responsible for giving Orlers's text to Micanzio; in any case,

---

[115] For a good summary of the dissatisfaction in the *terra firma* and the disruptions of the Interdict, see C. Pin, '"Qui si vive con esempi, non con ragione": Paolo Sarpi e la committenza di stato nel dopo-Interdetto', in *Ripensando Sarpi*, pp. 344–6.
[116] BMV, MS It. XI, 175 [= 6518], fol. 27r–v.
[117] *Narratio fidelis et succincta de nupera illa proditione ... a Jesuitis et conjuratis in ... Magnæ Britanniæ regem intentata, ex commentariis Anglicis, publica authoritate editis, in unum historiæ corpus congesta* (Leiden, 1607). Sources for this text included the *True and Perfect Relation* of the Jesuit Henry Garnet's trial which had been published in English by the King's Printer Robert Barker (London, 1606), and which was translated into Latin by William Camden as *Actio in Henricum Garnetem* (London, 1607).
[118] BMV, MS It. XI, 175 [= 6518], fol. 27r and fol. 27v; *Narratio fidelis* (Leiden, 1607), p. 5 and p. 28.
[119] 'Mirandu[m] exclamas quod gutta in stramine casu / Garneti vultum, sanguinolenta dedit! / Nos non miramur, qui multum sanguinis hausit / Plus sitiit, pingi sanguine si potuit', copied out by Micanzio in BMV, MS It. XI, 175 [= 6518], fol. 27v; *Narratio fidelis* (Leiden, 1607), p. 28.

it is clear that Micanzio took care to find out details of the Plot, and viewed it as yet more evidence of Jesuit villainy. It is also interesting to find Micanzio taking particular note of the epigram. During this same period, the Venetian poet Ottavio Menini wrote a number of anti-papal poems circulated amongst Sarpi and Micanzio's friends.[120] Bedell was clearly party to this jovial exchange of anti-papal ditties: he would later print a number of anti-papal poems, including at least one by Menini, at the end of the Latin translation of Sarpi's history of the Interdict.[121]

The impression of a strong Venetian interest in the Gunpowder Plot is further reinforced by the fact that a short Italian-language account of the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot, a copy of the depositions of Guy Fawkes and of the confession of Thomas Winter, both also in Italian, can also be found amongst the papers donated to the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1691 by Henry Puckering, the son of Adam Newton, tutor to the Prince of Wales and correspondent of William Bedell.[122] As will be discussed in more detail at a later point, these items had belonged to Giacomo Castelvetro, the Italian religious exile who had returned to live in Venice and worked closely with the English embassy in the post-Interdict period.[123] Castelvetro's translations adapt the text to make it more suitable for a non-English audience, suggesting his translations had an Italian manuscript readership.[124] Castelvetro's papers also include a translation of a short pamphlet the Earl of Salisbury had published in the wake of the Gunpowder Plot, in which he complained of a 'number of Authors… in

---

[120] Sarpi discusses and includes some of Menini's epigrams in his letters to Jacques Groslot de L'Isle. See Sarpi to Groslot de L'Isle, Venice, 22 July 1608, in *Lettres italiennes,* pp. 210–12.

[121] Paolo Sarpi, *Interdicti Veneti historia de motu Italiæ sub initia Pontificatus Pauli V commentarius* (Cambridge, 1626), trans. William Bedell, sigs. Ff4r–Gg4r.

[122] TCC, MS R.10.14, fols. 191r–6v, 'Ragionamento interno alla maniera dello scoprimento di questo ultimamente machinato tradimento' and 'La vera copia delle deposition di Guido Faukes'; MS R.16.24, fol. 27r–35v, 'I nomi d'altre principali persone', 'Confessione di Tomaso Winter, 23 Nov. 1605' and other details of plotters and accomplices. These are translations of section from *His Maiesties speach in this last session of Parliament as neere his very words as could be gathered at the instant. Together with a discourse of the maner of the discovery of this late intended treason, joyned with the examination of some of the prisoners* (London, 1605).

[123] For an authoritative discussion of Castelvetro's life and work, see Pirillo, *The Refugee-Diplomat*, esp. Ch. 6. Castelvetro is discussed further in Ch. 4 below.

[124] See discussion of Castelvetro's translation and intentions in M.L. de Rinaldis, 'Giacomo Castelvetro's political translations: narrative strategies and literary style', *Lingue Linguaggi* 14 (2015), pp. 181-96, esp. p. 186.

Rome, which strongly mainteine the doctrine of deposing kings', placing the blame for the Plot squarely on the papacy and its temporal ambitions.[125] Another translation of the same pamphlet, this one incomplete, can also be found amongst Doge Leonardo Donà's papers.[126] The two translations are sufficiently different to suggest that they were made independently of each other, though the identity of the second translator is unclear.[127] But the existence of these two manuscript translations is evidence that Salisbury's work – which made much the same argument we saw him make to the Venetian ambassador in the first chapter in more comprehensive form – had a substantial Italian circulation within Sarpi and Micanzio's Venetian milieu. The Gunpowder Plot, particularly interpreted as evidence of the dangers of the papacy's jurisdictional overreach, was a source of great interest in Venice. Bedell and Castelvetro appear to have done their best to sate Venetian curiosity with Italian material, disseminating anti-papal material much as had been advocated in the plan delivered by Biondi in January 1609. By emphasising a particular interpretation of the Gunpowder Plot, these accounts encouraged Venice to adopt a strong political stance against papal jurisdictional incursions.

As we have already seen, the writings of Micanzio and Sarpi in this period engaged closely with the questions raised by the Gunpowder Plot. Micanzio wrote extensive notes on Bellarmine's response to outpouring of pamphlets prompted by James's introduction of an Oath of Allegiance for Catholics in the wake of the Plot.[128] Meanwhile, Sarpi planned, and began work on, a larger theoretical work, drawing together his interpretation of how Church–State relations should look. This is the work known as 'Della potestà de' prencipi', draft chapters of which were only recently

[125] TCC, MS R.16.24, fols. 36r–45v, 'Risposta dell'Illustrissimo Signor Roberto Cicil Illustrissimo Conte di Salisbury, et Gran Secretario d'Inghilterra a certo libello sparso, sotto preteso d'una ammonitione Catolica'; quotation from Robert Cecil, *An answere to certaine scandalous papers, scattered abroad under colour of a Catholicke admonition* (London, 1606), sigs. C2r–v.
[126] Museo Correr, Fondo Donà dalle Rose 167, 'Risposta a certi scandolosi scritto disseminati sotto colore di catolicke Ammonitioni', fols. 124r–6r. This translation stops at sig. C1v of the English.
[127] The translator did not necessarily need to know English, as Salisbury's pamphlet was also published in Latin translation the same year, see Robert Cecil, *Responsio ad libellum quendam famosum, Catholicæ admonitionis prætextu in vulgus sparsum* (London, 1606).
[128] Discussed above.

rediscovered in the Beinecke Library, which Sarpi probably wrote in late 1610.[129] As a draft, the argument is incomplete, but it appears to be in essence a response to Bellarmine's writings against James on the topic of the Oath of Allegiance.[130] It accuses Bellarmine of undermining obedience to Princes and traces how the doctrine of indirect papal temporal jurisdiction paved the way for universal papal monarchy, in a similar, but more systematic, manner than the interdict pamphlets.[131] Sarpi's list of 207 planned chapter headings also survive, which imply strong agreement with James's stance in the controversy, particularly in terms of the King having no earthly superior and having the right – and the duty – to govern the Church.[132] Engagement with English discussion of anti-papal jurisdictional themes thus had a central place in Sarpi's effort to give the Venetian case against papal interference broader appeal. Though Sarpi never completed or circulated this work, it is another indication of the framework which underpinned his other writings of the period. However, Sarpi seems to have ultimately decided that it would be easier to win the argument against papal jurisdictional claims by providing empirical evidence of papal corruption, as he aimed to do in the *Historia del Concilio tridentino*, rather than by engaging in further theoretical debate. This interest in historical modes of argument will be traced in subsequent chapters. Nonetheless, it is clear that Sarpi found the Jacobean model of Royal Supremacy a valuable framework for thinking about the relationship between Church and State. He endeavoured to demonstrate its intellectual strengths in his writings, and thought Princes governing on such a model offered the firmest foundations for a stable European political order, a vision which he had set out in the 1609 plan.

III

[129] Paolo Sarpi, *Della potestà de' prencipi* (Venice, 2006), ed. N. Cannizzaro with an essay by C. Pin.
[130] For discussion on this point, see N. Cannizzaro in ibid., esp. pp. 2–5.
[131] Ibid., e.g. p. 51.
[132] Ibid., see, for instance, headings 7 ('che al Prencipe Cristiano Dio ha commesso la tutela e difesa della Chiesa'), 18 ('Autorità del Prencipe nel prescriver leggi della disciplina alli ministri'), 21 ('Ch'il Prencipe, abbandonato la cura delle cose della Chiesa e religione, overo lasciando minuire l'auttorità sua, in ciò offende Dio e pecca'), 24 ('al Prencipe appartiene congregar li ministri per avvisar sopra la verità e sopra la disciplina della Chiesa'), 66 ('Leggi delli prencipi intorno alla disciplina ecclesiastica') and 98 (che il Prencipe dipende da Dio solo e non [ha] superior in terra'). James himself in listed amongst the monarchs that Sarpi planned to discuss in 179 ('Di Enrico VIII et Elizabeta e Giacomo di Inghilterra').

To really be certain of the dividing lines between the approaches taken by Sarpi, Micanzio and Bedell, it is important to address the doctrine which provoked most controversy between England and Venice in this period: the contention that the Pope was the Antichrist. This controversial doctrine shaped discussions between Sarpi, Bedell and Micanzio too, and underpinned Sarpi's objections to James's *Apologie*. However, its effect in these discussions was not, as we might expect, a purely negative and limiting factor in Anglo-Venetian exchange. The characteristics which Bedell highlights as proof that the Pope is the Antichrist are the same characteristics which Sarpi and Micanzio criticise most strongly. Sarpi rejected the identification of the Antichrist as unnecessarily antagonistic and ultimately a matter too uncertain to judge; but he certainly did see the Pope as the foremost threat to Christendom. For both Bedell and Sarpi, it was the Pope's usurpation of temporal jurisdiction above all else which marked him out as an egregious threat to true religion.

As Anthony Milton has noted, the doctrine of the Antichrist assumed different meaning in the hands of different theologians. While puritan authors focussed on the Apocalyptic role of the Antichrist, as set out in the Book of Revelation, Reformed conformists could reconcile the doctrine of the papal Antichrist with the belief that the Roman Church remained, at its core, a true Church. The tensions between these two interpretations would be laid bare in the controversy over Joseph Hall's tract *The Old Religion* (published in London in 1628).[133] The moderate stance presented by Bedell's Emmanuel contemporary Hall (in which the Pope is the Antichrist but Rome nonetheless a true Church) in that work is very similar to that set out by Bedell in the apologetic works he wrote throughout his career. For Bedell, the identification of the Pope as the Antichrist was an important doctrinal truth. But it was also one which allowed him to argue that the Roman Church was still a true church, though one which had been corrupted by its antichristian rulers.

It is a commonplace of scholarship on Anglo-Venetian relations in the Interdict period to suggest that the English overestimated the appetite for Reform in Venice. One particular incident is often portrayed as symptomatic of this broader misunderstanding:

[133] A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 106–7.

King James's and his ambassador Henry Wotton's disappointment at the Senate's refusal to reverse a ban on the circulation of James's *Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* in Venice in late 1609. The Senate had received a presentation copy of the work from Wotton, which they had politely accepted but did not circulate further, recognising that the book would prove controversial in Rome.[134] The book openly contained a digression discussing the likelihood that the Pope was the Antichrist, a step which the King should have recognised as being unnecessarily inflammatory and likely to do his authority in European affairs more harm than good. Sarpi criticised the King's mention of the papal Antichrist on just these grounds in his correspondence at the time; it is hard to disagree with W.B. Patterson's judgment that James's mention of the Antichrist was a 'tactical mistake'.[135]

But it is also important to recognise that Sarpi's objection was also more a question of tactics than a clash of doctrines. The snubbing of James's book was one episode in a story of factional conflict within Venice. In the wake of the Interdict, Rome did its best to win over the Venetian nobility. The Papacy had seen the dangers the Interdict had presented to its authority and wanted to forestall any repeats. The papal strategy involved describing Venice as Rome's 'prodigal daughter', and the majority of the nobility were delighted to be welcomed back into the Roman fold with open arms. Sarpi, Micanzio and Donà thus increasingly found themselves amongst a minority of leading Venetians who retained a heavy scepticism of Rome and of Spain and had to step carefully in public. In a more private context, Sarpi told Bedell that Gabriel Powell's book *De Antichristo* 'was not esteemed unfit to be commended' to the anti-papal preacher and erstwhile ally of Sarpi's (before his dramatic defection to the papacy), Fulgenzio Manfredi.[136] In their works, Sarpi and Micanzio often describe the Pope using the attributes of the Antichrist, most notably hypocrisy and unjust usurpation. Hence although the designation of Antichrist itself was a hindrance, the idea that the Pope was the main corrupting force in an otherwise acceptable Christian

[134] For Wotton's account of discussions, see LPS I, pp. 468–78.
[135] B. Ulianich, 'Sarpi "riformatore"', pp. 84–5; Patterson, *James VI & I*, p. 97.
[136] Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], Bodl., Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 135v; *Two Biographies*, p. 245.

Church opened the way for a more substantial exchange of ideas between anti-papal writers in England and Venice. Powell's book was aggressively polemical in style, attacking the Jesuits as blasphemous and stating (in contrast to the view Bedell had set out in 1604) that membership of the Church of Rome debarred its believers from salvation. However, Powell's book also contained detailed historical accounts of the development of papal claims to temporal power, and how – with the help of the Jesuits – these claims would lead to the deposition of kings.[137] It is these aspects of the work, rather than his dogmatic pronouncements on the identity of the Antichrist, which Sarpi and Micanzio will have found appealing.

Importantly, both Bedell and King James also thought Powell's stance too extreme in some respects; both held back from stating that the identity of the Antichrist was certain. Though Sarpi thought James's digression on the Antichrist ill-advised, the King did add a caveat to his discussion, stating that 'I will not urge so obscure a poynt, as a matter of faith to be necessarily beleeved of all Christians'.[138] Bedell made a similar point in his letters to Wadsworth, noting that though 'a commonly received opinion', the papal Antichrist was 'no part of the doctrine of the Church of England'.[139] James also clarified this point to the French Ambassador in 1609, stating that he did 'not wish to say that the pope is the Antichrist except in so far as he [the Pope] maintains that he has the power to depose princes'.[140]

In order to understand exactly how far Sarpi and Micanzio's views on the question of the Antichrist differed from Bedell's, it is worth paying close attention to two texts produced by the three men in the period 1607–11. The first is the additions to Edwin Sandys's *Relation of the state of religion*, first published in English in London in 1605, a work based on Sandys's travels in Europe, in which he compares the beliefs

---

[137] Powell, *De Antichristo*, esp. pp. 83–4 and 191–204.
[138] James, *Apology*, p. 51. In the Latin edition, this is rendered 'nolo rem tam obscuram & involutam tamquam omnibus Christianis ad credendum necessariam urgere', James VI & I, *Apologia pro juramento fidelitatis* (London, 1609), p. 63. Sarpi's objections to the doctrine of the Antchrist are expressed most clearly in his letter to Groslot d'Isle, Venice, 17 February 1609, *Lettres italiennes*, p. 335. See also Ulianich, 'Considerazioni e documenti per una ecclesiologia', pp. 417–20.
[139] Bedell, *Copies of Certain letters*, pp. 81–2.
[140] Quoted in Patterson, *James VI & I*, p. 96.

and practices of Christendom's various churches.[141] This Italian translation was published in Geneva in 1625, two years after Sarpi's death, under the title *Relatione dello stato della religione*.[142] In this Genevan edition, the opening portion of Sandys's work was split into nine chapters (which did not exactly match the section divisions of the original), with short commentaries, described in on the title page as 'notable additions' (*aggiunte notabili*), appended to each of these chapters.[143] It was printed under the auspices of Giovanni Diodati, who is likely to have taken a copy back with him to Geneva following his journey to Venice in 1608–9. Bedell certainly believed Diodati had a copy there, as he told Ward.[144] The book was printed without a place of publication, but the printer's emblem on the frontispiece allows it to be identified as the work of the Genevan printer Pierre Aubert, with whom Diodati also worked on other occasions.[145] Diodati's editorial interventions are likely to have been minimal,

---

[141] Edwin Sandys, *A relation of the state of religion and with what hopes and pollicies it hath beene framed, and is maintained in the severall states of these westerne partes of the world* (London, 1605). The circumstances surrounding the first publication of Sandys's *Relation* in London in 1605 are still somewhat unclear. After swiftly passing through at least two editions in London in 1605, the Court of High Commission on 3 November – a mere two days before Guy Fawkes's arrest on 5 November – ordered that all copies of the work be burnt. This suppression of the work was apparently done with the author's consent: the preface to a later 1629 edition claimed that these earlier editions were made from 'a spurious stolne Copie; in part epitomized, in part amplified, and throughout most shamefully falsified & false printed'. However, as Rabb argues, it seems improbable that Sandys did not consent to the 1605 publications. T.K. Rabb, 'The Editions of Sir Edwin Sandys's "Relation of the State of Religion"', *Huntington Library Quarter*ly 26 (August 1963), pp. 323-336. See also T.K. Rabb, *Jacobean Gentleman: Sir Edwin Sandys, 1561-1629* (Princeton, 1998). But note that James Ellison, 'The Order of Editions of Sir Edwin Sandys's *Relation of the State of Religion* (1605)', *The Library*, ser. 6, 2 (1980), pp. 208–11, disputes Rabb's conclusions. For discussion of the 'irenic' content of Sandys's text, see G. Cozzi, 'Sir Edwin Sandys e la *Relazione dello Stato della Religione*', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 79 (1967) pp. 1095-121.

[142] Edwin Sandys, *Relatione dello stato della religione, e con quali dissegni et arti ella è stata fabricata e maneggiata in diversi stati di queste occidentali parti del mondo* ([Geneva], 1625), [trans. William Bedell, with additions by Paolo Sarpi].

[143] Sandys, *Relatione dello stato della religione,* title page.

[144] Bedell to Ward, Bury St Edmunds, 30 November 1613, Bodl., Tanner MS 74, fol. 31r; *Two Biographies*, p. 254.

[145] The emblem is that of the dolphin and anchor, with the motto 'festina tarde', most noted for its association with the Venetian Aldine press. Aubert uses this emblem on a number of his works, including Pierre du Moulin, *L'Antibarbare, ou du langage incogneu tant es prières des particuliers qu'au service public* (Geneva, 1629), and most interestingly, Diodati's translation of the Psalms into Italian, *I sacri salmi messi in rime italiane* (Geneva, 1631; s.l., 1631). Two impressions of the same edition of these psalms were published, one with Aubert's name printed on the title page, and one without an attribution to him or a place of publication. See W.A. McCormish, *The Epigones: A study of the theology of the Genevan Academy at the Time of the Synod of Dort, with special reference to Giovanni Diodati* (Eugene OR, 1989), p. 11. Possibly this was done in the hope of making it easier to distribute the work in Italy.

however, as a partial manuscript copy of the *aggiunte*, preserved amongst the papers of the Italian Protestant Giacomo Castelvetro, records the first *aggiunta* in almost exactly the same form.[146] Castelvetro died in England in 1616, after leaving Venice in 1612, so his copy would not have included later changes made by Diodati. Furthermore, Bedell's correspondence suggests that there was a plan to publish the *Relatione* with the *aggiunte* in Venice 1609.[147] Castelvetro's interest in the *aggiunte* may have been a first step towards printing, as he was closely connected to the printing trade, working for and living in the house of the Venetian printer Giovanni Battista Ciotti.[148]

Despite the *aggiunte notabili* being printed without attribution, they can confidently be identified as the fruit of the collaborative effort between Bedell, Sarpi and Micanzio in the wake of the Interdict. As the Cozzis suggest (affirming Bedell's statements in his letters), the translation is surely a corrected version of Bedell's work, while Sarpi is most probably the primary author of the attached notes: the additions are characterised by the flashes of irony which are typical of Sarpi's prose.[149] Yet there is also a strong similarity of approach between the *aggiunte* to the Sandys translation and Bedell's apologetical writings. Bedell produced two substantial manuscript works containing defences of the Church of England, which appear to have been written with the aim of converting Catholics. The first was his *Defence* of his reply to Alabaster

---

[146] TCC, MS R.4.36, 'Relatione delle essere della Religione', fols. 43r–8r.

[147] Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], fol. 136v; *Two Biographies*, p. 248.

[148] It is even possible that printing may have begun in Venice in 1610. Curiously, the appearance of the type and chapter divisions appears to change mid-way through gathering K of the Genevan edition. Closer bibliographical analysis might establish that one half was printed elsewhere, possibly even at an earlier date, with the printed sheets transferred to Geneva where they were bound up with earlier pages printed at a later date. This possibility is worth further investigation. For Castelvetro's links to Ciotti, see Pirillo, *The Refugee Diplomat*, p. 154.

[149] To take the most obvious example, in the notes to Chapter II, the annotator pokes fun at the multiplication of saints. He states that saints are allocated special responsibilities on tangential grounds, citing the case of S. Gottardo who 'purely from the similarity of the name… acquired control over gout [*la gotta*]', and notes that 'newer saints obscure the memory of the old'. As the Cozzis note, this is very similar point to that made by Sarpi a letter to the French Gallican Groslot d'Isle of 3 January 1612, in which Sarpi jokes that the newly canonised Cardinal Borromeo 'now does all the miracles' (scioccamente dalla sola similitudine del nome', 'ha acquisitato dominio sopra la gotta', 'i santi più moderni offuscano la memoria de' vecchi', [Sarpi], 'Aggiunte notabili' to Sandys's *Relatione*, printed in Sarpi, *Opere*, eds. G. Cozzi and L. Cozzi, p. 299; 'adesso fa tutti li miracoli', Sarpi to Groslot de l'Isle, Venice, 3 January 1612, printed in *Lettres italiennes*, p. 813; noted in footnote 2 in Sarpi, *Opere*, pp. 299–300).

(composed in 1604), discussed in Chapter 2.[150] The second was a short tract written after Bedell returned to England, which is preserved in a single manuscript copy now at the National Library of Ireland. The manuscript does not have a title but might accurately be described as 'A view of religion'.[151] In a prefatory letter, Bedell dedicates the work to Lady Anne Drury (1572–1624), who had apparently requested that Bedell write the work for the edification of a friend of hers who, 'having been brought up in the Roman Superstition [was] desirous to receive better information, if she be in error'.[152] Drury was the daughter of Sir Nicholas Bacon (1540–1624), Baronet, of Redgrave, Suffolk, and the younger sister of Sir Edmund Bacon, who succeeded his father to the baronetcy in 1624. This is the same Sir Edmund who was related to Sir Henry Wotton and who had originally recommended Bedell to him, and the same Lady Anne who received the letter from Thomas Daynes complaining about Bedell's sermon in front of the Bishop of Norwich in 1604.[153] Her grandfather, the Lord Keeper Sir Nicholas Bacon (d. 1579) was the father of Francis Bacon (1561–1626), Anne's uncle. Drury was a noted godly hostess, who welcomed leading puritans to the Bacon family home at Redgrave or to her husband Sir Robert Drury's seat in Hawstead, both in Suffolk. She appears to have had a particularly strong relationship with Bedell's Emmanuel contemporary, Joseph Hall, who had travelled to the Spanish Netherlands as Edmund's companion in 1605. Anne had presented Hall to the living of Hawstead in 1601.[154] Another indication of this close relationship is the fact that Drury had an emblematic painted closet made, the design of which seems to have been influenced by Hall's theological writings, with the aim of creating an object which would encourage piety.[155]

---

[150] See Chapter 2.
[151] William Bedell, [A view of religion], NLI, Dublin, MS 471. The manuscript is unfoliated but consists of 23 fols.
[152] Ibid., [fol. 1r].
[153] See Chapter 2.
[154] R.C. Bald, *Donne and the Drurys* (Cambridge, 1959), p. 50.
[155] For the closet, see H.L. Meakin, *The Painted Closet of Lady Anne Bacon Drury* (Ashgate, 2013). The closet, also known as the Hawstead Panels, can still be viewed today at the Ipswich Museum of Fine Art, Christchurch Manor, Ipswich, Suffolk.

As we shall see, the treatise can be confidently dated to *c*. 1611. It is written in a very neat hand (which is not Bedell's own) with generous spacing. It seems likely, therefore, that this is the copy that was presented to its dedicatee. I have not been able to ascertain the manuscript's exact provenance, but if this scenario is correct it was most probably not taken to Ireland by Bedell. Rather, it would have been given to Lady Anne in Suffolk and only acquired by the National Library of Ireland much later, by virtue of Bedell's later Irish associations. Bedell describes his treatise to Drury as a purposefully short and unadorned work, which he hopes will act as an introduction to broader reading: 'I would that this should serve only in the stead of a table to the more learned & large handling of these questions by others.'[156] Bedell proceeds to describe what he sees as the distinctive (and superior) merits of 'Reformed' or 'true' Christian religion, through comparisons with Judaism, Islam and Roman Catholicism, with the last treated at greatest length. The majority of the text is taken up with a catalogue of doctrines of the Church of Rome which Bedell decries as anti-Christian novelties, followed by a catalogue of Reformed doctrines which adherents to Rome describe as novel, but which Bedell justifies with reference to the early Church.

There is a significant level of overlap between the criticisms which Bedell makes of the Roman Church, and those made in the Italian annotations to Edwin Sandys. For instance, both take particular issue with Rome's insistence that the Scriptures be read, and services conducted, in Latin. Both make the point that Latin was once the vulgate, but is no longer. As Bedell puts it, 'If Hebrewes Greekes ancient Romans might and did reade them in ther tongues, why may not English men reade them in English, or those Italians that now live in Italy as well as ther ancestors.'[157] Similarly, Sarpi writes, 'this Latin language … was used in the early ages of the Latin Church, because it was then the vulgate, and understood and spoken by all in Italy, and in the colonies.'[158] The disapproval of the papacy's stance is palpable in both texts. Bedell highlights this 'Italian faction' (i.e. the Church of Rome) as the only group

[156] Bedell, [View of religion], fol. [1v].
[157] Ibid, fol. [12v].
[158] Sarpi, 'Relatione dello stato', p. 301.

within Christianity, Judaism and Islam which does not exhort its followers 'to the often reading & continued studie of ther lawes'.[159] Other matters on which the two texts agree include their condemnations of excessive ceremonies and worship of the saints for encouraging idolatry, as well as in their criticisms of indulgences, pardons and penances. However, Bedell's manuscript text to Drury is more doctrinally prescriptive than the notes to Sandys, addressing a number of contentious issues which the notes to the Sandys translation do not touch, such as prayers for the dead, purgatory and clerical marriage.

The comparisons which Bedell makes to Judaism and Islam for the most part play an instrumental rule, providing another stick with which to beat the Church of Rome. Perhaps most interesting is Bedell's discussion of why Mohammed cannot be the Antichrist. The question of an Islamic Antichrist had been a significant source of debate for sixteenth-century Protestants. Melanchthon had advocated a 'double Antichrist', which had both a papal and Islamic incarnation, an interpretation also adopted by the authors of the Magdeburg Centuries. Luther, on the other hand, had held back from applying the label of Antichrist to anyone but the Pope, despite his willingness at times to equate the papal and Muslim emphasis on works.[160] Bedell argues against the possibility of an Islamic Antichrist, drawing on the longstanding medieval tradition in which Islam is portrayed as a religion of the sword. While this is certainly not a positive characterisation, it allowed Bedell to conclude that Mohammed was at least an 'open enimy', who came 'without miracles and caries matters rather by might and the dint of a Sword, than lying hypocrisy'.[161] This was important, as hypocrisy was one of the defining features of biblical descriptions of the Antichrist. Bedell cites I Timothy 4, which describes how, 'in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy'.[162] One of the false doctrines cited by Paul is the prohibition of marriage,

---

[159] Bedell, [View of religion], fol. [2r–v].
[160] N. Malcolm, *Useful Enemies: Islam and The Ottoman Empire in Western Political Thought, 1450-1750* (Oxford, 2019), pp. 87–8.
[161] Bedell, [View of religion], fol. [8r].
[162] KJV, 1 Tim. 4:2–3.

and Bedell notes that this could not be a description of Mohammed, who 'commandeth all of both sexes to marry'.[163] More fundamentally, Bedell notes that Mohammed 'doeth deny Christ to be the Sonne of God', and thus makes no claim to belong to the Christian Church. Furthermore, 'his Alcoran is so full of ridiculous toyes, & soe contrary to the Scriptures… that neither Jew nor Christian of understanding can be in perill to be seduced into error thereby'.[164] Mohammed's deceptions are too obvious and too directly opposed to Christianity to qualify as Antichristian.

This comment about the Koran sheds some light on Bedell's sources for his knowledge of 'the Turkes'. Philippe Duplessis-Mornay (1549–1623), a leading French Protestant intellectual sometimes described as 'Le Pape des Huguenots' and a correspondent of both Sarpi and Wotton's, had made a very similar point in his *De la verité de la religion chrétienne* (Antwerp 1581). *De la verité* was a lengthy treatise defending the Christian faith against 'Atheists, Epicures, Paynims, Jewes, Mahumetists, and other Infidels', as the English translation by Sir Philip Sidney and Arthur Golding and published under the title *A Woorke concerning the trewnesse of the Christian Religion* in 1587, puts it. The translation renders Duplessis-Mornay's comments on the Quran as follows,

> What man of discretion would reade [Mohamet's] Alcoran twice, except it were for some greate gayne, or by manifest compulsion, considering the absurdities, toyes, contrarieties, dreames, and frantik deuyces that are in it, besides the wicked things, wherof I wilnot speake?[165]

The use of the same vocabulary ('toyes') in such a similar context suggests that Bedell was influenced by a close reading of this English edition of Duplessis-Mornay. *De veritate* may well have been Bedell's main source for Muslim beliefs, but it is worth noting that he builds on Duplessis-Mornay's account to build a polemic of his own. The Huguenot's text was not particularly concerned with refuting the Church of Rome (at

[163] Bedell, [View of religion], fol. [7v].
[164] Ibid., fols. [7v–8r].
[165] Philippe Duplessis-Mornay, *A Woorke concerning the trewnesse of the Christian Religion* (London, 1587), trans. Philip Sidney and Arthur Golding, p. 625.

least on the surface). Indeed, it was first published in the Habsburg stronghold of Antwerp. Instead, the work was – ostensibly, at least – directed against those entirely outside the Christian tradition, and does not touch on the question of the Antichrist. Bedell, on the other hand, was writing with the specific aim of asserting the superiority of the Reformed religion. Thus, Duplessis-Mornay cites Mohammed's teachings on marriage to criticise what he perceives as the Prophet's incontinence; for Bedell, by contrast, these are cited as proof that Mohammed cannot be the Antichrist, opening the way for further attacks on the papacy.[166] Bedell notes that the Pope, in sharp contrast to Mohammed, advocates abstinence and, more importantly, works from within the structures of the Church. Bedell describes how these pretences are used to gain temporal power for the papacy which it should not possess, by creating 'fabulous' traditions about papal primacy.[167] He emphasises the Pope's insistence on being the final judge in all controversies and considers the Pope guilty of 'rebellion against princes, nay murthering of princes and people'.[168]

The author of the Italian annotations to Sandys's *Relation* does not call the Pope the Antichrist, and nor (unsurprisingly) does Sarpi in any of the works of which he is the named author. However, the annotations do portray the Pope as a malign influence on the Church of Rome for similar reasons as Bedell had done. In particular, he emphasises the Pope's pretences and claims of jurisdiction over temporal rulers. The Pope is held responsible for the corruption of ceremonies and setting up the schools to 'invent some distinctions' to justify such abuses.[169] Papal inventions are driven by a desire of 'absolute rule over all', and to this 'a body of papal laws was made to emulate the imperial laws [i.e. Roman law], which were also amplified with glosses, until they were reduced to terms'.[170] This means – as the annotations go on to explain – that the words can be broken away from the doctrine they are supposed to describe, and their meanings twisted. In the schools, learned men try to develop 'any distinctions' which

[166] Ibid., p. 624.
[167] Bedell, [View of religion], fol. [8v].
[168] Ibid., fol. [22v].
[169] 'inventare qualche distinzione', Sarpi, 'Relatione dello stato', p. 298.
[170] 'imperio assoluto sopra tutti', 'fu fatto un corpo di leggi pontificie ad emulazione delle imperiali, le quali anco fecero amplificare con glose, sin che le han ridotte a' termini', ibid.

might allow them to 'accommodate… the Christian doctrine to the interests' of its corrupters.[171] In the end, however, such distinctions cannot completely erase the traces of true doctrine contained in the words.[172] The Pope of the Italian annotations to Sandys has introduced corruption to the Church of Rome by degrees during the period 700–1300, during which he 'assumed to himself temporal power over kingdoms and principalities'; Bedell in his treatise starts the decline a little earlier, citing disputes over the Pope's titles and jurisdiction in the years 420 and 606 AD.[173]

Whether the word Antichrist is used or not, the Pope is characterised both in the annotations and in Bedell's manuscript treatise as a hypocritical and proud usurper, who works from within the Church to undermine the jurisdiction which rightfully belongs to temporal monarchs. The polemic has a scriptural basis but does not deny that the Church of Rome is a true church. It allows the struggle against the Pope's claims as purely jurisdictional. The imperative to oppose his designs is doctrinal, and doctrinal in a way that might be described as Reformed, going back to the purity of the Scripture before the introduction of usurpations and corruptions. The author of the annotations is more careful not to mention points of Reformed doctrine with a more contested scriptural provenance. This fact, and its ironic tone, is strong evidence for Sarpi's primary authorship. But the extent to which its arguments can be mapped on to Bedell's slightly later text is surely proof of close collaboration in the development of this strong, jurisdictional polemic.

IV

It is highly probable that Bedell wrote this short treatise on Christianity very soon after he returned to England, that is, probably the first half of 1611, and thus that the opinions he expresses in this work are a good reflection of his views in the immediate aftermath of his encounter with Sarpi and Micanzio.[174] The first piece of evidence for

[171] 'qualche distinzione', 'accommodare… la dottrina christiana agl'interressi', ibid.
[172] 'salvasse nondimeno in parole la dottrina antica', ibid.
[173] 's'assunsero potenza temporale sopra i regni e i prencipati', ibid., p. 297; Bedell, [View of religion], fols. [8v–9r].
[174] Bedell was still in Padua but soon to depart on 13 February 1611, when he wrote a letter to Giacomo Castelvetro, the Italian Protestant propagandist who worked closely with the English embassy in Venice

this dating is Bedell's hope, expressed in his dedicatory epistle to his manuscript treatise on true religion, that the work might also serve a second purpose of showing 'to the world that the rumour of my revolt to popery spread abroad in my absence… was forged and scandalous', implying a return from recent travels. The second piece of evidence allows an even more precise dating. Bedell makes disparaging reference to a Catholic polemical work on the Antichrist recently dedicated ('two yeares since') to the Pope

> with this title *Paolo Pontifici Universalis Ecclesiae Occumenia Summo totius orbis Episcopo atque Monarchae et Supremo Vicedeo*. To Paul the first universall high Priest of the universall Church, highest Bishop & monarch of the whole world & Supreame Vice God.[175]

He adds this text was approved by the Inquisition and the author 'is since made Bishop of Caorli'.[176] The text in question must be *Antithesis qua, tam falsum esse, quod Vicarius Dei sit Antichristus, quam falsum est, quod Christus sit Antichristus, demonstratur*, by Benedetto Benedetti, published at Bologna in 1608.[177] Benedetti was appointed Bishop of Caorle in August 1610, allowing us to date Bedell's short treatise on the Reformed religion to the first few months after he returned to England, and most probably the first half of 1611.[178]

---

to distribute Protestant works. See William Bedell to Giacomo Castelvetro, Padua, 13 February 1611, in TNA, SP 85/3, fol. 174r. This letter, as well as Castelvetro's broader role, is discussed by Diego Pirillo in *The Refugee Diplomat*, p. 161.

[175] Bedell, [View of religion], fol. [9r].

[176] Ibid.

[177] Benedetto Benedetti, *Antithesis qua, tam falsum esse, quod Vicarius Dei sit Antichristus, quam falsum est, quod Christus sit Antichristus, demonstratur*, *Contra impii Guilielmi Vuitackeri haeretici Angli Thesin, qua Romanum Pontificem esse illum Antichristum, quem venturum Scriptura paedixit, demonstrare conatur* (Bologna, 1608). The dedication is on the first page of the unpaginated preface, A2r.

[178] The exact date of Bedell's return is unknown, but a letter of Wotton's which was delivered to Sir Edmund Bacon by Bedell on his return to Suffolk is dated 2 April 1611, suggesting that early 1611 is the best estimate. See LPS I, p. 505. Benedetti's work has 1608 on its title page, but Bedell notes that it appeared very late in the year we would call 1608, in the last week of December (see Bedell to Newton, [January 1609], BL, Lansdowne 90, fol. 138v; *Two Biographies*, p. 250, which describes the book as having 'last week… come forth'). For Venetians, 1609 did not begin until 1 March, while the English counted the year from 25 March. Thus in early 1611, the Benedetto's book was still accurately described as published 'two years since'.

Bedell's disgust at the description of the Pope as 'vicedeo' is a recurring preoccupation in his works, and it sheds further light on the doctrinal interests and polemical strategies he shared with Sarpi and Micanzio. In one of his letters to Adam Newton, Bedell traces the use of 'vicedeo' first to an earlier 'proud and blasphemous inscription of Friar Caraffa his Thesis, whereof a Ritratto [i.e. a print] was sent by his Lordship to his Majesty, where the Pope is thus stiled, PAVLO V. VICE DEO'.[179] This was soon followed up, he writes, by a book 'reviveing that blasphemy with advantage, penned by one Benedictus a Venetian, the bayardliest [i.e. stupidest] writer, that ever blotted paper'.[180] Interestingly, the target of Benedetti's pamphlet was an English author: it aimed, in Bedell's words, 'to Refute the position taken by Dr Whitaker, that the Pope is the Antichrist, &c'.[181] The pamphlet in question was the Cambridge Reformed theologian William Whitaker's refutation of Nicholas Sander, published in London in 1583.[182] As Stefano Villani has suggested, the fact that Whitaker's text was the subject of a refutation published in Bologna is almost certainly indicative of Bedell and Wotton's success in disseminating Protestant books in the Veneto in the post-Interdict period.[183] Following the usual strategy of yoking England's cause together with that of other nations, Bedell emphasised, however, that the pamphlet attacked not just the British, but multiple nations, including that of the Venetians themselves.[184]

Bedell makes clear that he had discussed all of these works with the Servites. Bedell was particularly pleased to note that if the Roman numeral letters contained in 'PAVLO V. VICE DEO' were added up, they gave 'the just number of the beast 666'. He noted that he had 'showed it to Fulgenzio [Micanzio]'.[185] He also discussed the work with Sarpi, who told Bedell that he had been involved in 'the consultation, that

---

[179] Bedell to Newton, Venice, [January 1609], BL Lansdowne 90, fol. 138r; *Two Biographies*, p. 250.
[180] Ibid.
[181] Ibid.
[182] William Whitaker, *Ad Nicolai Sanderi demonstrationes quadraginta, in octauo libro visibilis Monarchiæ positas, quibus Romanum Pontificem non esse Antichristum docere instituit, responsio Guilielmi Whitakeri ... Accessit eiusdem Thesis de Antichristo, defensa in comitijs Cantabrigiensibus* (London, 1583).
[183] Villani, 'Uno scisma', p. 80.
[184] Bedell to Newton, [January 1609], *Two Biographies*, p. 250. He cites Benedetti, *Antithesis*, p. 50 to illustrate his point.
[185] Ibid. V [5] + L [50] + V [5] + V [5] +I [1] +C [100] + D [500] = DCLXVI [666].

was here about the calling it in' where 'Maestro Paolo, as he told me [Bedell], resisted it'. The phrasing is a little ambiguous, but seems to suggest that Sarpi argued against preventing the circulation of the work, and was seemingly agreed with Bedell's belief that the Benedetti's text was helpful to the anti-papal cause, as it fell 'into such errors, as are proper to show madness [of the papalists] to the world'.[186] Though the book was not, in the end, called in, it was 'not suffered to be sold openly'.[187]

Nonetheless, both Bedell and Sarpi were keen to spread news of these pamphlets to as wide a circle of contacts as possible. We have already seen that Bedell mentioned both the engraved print accompanying Caraffa's text, and Benedetti's text to Adam Newton.[188] He adds that 'his Lordship', meaning Wotton, had sent a copy of the print to the King.[189] This print offers a curious case study in the way in which information on the Pope's jurisdictional transgressions spread around Europe. Copies of prints closely matching Bedell's description are held in the image collections of both the British Museum in London and the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam. However, the British Museum's copy, donated in 1872 (by James Hughes Anderdon), is definitely not that sent from Venice to England in 1609: as the additions in French at the top and bottom make clear, this copy is a later French reprint (and most likely a full re-engraving). In fact – as we shall see – this version was produced in Saumur, under the auspices of the (so-called) 'Pope of the Huguenots', Philippe Duplessis-Mornay, for inclusion in his anti-papal book *Le Mystère d'iniquité* (1611), and identical copies of the same engraving can be found in other examples of the same work, in both its French and Latin editions.[190] The provenance of the Rijksmuseum copy is less clear. It is also unlikely to be either the original Italian print or the copy sent to London, because the anti-papal notes in Latin above and below the image are exact translations of those seen in the French copy attached to Duplessis-Mornay's work (though possibly these words

[186] Ibid. For Sarpi's own statement of his stance, see below.
[187] Ibid.
[188] Ibid.
[189] Ibid.
[190] British Museum, London, Pope Paul V, BM 1872,0511.1276. See below for this image and for further discussion of Duplessis-Mornay's role.

– which may be handwritten – were only added later).[191] What is certain is the fact it did not come from one of the copies of Duplessis-Mornay's *Mysterium Iniquitatis*. While the British Museum copy exactly matches those found in Duplessis-Mornay's books, which were surely all printed from the same copperplate, the details of the Rijksmuseum image differ, suggesting that one of these versions was a careful (but, nonetheless, independent) copy of the other.[192] While I have not been able to ascertain the exact relationship between the Rijksmuseum version and the engravings produced under the auspices of Duplessis-Mornay, it is clear that this image of the Pope enjoyed particular popularity in Protestant Europe.

Bedell continued to return to these texts as particularly egregious examples of the dangers on papal power in his later writings. The mention of Benedetti's text in the manuscript dedicated to Drury in around 1611 is one example, in which Bedell adds the new detail that Benedetti has since been appointed Bishop of Caorle.[193] Another mention can be found in the longest and most substantial of the letters that makes up *The Copies of Certaine Letters* from Bedell to his Emmanuel contemporary, turned Catholic convert, James Wadsworth, sent on 22 October 1620 but not published until 1624.[194] This letter to Wadsworth is 123 pages long and divided into twelve chapters,

---

[191] Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, Allegorie op Paulus V als beschermheer van de missie, RP-P-1999-116. See image below. The print bears the collector's mark of Franz Josef von Enzenberg, who had a large collection of engravings, sold at Vienna in 1879. See Lugt 845, in F. Lugt, *Les Marques de Collections de Dessins & d'Estampes* (Amsterdam, 1921), via Fondation Custodia's updated online edition, [http://www.marquesdecollections.fr/?CFID=179852326&CFTOKEN=7adb9582c86a7fac-BA55B7CB-A708-4BA5-4D10AF2A7FEFDEB9]. The provenance before and after Enzenberg is uncertain; the Rijksmuseum only purchased the print in 1999.

[192] This conclusion is drawn from a close comparison of the Rijksmuseum copy, the British Museum copy, and the version included in Emmanuel College Library's copy of Philippe Duplessis-Mornay, *Mysterium iniquitatis seu, Historia papatus. Quibus gradibus ad id fastigii enisus sit, quamque acriter omni tempore ubique a piis contra intercessum. Asseruntur etiam jura Imperatorum, Regum, & Principium Christianorum adversus Bellarminum & Baronium Cardinales* (Saumur, 1611), shelf mark 309.1.49. While the copies taken from the works of Duplessis-Mornay (BM and Emmanuel) are identical images, the Rijksmuseum's copy differs in detail: the contrast can be seen particularly clearly in the faces of the figures, which vary substantially between the two versions. The only difference between the Emmanuel copy and the BM copy is that the BM copy features surrounding text in French explaining the engraving's supposed provenance; the Emmanuel copy has only a blank border, with no text in either French or Latin.

[193] Bedell, [A view of religion], [f. 9r].

[194] William Bedell, *The Copies of Certaine Letters which have passed between Spaine and England in matter of Religion* (London, 1624). For the date this letter-cum-treatise was sent, see p. 37.

and is thus more an epistolary treatise than a familiar letter. In Chapter IV, Bedell gives an even more detailed description of the print prefixed to Caraffa's work, describing the image in detail, down to its Latin inscriptions. He described how it was affixed to a thousand theses printed by Caraffa to be debated in Rome and Naples: five hundred on scientific, and five hundred on theological questions.[195] He notes that one thesis in the latter category was that 'only Peter and his successors have unlimited jurisdiction in the whole Church'.[196] In particular, Bedell highlights the way that the print places the Pope's portrait between two columns:

> On either side of these colums were depending Crownes and Scepters, wherof sixe were on the right hand after the Christian fashion. The imperial above, other underneath, and lowest the Corno of the Duke of Venice, so they call a certaine Cap the Prince useth to weare being of Gold Embroderie, and somewhat resembling a horne. There were also Turkish Turbanes, and Diadems of divers fashions, as many on the left side.[197]

[195] I have not been able to trace Caraffa's *Theses*. Caraffa's full name is given by Bedell and Sarpi as Thomas Maria Caraffa and the *Theses* are variously said to have been printed in Naples or Rome in 1608 or 1609. As discussed below, it is probable that the text was supressed by the Papacy, which may explain why it does not survive. Dompnier and Viallon suggest that the work referred to is *Poetiche dicerie divise in vaghissime descrittioni, & discorsi accademici* (Naples, 1636, 4th edn), by the Dominican Tommaso Carafa (d. 1614). See B. Dompnier and M. Viallon, *L'Habit religieux du penseur politique: Une biographie de Paolo Sarpi* (Paris, 2019), p. 1143. While Carafa seems a plausible candidate for authorship, this work is not a convincing match for Bedell's description. The first printed edition of it of which I am aware was printed at Messina in 1627 (USTC 4003857). More fundamentally, the editions I have seen contain only nine *discorsi accademici*, far short of the 1000 cited by Bedell, and none dealing with papal jurisdiction. However, I have not been able to view the particular Neapolitan edition Dompnier and Viallon cite to see if this provides contains any further evidence (e.g. a version of the engraving).

[196] 'solus Petrus & successores in totam ecclesiam illimitatam jurisdictionem habent', Bedell, *Copies of Certaine Letters*, p. 77.

[197] Ibid., p. 78.

Redacted for copyright reasons. Fig. 1 - The British Museum's copy of the engraving of Pope Paul V. Copyright: The British Museum

Redacted for copyright reasons. Fig. 2 - The Rijksmuseum's copy of the engraving of Pope Paul V. Copyright: Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

Bedell also highlights the use of *vicedeo* in the inscription and goes on to describe the reception of the print in Venice, noting that copies 'did the more amuse men at Venice because of the controversie that state had with the Pope a little before, and the seeing their Dukes Corno hanged up among his Trophees.' He reports that, 'The next day it was noised about the Citie, that this was the picture of the Antichrist; for that the inscription … contayned exactly in the numerall Letters the number of the beast in the Revelation 666.' This constituted an 'anger and shame … to the Popish faction', but as Bedell notes rather smugly, 'whom could they blame, but themselves, who had suffered so presumptuous and shameless a flatterie to come forth … as unawares to them by the

providence of God, should so plainly characterize the Antichrist?'[198] Bedell does not, in this account, claim the discovery of the number 666 as his own (as he had implied in his earlier letter to Newton), perhaps through modesty, perhaps through a desire to present his own judgment on the print as the judgment of the broader Venetian population. Nonetheless, Bedell's excitement at having happened upon such as clear sign that the Pope was the Antichrist is palpable.

Sarpi too mentions the print attached to Caraffa's *Theses* and the use of *vicedeo* in his correspondence. In a letter of 8 July 1608, Sarpi sent his own description of the print to the Huguenot Jérôme Groslot de L'Isle:

> [Caraffa] placed at the beginning [of his work] a copper-printed portrait of the Pope, with various shields and mottos from the Holy Scripture… At the sides hang two trophies. To the right-hand trophy is tied an imperial crown, and underneath two royal crowns, and lower down two others without crests, and finally the corno of the Doge of Venice, with many sceptres in various parts of the trophy: on the left side, the other trophy contains Turkish and Persian turbans, and some other oriental caps, and finally the hat of the Muscovite, with scimitars and other signs of these princes, with an inscription under the portrait, which contains these words, formally written: *Paulo V, Vice-Deo, Reipublicae christianae Monarchae invictissimo, pontificiae omnipotentiae conservatori acerrimo*.[199]

Although Sarpi did not send Groslot news of Bedell's observations about the number 666, he clearly shared Bedell's sustained fascination (and disgust) with the text. Sarpi sent a copy to the portrait to another of his correspondents, Fransceso Castrino, an Italian-born Huguenot living in Paris, along with a letter of 17 February 1609, explaining that this was the portrait and a few pages of text only, because the correspondent who had sent it to Sarpi from Rome had not thought it worth sending the

---

[198] Ibid., p. 79.

[199] 'nel principio ha posto un ritratto di esso pontifice in stampa di rame, con diverse imprese e motti della divina Scrittura… dalle parti pendono duoi trofei. Dalla destra, il trofeo ha legata una corona imperiale, e disotto due regie, e più basso due altre senza cimiero, e infine il corno del duce veneto, con molti scettri in diverse parti del trofeo: dalla parte sinistra, l'altro trofeo contiene li turbanti turchesco e persiano, e alcune altre berrette all' orientale, e nel fine il cappello del moscovita con scimitarre e altre insegne di quei principi, con una inscrizione sotto il ritratto, la quale contiene formalmente queste parole: *Paulo V, Vice-Deo, Reipublicae christianae Monarchae invictissimo, pontificiae omnipotentiae conservatori acerrimo*', Sarpi to Groslot de L'Isle, Venice, 8 July 1608, *Lettres italiennes,* pp. 206–7.

rest of the work, which was 'a great mass but all straw'.[200] A few months later, responding to Groslot's request for a copy of the image, Sarpi promised to do his best to find another to send, but explained that they were hard to come by.[201] On the 30 July 1608, Pierre de L'Estoile, the noted French book collector and diarist of Gallican sympathies, records being shown a copy of a short 'Advis' (news sheet) describing the print dated 8 July, which had apparently been sent from Rome, but which sounds very much like Sarpi's description to Groslot being circulated more widely.[202] L'Estoile was later shown a copy of the work itself, belonging to Jacques Gillot, another of Sarpi's correspondents, and reported that the Pope himself was said to have had the work suppressed 'from shame or from fear that it would make the heretics laugh'.[203] This would offer some explanation for the lack of surviving copies of the *Theses* in an Italian edition. It is also worth noting the possibility that Caraffa's *Theses* were a forgery, printed with the sole intention of demonstrating the Pope's extravagance; in this case, they may not have been printed in Rome at all. However, this seems unlikely. News of the print certainly seems to have passed from Rome to Venice and from Italy to France rather than vice versa. Whether or not it was genuine, the print certainly encouraged criticism. L'Estoile adds that another of Sarpi's Gallican correspondents, the historian Jacques Auguste de Thou commented, on seeing the print, 'What can one say of all this, except that this is "the Antichrist"?'[204]

Duplessis-Mornay, another of Sarpi's correspondents, also learnt of, and was evidently struck by, this frontispiece. In 1611, he published a work on the theme of the papal Antichrist, entitled *Le Mystère d'iniquité*. This work was a substantial statement of the case against the Pope and was aimed at an international audience. At the same time as its publication in French, he also published a Latin translation (*Mysterium*

---

[200] 'una gran mole ma tutta paglia', Sarpi to Castrino, Venice, 17 February 1609, *Lettres italiennes,* p. 333.
[201] Sarpi to Groslot de L'Isle, Venice, 28 April 1609, *Lettres italiennes,* p. 383.
[202] 30 July 1608, Pierre de L'Estoile, *Mémoires-journaux: 1574-1611* IX (Paris, 1982), ed. G. Brunet, p. 109. For L'Estoile's interest in Venice, see T. Hamilton, *Pierre de L'Estoile and his World in the Wars of Religion* (Oxford, 2017), pp. 184–6. Dompnier and Viallon discuss Sarpi's interest in Caraffa's text, and its reception in Paris, but not Bedell's parallel interest, in *L'Habit religieux*, pp. 284–6.
[203] 'ou a eu honte ou a eu peur qu'ils n'apprestassent à rire aux Hérétiques', 17 November 1608, L'Estoile, *Mémoires-journaux* IX, p. 163.
[204] 'Que voudriez-vous dire de tout cela, sinon que c'est "l'Antechrist"?', ibid.

iniquitatis).[205] In some, though not all, impressions of the work, Mornay's book includes a fold-out engraving, placed immediately after the frontispiece, of an image of the Pope exactly like that described by Sarpi and Bedell.[206] A copy of the *Le Mystère d'iniquité* is therefore the source of the British Museum's print, with its French additions. Duplessis-Mornay goes on to discuss the print in a prefatory 'letter to men of the Church of Rome' ('A messieurs de l'eglise Romaine), noting that Caraffa's *Theses*, and other texts like it, prove that 'The sceptres and diadems of Princes, Kings and Emperors are like trophies to him [the Pope].'[207] Duplessis-Mornay seems to have procured one of the rare copies of the engraving, after a dedicated search, and decided to distribute it to a broader audience by having it re-engraved.[208] Whether he finally succeeded in this task by receiving a copy sent direct from Italy or via a Parisian contact, it is probable that Sarpi's efforts to send descriptions and copies of the text to France played a role.

Duplessis-Mornay's French edition had been dedicated to the recently crowned Louis XIII, but the Latin edition was instead addressed to James VI & I of England. In his short Latin preface, Duplessis-Mornay expressed his admiration for the war James had been waging on the papacy 'by means of the pen', and his hopes that this might be

---

[205] Philippe Duplessis-Mornay, *Mysterium iniquitatis* (Saumur, 1611).

[206] It was certainly included in the 1611 Latin and French Saumur editions, and a version of it was reprinted in at least some copies of the 1612 French edition printed without a place (but probably also in Saumur); though it was not included in the 1612 Genevan edition. I have not yet been able to systematically check other editions, and it is hard to tell from online copies, especially given the possibility that the print may have become separated from the text (as with the British Museum's copy). See Duplessis-Mornay, *Mysterium iniquitatis* (Saumur, 1611); Philippe Duplessis-Mornay*, Le Mystère d'iniquité: c'est à dire l'histoire de la papauté, par quels progrez elle est montée à ce comble & quelles oppositions les gens de bien lui ont faict de temps en temps. Ou sont aussi defendus les Droicts des Empereurs Rois & Princes Chrestiens, contre les Assertions des Cardinaux Bellarmin & Baronius* (Saumur, 1611); and Philippe Duplessis-Mornay*, Mystère d'iniquité: c'est à dire l'histoire de la papauté, par quels progrez elle est montée à ce comble & quelles oppositions les gens de bien lui ont faict de temps en temps. Ou sont aussi defendus les Droicts des Empereurs Rois & Princes Chrestiens, contre les Assertions des Cardinaux Bellarmin & Baronius* ([Saumur], 1612). For discussion of the inclusion of the print in Duplessis–Mornay's text, see Ulianich, 'Considerazioni e documenti per una ecclesiologia di Paolo Sarpi', pp. 443–4; Dompnier and Viallon, *L'Habit religieux*, p. 185; and Viallon, *Lettres italienes,* p. 206, note 193.

[207] 'Les sceptres & les diadems des Princes, des Rois, des Empereurs lui sont pour Trophée', Duplessis-Mornay*, Mystère d'iniquité* (Saumur, 1611), p. 12.

[208] On 17 September 1608, L'Estoile reports that Duplessis-Mornay was searching for a copy (as L'Estoile was himself), see L'Estoile, *Mémoires-journaux* IX, p. 131.

continued 'by means of the sword'.[209] The text appears to have garnered immediate interest in England. Bedell's cousin, Joseph Alliston, donated a copy of this Latin edition (including a copy of the portrait of Paul V) to Emmanuel College Library in 1611, the year of its publication.[210] In 1612, Samson Lennard published an English translation entitled *The mysterie of iniquitie*. He dedicated his text to Henry, Prince of Wales in a forthright, anti-papal preface.[211] Adapting Duplessis-Mornay's sentiments, Lennard writes to Henry that James's 'pen hath made way for your sword', stating that he wished 'with du Plessis, that I may live to march over the Alpes, and to trayle a pike before the walls of Rome, under your Highnesse Standard'.[212] Lennard had previously produced a translation of Pierre Charron's *Of Wisdome* (1608), which he had also dedicated to Henry, and he had presumably been encouraged enough by the reception of that earlier work to seek the Prince's patronage again.[213] Lennard also included a second (shorter) dedicatory epistle to 'George [Abbot] Archbishop of Canterburie and Metropolitan of England: and John [King] Bishop of London', both clergymen noted for their commitment to the cause of pan-European Reform.[214] Whether Lennard had any real intimacy with Henry's household is unclear. His edition does not contain a copy of the print of Paul V on his throne, but he does add to Duplessis-Mornay's discussion of Caraffa a brief note 'To the Reader', which contains the observation about the number 666:

> Pope Paule the fift caused himselfe to be pourtrayed in the first page of divers Bookes dedicated unto him, printed at Rome and at Bolognia; as hath beene sayd in the Preface: The first words of the Latine inscription are, PAVLO V.

---

[209] 'calumo' and 'gladio', ibid., sig. A1r.
[210] See dedicatory note 'Collegio Em[m]anuelis Dedit Josephus Alliston eiusdem Coll: Socius. Anno D[omi]ni 1611', in Duplessis-Mornay, *Mysterium iniquitatis* (Saumur, 1611), Emmanuel College Library, shelf mark 309.1.49, flyleaf. For Alliston, see above, p. 93 and below, pp. 173–4.
[211] Philippe Duplessis-Mornay*, The mysterie of iniquitie: that is to say, The historie of the papacie Declaring by what degrees it is now mounted to this height, and what oppositions the better sort from time to time have made against it. Where is also defended the right of emperours, kings, and Christian princes, against the assertions of the cardinals, Bellarmine and Baronius*, (London, 1612), trans. Samson Lennard.
[212] Ibid., sig. A1r–v.
[213] Pierre Charron, *Of Wisdome Three Bookes* ([London], [1608]), trans. Samson Lennard.
[214] Duplessis-Mornay*, The mysterie of iniquitie,* trans. Samson Lennard, sig. A2r.

> VICEDEO; take the numerall letters and you shall find the number of the Beast, Apocal. c. 13. v. 18.[215]

Lennard includes a diagram to illustrate the point (see fig. 3). Though it seems most likely that Lennard got this information from another edition of Duplessis-Mornay's book which contained the full print, he could also have learnt this information from Adam Newton, the recipient of Bedell's letter mentioning his observation. The particular Reformed coterie around Prince Henry will be discussed at greater length in the next chapter, but the key point here is that information from Bedell's travels in Venice had – by one means or another – reached Lennard and was being used to bring the Prince's attention to the evils of popery. The account in Bedell's letter to Newton had left a lasting footprint in English and European religious polemic. Indeed, Caraffa and Benedetti's pamphlets continued to be cited in later works, including Richard Baxter's *The successive visibility of the church* (London, 1660).[216]

---

[215] Ibid., sig. A6v.

[216] Richard Baxter, *The successive visibility of the church of which the Protestants are the soundest members I. defended against the opposition of Mr. William Johnson, II. proved by many arguments* (London, 1660), p. 181. See also Michel Le Vassor, *The History of the reign of Lewis the XIIIth* Vol. I (London, 1701), p. 164; Erasmus Middleton, *Biographia Evangelica Or, An Historical Account Of The Lives And Deaths Of the Most Eminent and Evangelical Authors, Or Preachers, Both British And Foreign, In The Several Denominations Of Protestants, From the Beginning of the Reformation, to the Present Time* Vol. II (London, 1780), p. 440

Redacted for copyright reasons. Lennard's diagram, in Duplessis-Mornay, The mysterie of iniquitie, trans. Samson Lennard, sig. A6v. Copyright: Early English Books Online

Bedell, in turn, was aware that Duplessis-Mornay had mentioned Caraffa in his *Mystère d'iniquité*. He mentions the Huguenot's work in his discussion of the text in the letter to Wadsworth, writing that 'the matter [of Pope being given the title *vicedeo*] being come to the knowledge of the Protestants in France, and England, made them talke and write of it broadly, namely the Lord Plessis, in his *Mysterium iniquitatis*'.[217] The networks of advocates of Reform in England, France and Venice were closely interlocked; Bedell may well have been aware that it was through Sarpi's correspondence that the French Protestants came to know of the work. Bedell could see the ripples spreading out from Venice to a wider European audience.

[217] Bedell, *Copies of Certaine Letters*, p. 81.

Bedell was also interested in – and seems to have had access to some information relating to – Rome's response to the backlash. He first describes the immediate response in Venice, which he claimed came in the form of the publication of a pamphlet which 'pretended to have been written at Rome, An. 1592, by the Rever. D. Valentinus Granarensis touching the birth of Antichrist'.[218] The pamphlet in question was Tiberio Valentini's *Nascimento di antichristo*, a work which appears to have originally been printed at Fano and Venice, rather than Rome, in 1592, and claimed that the Antichrist had been born in Babylon, had performed many false miracles and was now headed for Christendom with an army.[219] Bedell was convinced that this was an effort to popularise an alternative narrative about identity of the antichrist to distract from the Pope's embarrassment. A new edition was certainly printed in Venice in 1609.[220] Bedell notes, however, that the use of the term *vicedeo* did not stop, but was swiftly repeated by Benedetti. Once the news had reached France, Bedell reports that

> this gave occasion to the Cardinall Gieurè, to relate in the Officio Santo at Rome of the scandall taken hereat, and to make a motion, *De moderandis titulis*. It was on foot sundrie months. At last the Pope revoking it to himselfe, blamed those that had spoken against these Titles, and said, they were no whit greater then the authoritie of S. Peters Successor did beare.[221]

Bedell's sources are unclear, and his depiction of events in Rome is probably exaggerated. It does, however, tie in with Pierre de L'Estoile's reports of papal efforts to suppress the text.[222] It is certainly true that the pamphlets which had outraged Bedell, Sarpi and Micanzio in Venice went on to provoke further reactions in France, England and Rome. In large part, this was a result of the Venetians' circulation of them.

---

[218] Bedell, *Copies of Certaine Letters*, p. 79.
[219] Tiberio Valentini, *Nascimento di antichristo, sua stirpe, progenie, patria, habitatione, podesta, maraviglie, vita, & morte* (Fano, 1592; Venice, 1592). The Venetian edition is held at Venice, Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia, Class Mark: PIANO I H 2190.
[220] Tiberio Valentini, *Copia di una lettera nella quale si descrive il nascimento di Antichristo. Sua stirpe, progenie, patria, habitatione, potesta, maraviglie, vita, & morte* (Venice, 1609). There is a copy of this in the BMV, Class Mark: MISC 2636. 046.
[221] Bedell, *Copies of Certaine Letters*, p. 81.
[222] See above.

V

The networks of the anti-papal European alliance were complex, and exact manifestations of anti-papal feeling varied from place to place. But members of these networks recognised each other as allies, seeming to view themselves as part of an association which crossed borders. Inspiration for the cause of Reform was drawn from a variety of sources across Europe. Though Sarpi and Micanzio avoided using the language of the Antichrist (at least publicly), the characteristics of papal power which they criticised were for the most part exactly the same as those adopted by Bedell in describing his papal Antichrist. The anti-papal alliance formed by these men was no figment of Bedell's imagination: it seems Sarpi was sincerely interested in what Bedell had to say and drew on information from Bedell when writing to his wider network of correspondents.

The evidence for closeness of Bedell and the Servites is piecemeal, but once the disparate threads of evidence are drawn together, a picture emerges of a relationship that was very close indeed. Despite the covert nature of these interactions, a paper-trail attests to a deep intellectual exchange. Comparing the Italian annotations to Edwin Sandys's *Relation of the State of Religion* with the manuscript 'View of Religion' Bedell wrote on his return to Suffolk brings this out with particular clarity. The overlap between the themes explored in these works, and with Micanzio's surviving sermon notes adds to the impression of a close collaboration, as do Sarpi and Micanzio's engagements with the works of the Oath of Allegiance controversy, and particularly the contribution of William Barclay. Sarpi's disagreements with Barclay throw his fundamental areas of agreement with Bedell and the English into stark relief, and though Sarpi did not always agree with James VI & I's tactics, I have argued that he agreed with James's ecclesiological arguments. Smaller scraps of evidence also reinforce this interpretation, including Micanzio's holograph notes on the events surrounding the Gunpowder plot, Doge Leonardo Donà's copies of works by James and his chief minister Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury, and the similar material found amongst the papers of the Italian Protestant exile Giacomo Castelvetro. Finally, the

similar and interconnected responses of Sarpi and Bedell to the depiction of the Pope as 'vicedeo' suggests that the two men did indeed discuss the works of Caraffa and Benedetti, and agreed that spreading news of these works to their respective networks of correspondents would help the anti-papal cause.

Questions remain about how far Sarpi and Micanzio's sympathies for the Reformed religion went. Certainly, they thought that the Church of Rome should be reformed in a number of ways, even if this might not have matched on to the dictates of 'Reform' as advocated by many followers of that tradition. However, there were substantial overlaps between their concerns and those of William Bedell. Sarpi and Micanzio belong to a sceptical tradition in a way that Bedell did not. But it turns out that this could complement Bedell's emphasis on a strictly scriptural Christianity, in which matters such as ceremonies were safely confined to being things indifferent.

The interactions between Sarpi, Bedell and Micanzio in 1607–10 thus inspired a range of polemical works, some written jointly, some individually; it is telling that in cases such as the annotations to Sandys, authorship is hard to definitively determine. But all these works share certain preoccupations. Foremost amongst these is a conviction that all the temporal jurisdiction claimed by the papacy is usurped from the temporal monarch. The true Church for all three men is a purely spiritual entity. It can be supported by a visible, earthly Church, but that Church would not have jurisdiction or coercive power in its own right; these powers would be delegated from the Prince – whether that prince was a monarch, or an aristocratic council. The visible Church should be nestled within the structures of the state. Thus, it was the Prince, rather than theologians, who should rule on matters indifferent, such as Church discipline, and who had the ultimate say over the use of Church property. This vision of Royal (or perhaps better 'Princely') Supremacy had powerful appeal in both England and Venice. It defused with especial effectiveness the threat of Cardinal Bellarmine's authoritative theory of papal deposing power and united each Christian polity under a single supreme temporal ruler.

Chapter 4: Influence at the English Court

During their time in Venice, Henry Wotton and William Bedell were in close contact with a wider network of individuals back in England who had a deep interest in Venetian affairs. As was the usual practice for diplomats, Wotton stayed in close contact both the King and with his Secretary of State, the Earl of Salisbury. More unexpectedly, it is clear that there was also a concerted effort to keep the young Prince Henry (1594–1612) informed about developments in Venice. This chapter will discuss some of the ways in which a broader circle of people helped with the diffusion of Venetian anti-papal polemic, and how they brought these ideas to bear at Court.

The defences of Venice penned during the Interdict proved useful to different groups in different ways. Filippo de Vivo, in particular, has traced how the Catholic Earl of Northampton drew on Venetian arguments to emphasise the compatibility of Catholicism with loyalty to the state.[1] This chapter will focus on a different group at the Jacobean court, the Reformed conformists. The fact that Bedell and Wotton attempted to deploy Venetian writings to gain authority for the Reformed cause in England, and that this task was later taken up by others, including the new Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbott, has been well known since the work of Gaetano Cozzi. However, I will suggest here that events in Venice also had particular resonance for a broader group of English Reformed conformists than has previously been appreciated. This wider Reformed conformist network worked to pursue a distinctive political and ecclesiological agenda by bringing their influence to bear both on James's polemical efforts and on the education of the young Prince Henry.

I

As Aysha Pollnitz has noted, the circles around Prince Henry were dominated by Reformed conformists. This was a conscious decision by James, and represented the

[1] F. de Vivo, 'Francia e Inghilterra di fronte all'Interdetto di Venezia', in *Paolo Sarpi: Politique et religion en Europe*, ed. M. Viallon (Paris, 2010), pp. 185–8.

King's attempt to put the principles of his *Basilikon Doron* into practice in Henry's English schooling.[2] While James had complained in that text about 'Puritaines' with a disdain equal to that which he had expressed for Catholics, his objections were rooted in his conviction that both groups offered dangerous defences of the right to depose a King. The King did not, therefore, object to individuals who held Reformed or Scottish Presbyterian sympathies, so long as they respected the Royal Supremacy. Adam Newton (d. 1630), the man James chose as Henry's tutor while still only King of Scotland, represented just this fusion: despite his sympathies with certain aspects of Presbyterianism, he was a staunch supporter of James's royal powers.[3] Indeed, during James's early Scottish rule, and the first decade of his rule in England, Reformed conformists were often the most vociferous defenders of the royal supremacy against papal attack, an affinity clarified by the revelation of the Gunpowder Plot.[4]

Salisbury and the Prince's tutor, Adam Newton, appear to have worked together to encourage the Prince to become a godly champion of the Reformed cause in Europe. Thus, amongst the papers of Sir Michael Hickes (1543–1612), Salisbury's secretary and a man who had developed strong Reformed sympathies at Trinity College, Cambridge, in the 1560s, we find a letter from the earl to Newton from 1607 in which the former had enclosed 'a malicious libel … written by Persons the Jesuitt'. Salisbury expresses his belief that upon reading the tract, the Prince 'shall find so little left to Monarchy by these Catholick distinctions as he will never beleave that any Prince is other than a servant, if that doctrine be mayntayned'.[5] Bedell's letters to Newton about the religious situation in Venice (discussed in the previous chapter) are preserved in the same set of papers, as is a letter from Henry Wotton to Sir David Murray, one of Henry's Gentleman of the Bedchamber, giving him and Newton a gift of the 'very best' Venetian treacle, a concoction thought to have medicinal properties, 'made purposely

---

[2] A. Pollnitz, *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 324–8.
[3] Ibid., p. 326.
[4] Ibid., pp. 327–8.
[5] A.G.R. Smith, 'Hickes, Sir Michael (1543–1612)', ODNB; Salisbury to Adam Newton, Kensington, 24 August 1607, BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 61. It is not clear to which of Robert Persons's works Salisbury is referring; it may be [Robert Persons], *A treatise tending to mitigation towardes Catholike-subjectes in England* ([Saint-Omer], 1607).

with Balsam instead of the oyle of Nutmeggs which is the baser ingredient commonly taken to save charges'.[6]

In his letter to Murray, Wotton requested that the Prince talk to the Venetian Ambassador, about the cases of a particular prisoner in Venice Wotton hoped to see released.[7] Wotton made a sustained effort to cultivate relations with the Prince, and to interest him in Venice. In January 1608 Wotton sent Henry a New Year's gift, and took the excuse of a report that Henry had liked the gift to write again in April of the same year.[8] In this letter, discussion is more political, with Wotton stating that he had told the Venetian Senate of Henry's interest in their affairs, and sending news that about recent marriages in the houses of Savoy and Tuscany. Already, there are signs of Wotton looking ahead to Henry's future as a monarch, with light-hearted talk of Henry's own nuptials. After talking of other princely marriages, Wotton adds, 'Fear not, Sir, There will be left for you a good wife I warrant you and whatsoever she be she shall be glad of it.'[9] Wotton himself had hopes that a Savoyard match might be found for Henry, which might bring Savoy – a Catholic Dukedom, but one with concerns about Spanish hegemony – into an anti-papal and anti-Spanish alliance.[10] On 1/11 August 1608, a letter was sent by Doge Leonardo Donà to Henry, introducing the new ambassador from Venice, Marc' Antonio Correr and, concurrently, Wotton wrote specifically introducing Correr's son to him, with a description of Venice's leading families.[11] Later, Wotton would also introduce his own nephew Albert Morton to Henry by means of a letter, while another letter from the Doge to Henry introducing ambassador extraordinary Francesco Contarini was sent to Henry in 1609.[12] As Wotton's habit of sending gifts might suggest, Wotton was keen to exploit his

---

[6] Bedell to Adam Newton, Venice, 1/11 January 1608 and [January 1609], BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fols. 106r–110v and 133r–8v; Wotton to Sir David Murray, 14/24 April 1608, BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fols. 139r–40r. Quote at fol. 139r.
[7] Wotton to Murray, 14/24 April 1608, BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fols. 139v–40r.
[8] Wotton to Prince Henry, Venice, 1/11 January 1608, BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 179r.
[9] Wotton to Prince Henry, Venice, 14/24 April 1608, BL, Harl. MS 7007, fol. 185r–v.
[10] See R. Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (New York, 1986), pp. 59–88.
[11] Leonardo Donà to Prince Henry, Venice, 1/11 August 1608, TCC, MS R.10.9, insert in front pocket; Wotton to Prince Henry, Venice, 1[/11?] August 1608, BL, Harl. MS 7007, fol. 202r–v.
[12] Wotton to Prince Henry, Venice, 12/22 July 1609, BL, Harl. MS 7007, fol. 271r; Leonardo Donà to Prince Henry, Venice, 25 September/5 October 1609, TCC, MS R.10.9, insert in front pocket.

privileged access to the art and culture of Venice to gain political leverage. Offering Venetian art offered particularly valuable opportunities for this (which Dudley Carleton too would later benefit from). In 1610, Wotton helped Henry procure a large shipment of Venetian art, consisting of probably around 20 paintings.[13] The close attention Wotton paid to Prince Henry appears to have paid off. At the death of Salisbury in 1612, Henry was reportedly a strong supporter of Wotton's (ultimately fruitless) hopes to succeed him as Secretary of State.[14]

Wotton and other members of the Anglo-Venetian network had looked to Henry as a future monarch who would be even more sympathetic to their diagnosis of European politics than James. It is possible to overstate the extent to which Prince Henry became the focus of a 'reversionary interest' in the years 1607–12. By the time of his death, Henry's household had become 'a semi-independent power base', but to say, with Kevin Sharpe, that it 'drew critics of the king' pushes the point little too far.[15] At this stage, James's policy was still generally to the liking of the firmly anti-papalist and anti-Spanish Venetian Connection, who, as we shall see, occupied important positions at James's Court, at the same time looking to his successor. Nonetheless, there was certainly a concerted effort to plan ahead, to ensure that Henry would continue and build on James's efforts to carve out a place for the King of England as Europe's leading exponent of a certain vision of Reformed politics. In later life, as Provost of Eton, Wotton started (but never finished) writing a short treatise on education.[16] It is clear that he, and others in his circles, thought particularly carefully about the purposes of princely education, taking seriously the humanist commonplace that princely education

---

[13] For these interactions, see R. Hill, 'Art and Patronage: Sir Henry Wotton and the Venetian Embassy 1604–1624', in *Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, 2011), eds. M. Keblusek and B.V. Noldus, pp. 32–7.

[14] Queen Anne was also reportedly a supporter of Wotton. See Chamberlain to Carleton, London, 27 May 1612 and 17 June 1612, in N.E. McClure (ed.), *The Letters of John Chamberlain* I (Philadelphia PA, 1939), pp. 350–2 and pp. 356–60. For Henry's support for Wotton and the frustration of Wotton's ambitions, see Hill, 'Art and Patronage', p. 40–1.

[15] K. Sharpe, *Image Wars: Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (New Haven CT, 2010), p. 108.

[16] Henry Wotton, 'A Philosphicall Surveigh of Education, or Moral Architecture', in *Reliquiae Wottonianae* (London, 1651), pp. 309–35.

was an important form of political counsel.[17] The Venetian Connection successfully put this theory into practice in Henry's formative years.

II

The close connection between Salisbury and Newton, attested by Hickes's papers, was reinforced by the fact that Salisbury's son, William Cecil, was educated alongside the Prince. Salisbury seems to have been keen to ensure that the Prince grew up alongside others of the same age who could act as his future political advisors, forming a well-educated elite, and he kept in close contact with Newton, Henry and his son.[18] Also educated alongside Prince Henry was Sir John Harington (1592–1614), son of John Harington, first Baron Harington of Exton (1539/40–1613). The elder John Harington was a distant cousin of King James, who had quickly gained the king's favour and been given charge of the education of Henry's sister, Princess Elizabeth. His own son was educated alongside Prince Henry and his daughter, Lucy, countess of Bedford (1581–1627), became a close companion of Queen Anne.[19]

The elder Harington had also been an influential figure in the founding of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, as one of the executors of the will of Lady Frances Sidney, Countess of Sussex. Thus, when his son had completed his education alongside the Prince, it is unsurprising to find that he was sent to study at Sidney Sussex for a year, in 1607–8, before going abroad to travel to various parts of Europe, including Venice.[20] The goal of these travels appear to have been twofold: to supplement Harington's courtly education, and allow Prince Henry to travel by proxy. William Cecil, too, was encouraged by his father to travel to enhance his knowledge of languages and the world. The younger Cecil's travels included visiting Philippe

---

[17] For English writing on the relationship between princely education and good counsel, see J. Paul, *Counsel and Command in Early Modern English Thought* (Cambridge, 2020), *passim*.
[18] See, for instance, Lord Salisbury and Lord Suffolk to Adam Newton, 12 August 1607, which contains a familiar postscript to the Prince, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 56r–v.
[19] See J. Broadway, 'Harington, John, first Baron Harington of Exton (1539/40–1613)', ODNB.
[20] The best account of Harington's education and travels is S. Healy, 'Harington, Sir John', in in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629*, ed. A. Thrush and J.P. Ferris (Cambridge, 2010).

Duplessis-Mornay in Saumur.[21] Salisbury, however, expressed disappointment to his son that he had not been sending news of his travels to Prince Henry as regularly as the young Sir John Harington. Harington did indeed send regular letters back to Prince Henry, via Adam Newton, throughout his travels.[22]

A number of these letters are written in the 'noble language' of Italian, which Harington wanted to practice during his stay in the country in 1609, are preserved amongst Hickes's papers and in the BL's Harley papers.[23] In them, Harington offers news and observations from the continent. Harington was in Venice during the period that Micanzio delivered the sermons we have previously discussed. Though he does not go into detail, Harington wrote to Henry midway through the cycle of sermons in 1609 expressing his eagerness to see 'the fruit of the sound sermons of one Father Fulgenzio' when he had completed his efforts 'to preach the Gospel'.[24] Another letter, not by Harington and unsigned, but preserved in the Venetian State Papers, also attests to Harington's particular fascination with Micanzio's sermons. The author of this account is evidently an English Catholic, writing to a different English Catholic who was apparently a kinsman of Harington's.[25] He writes:

> Lett me tell you that which all me speake of heare, There is one Fulgentio, A schismaticall & calvinisticall precher in Venice who stoutly maintaineth Justifycation by faith without workes, he urgeth the people to reade the scripture, telleth them of praying in an unknowne tounge that it is unlawfull, he precheth for spirituall presence in the sacrament, that the civill magistrate ought

---

[21] See 'Viscount Cranborne's Travel Diary', 29 July 1609 in *Calendar of the manuscripts of the most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury* Vol. 21: 1609-1612 (London, 1970), ed. G. Dyfnallt Owen, entry 294, p. 104

[22] The best account of Harington's travels is that given in his History of Parliament biography: S. Healy, 'Harington, Sir John', in in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629*, ed. A. Thrush and J.P. Ferris (Cambridge, 2010).

[23] BL, MS Lansdowne 91 and MS Harl. 7007. For the 'nobil lingua' of Italian, see Harington to Prince Henry, Venice, [Lent] 1609, MS Lansdowne 91, fol. 37r.

[24] 'la frutta de le sane prediche d'un padre Fulgenzio', 'di predicare l'Evangelio', ibid. Harington also makes further mention of Micanzio's sermons in Harington to Prince Henry, Venice, [1609], BL, Harl. MS 7007, fol. 319r. Here he asserts that Micanzio had preached 'the word of God purely and without mixture' ('la parolle de dieu purement et sans mescolance').

[25] Extract of letter from an English Catholic to an English Catholic, Venice, 24 March/3 April 1609, TNA, SP 99/5, fol. 234r. I have not been able to work out which of Harington's many cousins this might be. We know that Harington had contact with the Catholic exile Sir Anthony Standen and with the Tuscan English exile community. See Healy, 'Harrington'.

> to kepe the clergy in good order, he precheth against legends [of the saints], & that nothing is sure but scripture, against pilgrymage, against confessyon, as it is told, that the people should not care for excommunycacon so they followed the scripture, with such other poynts of Calvins doctrine. The noble-men resorte much unto him.[26]

The point that 'the civill magistrate ought to kepe the clergy in good order' is particularly interesting, echoing the emphasis on the correct ordering of society which we saw in Micanzio's sermon notes. The author continues to add that, just as Venetian noblemen were attracted to Micanzio, so Harington was too:

> And with this Fulgentio is your cosen Sir John Haryngton very great, but I will have an eye I hope, that he shall not be infected with any more scisme or heresie but to kepe him a true catholike styll.[27]

The author's hopes were to be disappointed, as Harington remained an enthusiastic proponent of the Reformed cause until his death in 1612.

Harington's tone throughout his correspondence with Henry during his travels was cautious and wary of interception; he tells the Prince that he would write more, but for the fact that 'a wall of paper is too weak to protect any secrets of importance'.[28] Harington promised Henry a more detailed account on his return to England and kept a journal of his time in Italy which he seems to have discussed with the Prince in depth. The journal does not appear to have survived.[29] But we do not require its survival to see that political and religious interests were closely fused in the Prince of Wales's godly network. According to Harington's funeral sermon, printed in 1614, he was also known to write a diary for devotional purposes as well as mere record keeping, setting down 'how he had either offended or done good' each day.[30] It may well have been

---

[26] Extract of letter from an English Catholic to an English Catholic, Venice, 24 March/3 April 1609, TNA, SP 99/5, fol. 234r.
[27] Ibid.
[28] 'un muro di carta e tropo debole per guardare alcune secrete d'importanza', Harington to Prince Henry, Venice, 1 May 1609, BL, MS Lansdowne 91, fol. 35r.
[29] Healy, 'Harington'.
[30] Richard Stock, *The churches lamentation for the losse of the godly deliuered in a sermon, at the funerals of that truly noble, and most hopefull young gentleman, John Lord Harington, Baron of Exton* (London, 1614), p. 82.

Samuel Ward, the friend and correspondent of William Bedell and future master of Sidney Sussex, who encouraged Harington to take up the habit during his year in Cambridge; Ward famously kept a spiritual diary of his own in his youth.[31] As Alan Stewart notes, a high proportion of 'early Puritan self-examination diaries… can be tracked to a narrow circle of godly men in Cambridge'.[32] Ward certainly knew Harington during his time at Cambridge (although Ward was at that time, still a fellow of Emmanuel, rather than Master of Sidney Sussex): amongst Ward's papers at Cambridge, we find a letters to Harington's tutor, John Tovey, who accompanied Harington on his travels, and to Harington himself.[33]

The Harington family had forged a close connection between Prince Henry's household and Cambridge's 'puritan' colleges (Emmanuel, Sidney Sussex and Christ's). This was the context which saw the Emmanuel divines discussed in Chapter 2 – Bedell, Sotheby and Wadsworth – appointed to important ambassadorial chaplaincies. Prince Henry was not merely a passive receiver of these efforts to interest him in Reformed Cantabrigian theology: Joseph Hall was appointed chaplain to Prince Henry at the Prince's personal request in 1607, after Henry had been impressed by Hall's *Meditations* and sermons.[34] Hall's 1608 volume of published correspondence, which was dedicated to the Prince and includes letters to Adam Newton and David Murray, as well as the letters we have already seen to Bedell and Sotheby, offers a printed testimony to the cohesiveness of these circles.[35] Hall's letters constitute a clear and public statement of the links between Henry's household and a particular vision of

---

[31] Ward's diary is preserved, like many of his other papers, at Sidney Sussex, MS 45; partially printed as Samuel Ward, 'The Diary of Samuel Ward', in *Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries* (Chicago, 1933), ed. M.M. Knappen, pp.103–23. See also M. Todd, 'Puritan Self-Fashioning: The Diary of Samuel Ward', *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992), pp. 236-264.

[32] Alan Stewart, *The Oxford History of Life-writing* II (Oxford, 2018), pp. 143.

[33] Ward to Tovey, Wells, 23 July 1608, Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 48r; Ward to Harington, Cambridge, [late 1608?], Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 55r. John Tovey was the father of Nathaniel Tovey, tutor to John Milton. See G. Campbell, 'Nathaniel Tovey: Milton's Second Tutor', *Milton Quarterly* 21 (October 1987), pp. 81-90.

[34] For a list of Henry's chaplains, see Thomas Birch, *The Life of Henry, Prince of Wales, Eldest Son of King James I: Compiled Chiefly from His Own Papers, and Other Manuscripts, Never Before Published* (London, 1760), pp. 454–5. For Hall's appointment, see pp. 84–5; and P. McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean preaching* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 187.

[35] Joseph Hall, *Epistles, the first volume: conteining two decads* (London, 1608).

Reformed influence in Europe. The epistolary network he highlighted was composed of increasingly influential people, who had reason to hope for greater influence still once King Henry IX ascended the throne.

III

As well as corresponding with Harington and Tovey, Samuel Ward also continued his regular correspondence with William Bedell during the latter's time in Venice. Ward constitutes another important node in the Anglo-Venetian network of 1607–10, and although we do not have his complete correspondence, a few letters survive in draft. Perhaps most interesting is a letter from Ward to Bedell written in 1608, a copy of which is preserved in one of Ward's Latin notebooks in the Muniment Room at Sidney Sussex.[36] As far as I am aware, this letter has not received any previous scholarly attention. It is one of several preserved in a notebook written in Ward's hand, which seems to contain copies for Ward's own reference of letters he had written.[37] Some of these are neat copies of letters by others which Ward seems to have considered particularly interesting. Others, including Ward's letter to Bedell, appear to be drafts, although reasonably neat drafts written at a late stage (there are crossings out and amendments, but few); perhaps Ward wanted to keep these final drafts for his own reference and then copied out neater versions to send, a common enough practice. The letters generally contain details of political and religious controversies of which Ward may well have wanted to keep a record; one of the few letters in the book which has recently received any comment from historians (which is not related to Venice) is his letter to Richard Harvey, brother of Gabriel, defending the inclusion of 1 and 2 Maccabees as part of the canon of the Old Testament.[38] This is a further indication of the importance of the Reformed context for these communications. A final curious feature of the draft letter to Bedell is the fact that it is written in Latin. The surviving

[36] Ward to Bedell, [Cambridge?], [October? 1608], Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fols. 51r–54r.
[37] Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I.
[38] J. A. Miller, 'The Earliest Known Draft of the King James Bible: Samuel Ward's Draft of 1 Esdras and Wisdom 3–4', in *Labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord: Erudition and the Making of the King James Version of the Bible* (Leiden, 2018), ed. M. Feingold, p. 258; Ward to Richard Harvey, [Cambridge?], 12 February 1609, Sidney Sussex, MS Ward I, fols. 64v–8r.

letters from Bedell to Ward generally seem to have been written in English. Possibly Ward, who had spent longer in an academic environment, preferred to write in Latin, while Bedell preferred English; but it is also possible that Ward took the view that writing in Latin would make it easier for Bedell to show his letter to Venetians at the other end.

Ward's letter to Bedell contains news of Adam Newton's appointment (despite his lay status) as Dean of Durham Cathedral, and of James Montagu's appointment as Bishop of Bath and Wells. Montagu had been the first Master of Sidney Sussex. He was another Reformed conformist who played a part in the education of Prince Henry; as Dean of the Chapel Royal, Montagu was in a position to influence the King's appointments to his son's household.[39] Ward describes to Bedell how, given that he had almost reached the maximum number of years for which Emmanuel College's statutes allowed its fellows to remain at the College, he had agreed to take up a post in Durham, the town which Ward himself was originally from.[40] Ward explains that he had been nominated by Newton, 'the very worthy tutor of the most serene and extremely talented Prince Henry', and had promised to move there by the next Easter (presumably Easter 1608, which fell on 6 April).[41] In the meantime, however, Montagu had been appointed Bishop of Bath and Wells and asked Ward to be his Chaplain there.[42] Ward reports that he was initially reluctant to agree, on account of his promise to Newton, but that Montagu had himself interceded to have Ward released from this obligation.[43]

The circles that Ward saw fit to tell Bedell about, then, map on to the circles of Reformed conformists around Prince Henry. The letter soon moves on from personal

---

[39] It was Montagu who unwisely recommended the radical non-conformist preacher John Burgess for a role in Henry's household. Burgess was sent to the tower after a trial sermon in which he criticised the King's licencing of the canons of conformity. In other cases, Montagu seems to have been careful to recommend Reformed conformists, see Pollnitz, *Princely Education*, p. 328.

[40] Emmanuel College's statues had been designed with the express purpose of training up preachers who would not stay in Cambridge but rather go out to do God's work in parish. Fellows had to leave either within a year of proceeding DD or, if they did not proceed DD, in the year in which they could have. See P. Collinson, 'The Foundation and Beginnings', in S. Bendall, C. Brooke and P. Collinson, *A History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 26–7.

[41] 'serenissimi & optimi indolis principis Henrici dignissimo Tutore', Ward to Bedell, [Cambridge?] [October? 1608], Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 51r.

[42] Ibid and CSPD: James I XXXI, 21 March 1608.

[43] Ward to Bedell, [Cambridge?] [October? 1608], Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 51r.

news to more political matters. Ward reports that Montagu had recently been called back to London sooner than expected, 'by letters and a messenger sent by the King'.[44] James wanted Montagu's help in refuting two Catholic polemical tracts which had recently appeared, one by Robert Persons and the other by 'Mattheaus Tortus', which was really a pseudonym for Robert Bellarmine; Ward himself was persuaded that the work was Bellarmine's by the fact that it 'matched with the style of that book which he wrote against the Venetians'.[45] Persons's book was dated 10[/20] June 1608 and had reached England by 11/21 August; Bellarmine's appears to have arrived around the same time, and on 15/25 August 1608, Montagu sent a letter to the Earl of Salisbury from Wells stating that it would be easy to refute the works by 'Person and Vicar' (the latter seemingly a reference to the fact that Mattheaus Tortus was the name of Bellarmine's almoner), stating that 'as poore a minister as I am I durst undertake to make boethe [of them] weary of gaynsayinge in this argument'.[46] Both tracts were critiques of James's own work, *Triplici nodo*, published in February 1608, a book which Montagu had had a hand in writing.[47] The tract was a defence of the English oath requiring Catholics to deny the papal deposing power, which had been introduced in the wake of the Gunpowder Plot. Now, the King recalled Montagu to Royston to help him write his response to these responses. A couple of months later on 9 October 1608, Zorzi Giustinian, the Venetian Ambassador in England, noted the King's receipt of Bellarmine's reply, and reported that James was 'getting ready an answer, and intend[ed] to retire to Royston in a few days along with his Theologians'.[48]

Ward's letter to Bedell appears to have been written after the gathering at Royston. He in turn reports that the Bishop of Chichester (Lancelot Andrewes) and the

---

[44] 'literis & nuntio a Rege missis', ibid.
[45] 'congruit cum stylo illius libri quem contra Venetos conscripsit', ibid.
[46] See [Robert Persons], *Judgement of a Catholicke English-Man* ([Saint Omer], 1608), p. 128; [Robert Bellarmine], *Matthaei Torti presbyteri, & theologi Papiensis responsio ad librum inscriptum, triplici nodo, triplex cuneus, sive apologia pro iuramento fidelitatis* ([Saint Omer], 1608); Sommerville, 'Jacobean political thought', pp. 54–5; Montagu to Salisbury, Wells, 15 August 1608, TNA, SP 14/35, fol. 88r.
[47] [James VI & I], *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus: Or An apologie for the Oath of allegiance* (London, 1607). For an account of Montagu's role in the production of the *Apologie*, see D.H. Wilson, 'James I and His Literary Assistants', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 8 (1944), p. 42.
[48] CSPV XI, 9 October 1608.

Bishop of Lincoln (William Barlow) had been appointed to write responses.[49] John Barclay was also asked to prepare a posthumous edition of his father William's unpublished treatise against papal pretensions to temporal power, *De potestate papae*. This book was published in 1609 (inspiring the response from Bellarmine on which, as we have seen, Micanzio made extensive notes).[50] With the help of Montagu, James also prepared his own response, entitled 'A Premonition', which he attached to the 1609 reprint of the *Apologie*.[51] As the participation of the avant-garde conformist Andrewes makes plain, these respondents cannot all be described as of the Reformed party. However, the Reformed circles around Prince Henry are clearly represented.[52] James's *Apologie* had itself addressed the case of Venice, and the King returned to this theme in the 'Confutation' of Bellarmine which prefaced James's 'Premonition' of 1609, expressing his wish that Catholic polemicists would 'cease to vent [their claims of papal temporal jurisdiction]… till they have disproved their owne *Venetians*, who charge them with Noveltie, and forgery in this poynt.'[53]

Ward's 1608 letter to Bedell allows us to build up a more detailed picture of the process of James's polemical composition. In the letter, Ward asks Bedell directly for help with one point in particular: the refutation of Baronius's account of the year 1177 in his *Annales*, which had been drawn on by Bellarmine. Baronius's *Annales* constituted the most substantial work of church history produced in the sixteenth century and rebuttals of it became a staple of anti-papal controversy. In his discussion of the year 1177, Baronius recorded that Pope Alexander III had met Emperor Frederick Barbarossa outside St Mark's Basilica in Venice. It was popularly believed that Pope Alexander had stepped on the Emperor's neck, to assert his superiority. But, Baronius asserted, there was no evidence that such an event had really occurred.[54] Writing as

---

[49] Ward to Bedell, [Cambridge?] [October? 1608], Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 51r. See also Chamberlain to Carleton, London, 21 October 1608, *The Letters of John Chamberlain* I, p. 264.
[50] Sommerville, 'Jacobean political thought', pp. 61–2.
[51] Ibid., p. 57; James VI & I, *An apologie for the oath of allegiance… together with a premonition of His Majesties, to all most mightie monarches, kings, free princes and states of Christendome* (London, 1609).
[52] Other Reformed clerics who wrote, but who did not have clear links to Venice, included Robert Abbot (brother of George) and John Prideaux. See Sommerville, 'Jacobean political thought', p. 64.
[53] James VI & I, *An apologie… together with a premonition*, sig. t3v. For other mentions of Venice, see the 'Premonition', p. 20; and the 'Apologie', p. 89 and p. 106.
[54] Cesare Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* XII (Mainz, 1608), anno 1177, no. 86, col. 891.

Tortus, Bellarmine seconded Baronius's denial. Yet this was a story of great value to Protestant polemicists, epitomising the arrogance with which the Pope assert his claims over temporal rulers. The incident was supposed to have taken place 'at the doors of St Mark's Basilica' in Venice, and Ward asked Bedell whether – using his connections in Venice – he might be able to find local accounts confirming the story's veracity:

> Following Baronius Vol. XII on the year 1177, [Bellarmine] denies the story of the neck of Emperor Frederick Barbarossa being compressed by the foot of Alexander III. Since the Histories say this happened before the doors of Temple of St Mark's Basilica in Venice, I ask that you diligently search for this in the Annals of the Venetians, which without doubt testify this most clearly, unless I'm much mistaken. The names of the authors and the places in the text should please be noted… and sent to me in future letters.[55]

Bedell's reply appears not to survive. However, a direct rebuttal of Bellarmine on this point was indeed printed in the section of the 1609 reprint of James's *Apologie* entitled 'Confutations'. In response to Bellarmine's suggestion that the story of Alexander stepping on Frederick's neck 'may be justly doubted of', James asserted that 'no Historian doubteth of it; and many do avouch it'.[56] The King cites a number of authorities to back up this claim, including several Italians. These include works by the Venetian historians Pietro Giustiniani and Giacomo Filippo Foresti, as well as Girolamo Bardi's *Vittoria navale ottenuta dalla Republica Venetiana* (printed in Venice in 1584), a work which discusses the historical evidence for a depiction of the event painted by Federico Zuccaro (c. 1582) for the recently redecorated Doge's Palace.[57] It is highly likely that these works owe their inclusion to Bedell, via Ward's request.

---

[55] '[Bellarmine] secutus Baronium ad an: 1177. Tom XII. negat Historiam Alexandri III. collum Frederici Barbarosae Imperatoris pede comprimentis. Hoc cum narrant Historici factum fuisse Venetiis prae foribus Templi D. Marci, des opum, rogo, ut diligenter inquirantur Annales Venetorum, qui proculdubio clarissime hoc testantur, ni multum fallor. Nomina Authorum & loci quaeso notentur… et proximis literis huc mittantur', Ward to Bedell, [Cambridge?] [October? 1608], Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 51r–2r; [Bellarmine], *Matthaei Torti*, pp. 85–8.

[56] James VI & I, *An apologie… together with a premonition*, sig. t2r.

[57] Pietro Giustiniani, *Rerum Venetarum ab urbe condita historia* (Venice, 1560), Book 2; Giacomo Filippo Foresti da Bergamo, *Supplementum chronicarum* (Venice, 1483); Girolamo Bardi, *Vittoria navale ottenuta dalla Republica Venetiana* (Venice, 1584), pp. 133–49. Bardi (c. 1544–94) was a

There is also further evidence of the Venetian Connection's interest in the painting of Pope Alexander's encounter with Frederick discussed by Bardi, and which was prominently displayed on the wall of the Great Council Chamber of the Doge's Palace. In 1609, Sir John Harington sent Prince Henry a copy of this very painting: in a postscript of a letter Harington writes that he has included a 'portrait of Alexander III putting his foot on the neck of the emperor with all the circumstances', which depicted the event 'no more or less accurately than it is in the chamber of the Great Council in Venice'.[58] Harington added that he was sending the painting to Henry 'because this action of the Pope is denied in the recent book under the name of Tortus against the oath of allegiance'; the painting, however, was a 'perpetual monument' to the truth of the incident.[59] The English fascination with the events of 1177 coincided with renewed debate over the story in Venice too. Perhaps surprisingly, the Pope also had a prominent painting of the fabled meeting between Pope and Emperor on the wall of the Sala Regia in the Apostolic Palace in Rome, painted by Giuseppe Porta in around 1564. The inscription on this Roman depiction was itself become a source of controversy between Venice and the papacy in the early seventeenth century. The aspect of the painting which provoked tensions between Venice and the Pope, however, was not the question of the Pope standing on the neck, or the words the Pope had spoken.[60] Venetian concerns instead focussed on the question of whether or not the city had been responsible for protecting the Pope by hiding him in Venice and defeating Barbarossa's fleet, which had been highlighted in the painting's original inscription with the words

---

Florentine Camaldolese monk who moved to Venice. He was chosen as one of three advisors on the redecoration of the Sala del Maggior Consiglio of the Doge's Palace after the fire of 1577.

[58] 'poutrait d'Allessandre iii ce mettant le pied su le col de l'Empereur avec toute les circumstances ne plus ne moins justement comme il est en la sale du grand conseil en Venice', Harington to Prince Henry, Venice, [1609], BL, Harl. MS 7007, fol. 319v. I have not been able to trace the accompanying image.

[59] 'parceque ce comportement du pape est nié per le dernier livre sous le nom de Tortus contre le serment d'allegeance', 'monument purpatual', ibid.

[60] Although some contemporary visitors to the Sala Regia, including Michel de Montaigne, commented on the fact that the words said to have been spoken by the Pope were omitted from the painting's inscription. See J.L. de Jong, *The Power and the Glorification: Papal Pretensions and the Art of Propaganda in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (University Park, PA, 2013), p. 132.

'Thus the pope's dignity is restored to him by the kind service of the Venetian republic, in the year 1177'.[61]

This story of Venice's central role in restoring the pope's authority played a crucial role in the Republic's self-image. It also underpinned Venice's claims to sovereignty over the Adriatic: Pope Alexander was supposed to have given the Doge a ring, symbolising dominion over the sea, by way of thanks.[62] As well as challenging the story of Alexander stepping on Frederick's neck, however, Baronius had also refuted Venetian claims to have played a special role in saving the Pope from the Emperor. In 1635, Pope Urban VIII had the inscription of Porta's painting updated to reflect Baronius's revised version of events, prompting forthright protests from the Venetian Ambassador.[63] In Venice in the intervening years, however, there had been increasing recognition that the Republic would be better served by defending its Adriatic dominion by other means. As Gaetano Cozzi and Filippo de Vivo have emphasised, it was Sarpi who took the lead in this effort to ground Venice's Adriatic sovereignty in the law of nations rather than the historical story of Alexander III's donation.[64] Sarpi was, then, interested in the implications of the story of Alexander and Frederick's encounter, and may have pointed Bedell in the direction of the sources Ward had asked for. However, Sarpi was evidently sceptical of the truth of the historical accounts of the encounter, and thought that, for Venice, this was not a polemical battle worth trying to fight. He probably doubted the truth of the English interpretation of the story too. However, this English version, which illustrated the arrogance of a pope seeking to assert his authority over a temporal ruler, would surely have been viewed by Sarpi as less pernicious than the traditional Venetian version, in which jurisdiction over the Adriatic was the Pope's to give. Venetian and English objections to Baronius's retelling of the events of 1177 overlapped, but also diverged in important ways. Sarpi took a novel position within Venice in this debate, which in its denial of papal

---

[61] Ibid., pp. 130–33.
[62] F. de Vivo, 'Historical Justifications of Venetian Power in the Adriatic', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64 (2003), pp. 159-76, esp. 160–62.
[63] De Jong, *The Power and the Glorification*, p. 133.
[64] See Sarpi, *Opere*, ed. G. and L. Cozzi, pp. 614–22; De Vivo, 'Historical Justifications', pp. 171–6.

jurisdiction in temporal affairs, was closer to that put forward in the English sources than in older Venetian ones.

Redacted for copyright reasons. Fig. 4 – Painting by Federico Zuccaro (c. 1582) in the Sala del Maggior Consiglio of the Palazzo Ducale, Venice. Copyright: Palazzo Ducale, Fondazione Musei Civici Venezia

Redacted for copyright reasons. Fig. 5 – Painting by Giuseppe Porta (c. 1564), in the Sala Regia, Palazzo Apostolico, Rome. Copyright: Palazzo Apostolico, Rome

Though we do not have Bedell's letter responding to Ward's questions about the events of 1177, we do have another short letter which Bedell wrote to Ward, which discusses the rebuttal of Bellarmine's work, sent on 24 December 1609/3 January 1610. In this letter Bedell mentions his 'last letters' to Ward in which, he says, 'I signified what I thought of Bellarmines late Booke and was bold to imparte to you what pointes would be of principall use and satisfaction to men indifferently affected here',

confirming the existence of a lost response to Ward's request.[65] By the time of this letter in late December, Bedell had had a further thought about a point in Bellarmine's book that might be addressed. Mentioning the section in which Bellarmine attacked James as an apostate, because he had been born of Catholic parents and baptised into the Roman Catholic Church, Bedell notes that Bellarmine does not mention the fact that Queen Elizabeth I had been asked to be James's godmother and had given him his baptismal font.[66] On Bedell's reading, this was an important omission which needed to be rectified, because it proved that James's mother, the Roman Catholic Mary, Queen of Scots, had thought Elizabeth a suitable person to 'instruct the Infant' in matters of faith, thus making clear that 'his Majesties mother (what ever [Bellarmine] boldly would beare downe with conjectures) had not that opinion of the Reformed religion which the Popish faction now hath'.[67] Once again, turning to James's 1609 reprint of his 'Apologie', we find that this point was included. Responding to Bellarmine's charge of apostacy in his 'Premonition', James draws attention to the choice of Elizabeth as his godmother and her gift of his baptismal font. James offering these facts alongside other evidence that his mother was not 'superstitious or Jesuited' and adds that 'Pius V was not ignorant' of the nature of his godmother's religion either.[68] We cannot know for sure that this was a point added by Ward at Bedell's suggestion. But given the specificity of the point, and combined with the evidence of the 'Confutation' dealing with the events of 1177, it looks highly likely. Once again, it seems Bedell and Ward's correspondence fed directly into James's polemical works.

Ward's close connection to the updated edition of the King's *Apologie* is underlined once more by the fact that he donated English and Latin copies of the book to Emmanuel College Library in September 1609, just before he moved to Sidney Sussex.[69] This donation, as well as being a means by which Ward could assert his own

---

[65] Bedell to Ward, Venice, 24 December 1609/3 January 1610, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 131r.
[66] [Bellarmine], *Matthaei Torti*, pp. 96–8.
[67] Bedell to Ward, Venice, 24 December 1609/3 January 1610, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 131r. Bedell also states that he was sending Ward another book along with this letter, which he hoped would be of use for the refutation.
[68] James VI & I, 'Premonition', in *An apologie… together with a premonition*, pp. 33–4.
[69] See S. Bush and C.J. Rasmussen, *The Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, 1584-1637* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 23–4.

link to the work, is also an indication that Ward thought that this important text was one to which future scholars should have easy access. Emmanuel, always meant to be a training ground for a Godly preaching ministry, was also becoming a training ground for theologians who could write in support of the King.

IV

It seems that that Ward received information about Paolo Sarpi from a wider range of contacts than Bedell alone. He writes to Bedell in his letter of 1608 that 'the day before yesterday' he had received from a correspondent in France a copy of a letter sent from Sarpi to François Hotman de Villiers, the Abbot of Saint-Médard de Soissons, a copy of which is also contained in Ward MS I. This letter lists works of history that Sarpi recommends to his recipient, including a number by English historians, which Sarpi may have been introduced to by Bedell.[70] Ward writes that 'from this I conclude that the fame of Padre Paolo is greatly renowned amongst the French'.[71]

The identity of Ward's contact in France here is unclear. It may have been John Tovey, who, as we have seen, was a correspondent of Ward's who travelled through Paris with Harington. Ward may well have made a habit of asking friends and students from Emmanuel, Christ's and Sidney Sussex to write to him with news of his travels. Another of Ward's continental informants was Bedell's cousin, and Ward and Bedell's contemporary at Emmanuel (matric. 1595), Joseph Alliston.[72] Alliston is frequently mentioned in correspondence between Ward and Bedell both before and during the latter's stint in Venice. In the last known letter which Bedell sent to Ward from Venice in 1610, Bedell asked Ward about the possibility of finding Alliston court patronage.[73] In the event, Alliston went not to London, but abroad (though it is still possible this was

[70] Sarpi to the Abbot of St Medard [François Hotman], 22 July 1608, copied in Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fols. 32–3; original Italian held at BnF, Dupuy 766, fol. 43r and printed in *Lettres Italiennes,* pp. 212–15. For a discussion of other copies of this letter, which continued to be circulated throughout the seventeenth century (many of them in England), see Ulianich, *Lettere ai Gallicani*, pp. CXC–CXCIV; for a contemporary French translation held at ÖNB, MS 6189, see *Lettres Italiennes,* pp. 215–8.
[71] 'hinc coniicio famam P. Pauli valde celebrem esse apud Gallos', Ward to Bedell, [Cambridge?] [October? 1608], Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 52r.
[72] J. and J.A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses* Vol. 1 Part 1 (Cambridge, 1922), p. 22; T.W. Jones, in *A true relation*, p. 99.
[73] Bedell to Ward, Venice, 23 July 1610, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 354r.

done under the auspices of Court patronage). I have found very little documentary evidence of Alliston's activities, but one letter he wrote to Ward in 1612, in which he discusses the flaws of the Catholic churches he had observed on his travels, survives amongst the Tanner manuscripts, and Bedell mentions that Alliston was in Geneva in a letter of 30 November 1613.[74] It is probable that Alliston's letter to Ward is only one part of a broader correspondence. This letter was sent on to Ward by Thomas Lorkin (d. 1625), another alumnus of Emmanuel College (BA, 1601; MA, 1605), who was at that time in Paris.[75] Lorkin had left England in 1610 to travel as the tutor of Sir Thomas Puckering, Adam Newton's brother-in-law (Puckering's sister, Catherine, having married Newton in 1605) who had, by virtue of his sister's marriage, been educated alongside Prince Henry.[76] Lorkin later returned to Paris on diplomatic business from 1620 to until his death by drowning crossing the Channel in 1625.[77] Like Tovey, Lorkin was a tutor to a member of Prince Henry's household who travelled on the European continent, and like Tovey, he is another possible source of information about France which reached Ward, albeit in Lorkin's case this was in a slightly later period to that of the letter to Bedell.

Whatever the identity of his French contact, Ward was well informed.[78] His letters mention both Isaac Casaubon and the French Gallican jurist (and correspondent of Sarpi) Jacques Leschassier (1550–1625), citing both the latter's defence of the canons of Senlis and his *Consultatio,* written in defence of the Venetians, with admiration.[79] It is also clear from Ward's letter to Bedell that he was keen to learn more

---

[74] Alliston to Ward, Paris, 9 April 1612, Bodl., Tanner MS 74, fol. 8r.
[75] Ibid.; 'Thomas Lorkin (*d.* 1625)', discussed within W.A.J Archbold, revised by S. Bakewell, 'Lorkin, Thomas (c. 1528–1591), ODNB.
[76] See A. Thrush, 'Puckering, Sir Thomas, 1st Bt. (1591-1637)', in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629* (2010), ed. A. Thrush and J.P. Ferris.
[77] Lorkin's letters to Puckering in this period are preserved in BL, Harl. MS 7000.
[78] Another possible source of information on Paris available to Ward in 1608 was Richard Thompson, Casaubon's friend and correspondent, who also features in Ward MS I. See Scaliger to Thomson, 3 September 1605, Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 40r.
[79] 'cupio et doctissimum Casaubonum, nec non D. Jacobum Leschassier Advocatum regium, cuius Confutatio in causa Venetorum superiori anno conscipta', Samuel Ward to John Tovey, Wells, 23 July 1608, Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 48. On the defence of the canons of Senlis, see T. Amalou, 'Jacques Leschassier, Senlis et les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane (1607)', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 3 (2009), pp. 445-66.

about Sarpi and other writers of the Venetian Interdict controversy. He expresses his sorrow that 'the controversy between the Pope and the Republic of Venice had been calmed so suddenly', noting that it would have done far more for the cause of religion had it lasted longer.[80] He also expresses disappointment that he is not able to read the works written on the controversy which were written in Italian, and asks Bedell to send him 'whatever [works] exist in Latin', apart from those he already owns, which he lists.[81] These works which Ward had already seen included Antonio Querini's *Disputationes* and *Tractatus de Jurisdictio*, Giovanni Marsilio's *Vindicatio* of Sarpi, Sarpi's defence of Gerson, and another work by Sarpi.[82] He also gives the title of another work on the controversy of which he is aware, *Apologia pro ecclesiae et Concilii auctoritate adversus Joannis Gersonii doctoris christianissimi obtrectatores*, asking Bedell to send him a copy along with the name of the author. The work, which had appeared in Venice without the name of an author or printer in 1607, was in fact by the French Gallican Edmund Richer.[83] Ward notes that many more books may have been printed which had not made it across the Alps.[84] Bedell may well have been able to provide Ward with copies of further works; he gathered a large personal collection, donating a set of thirty-seven publications linked to the Venetian Interdict controversy to Emmanuel College Library in 1621, bound in three volumes. [85] The Latin inscription on the first volume, not in Bedell's hand, reads 'This book was given to Emmanuel College by William Beadle, member of the College' and is dated 4 October 1621.[86]

Of the texts Bedell donated to Emmanuel, thirteen were in Latin and twenty-four in Italian. As none of the thirteen Latin texts are included on Ward's lists of books

---

[80] 'Doleo certe quod tam subito sopitae erant controversiae inter papam & Remp[ublicam] Veneta[rum]', Ward to Bedell, [Cambridge?], [October? 1608], Ward MS I, fol. 52r.
[81] 'quotquot Latine extant', ibid.
[82] Ibid.
[83] F. Oakley, 'Complexities of Context: Gerson, Bellarmine, Sarpi, Richer, and the Venetian Interdict of 1606-1607', *The Catholic Historical Review* 82 (July 1996), p. 388
[84] Ward to Bedell, [Cambridge?], [October? 1608], Ward MS I, fol. 52r.
[85] See Emmanuel College Library, shelf marks 329.3.10-12; S. Bush and C.J. Rasmussen, *The Library of Emmanuel College*, p. 24. The full list of the pamphlets included in these volumes is included in the bibliography of William Bedell at the end of this dissertation.
[86] 'Hunc librum Collegio Emanuelis D[onum] D[edit] Guilielmus Beadle eiusdem Colleg: socius} Octob 4 Anno 1621', Emmanuel College Library, shelf mark 329.3.10, handwritten note on flyleaf.

he already possessed, it is likely that Bedell would have shared either these copies or duplicates with him. Thus, these thirteen texts can probably be added to the six Ward mentions in his letter as sources which contributed to his – and the wider Jacobean Court circle's – understanding of the Interdict controversy.[87] The anti-papal vision of politics promoted by King James, his agents in England and the Sarpian circle in Venice aimed to provide an analysis of Europe's difficulties that would have widespread appeal.

Bedell's presence in Venice in the wake of the Interdict thus seems to have provided Ward – and by extension the broader group of clergymen who assisted James in the production of his published works in the period 1607–10 – with access to a far greater range of texts related to the Interdict controversy than they had access to in England. While the English translations produced during and immediately after the Interdict controversy will have had the greatest impact on English popular perceptions of the controversy, it is this exchange of Latin works which cemented the Interdict controversy's place at the heart of the political thought of the Jacobean Court.

V

Ward's letter to Bedell, and other letters in Ward MS I, also help locate him within British and Irish networks beyond Cambridge and Suffolk, shedding light on his role within Reformed intellectual circles. The letter to Bedell mentions Thomas James, the first Bodleian Librarian, and Henry Savile, Warden of Merton and Provost of Eton, both influential Reformed conformists linked to Oxford rather than Cambridge. In Ward MS I more broadly, we can trace the place of Ward's Venetian interests in his correspondence with Clement Colmore, a civil lawyer based in Durham, and James

[87] The texts involved are Pellegrini, Othelius and Scaynus's *Responsa* (1606); Crasso's, *Antiparaenesis ad Caesarem Baronium* (1606); Lonigo's *Consilium super controversia vertente* (1606); Servin's *Pro libertate Status et Reipublicae Venetorum* (1606); Lisca's *Ad illustrissimum Caesarem Baronium Cardinalem epistola* (1606); Vendrameni's *Disquisitiones* (1607) and *Assertiones* (1606); Marsilio's *Catholicae veritatis audiendae studiosis* (1606); Menini's *Ad Paulum V pontificem maximum* (1607); Crancius's *Sententia* (1607); Baronius's *Duo vota* (1606); the *Missiva Principum Apostolorum Petri, et Pauli* (1607); and the *Consilium… de recuperanda et in posterum stabilienda pace Regni Poloniae* (1607). It should be noted that the last of these works is not focussed on the Interdict controversy, but rather on criticising the activities of the Jesuits in Poland; nonetheless, the text regularly refers to Venice and the Interdict as a comparison to the Polish case. See, for instance, sigs. C4v–5r and G1r–v.

Ussher, the influential Irish Protestant clergyman and scholar, and future Archbishop of Armagh.

Ward discusses James and Savile in the context of their patristic scholarship. He notes that James had been in Cambridge working on his edition of Bradwardine, and reports that Savile had begun work on his own edition of the works of John Chrysostom:

> Dr Savile, Provost of Eton College, is already beginning, and very earnestly, an edition of Chrysostom; to this end, he sought the type founts [really lovely ones] which Robert Estienne once used in printing Eusebius, and other monuments of the fathers, and already the press arrives at Eton.[88]

Ward was evidently interested in these efforts. He expresses his own desire for an edition of the canons of the Greek councils, a task which he had been told Savile might take on next, and asks Bedell to make enquiries of Sarpi about any relevant manuscripts in Venice.[89] Ward also informs Bedell that he had been making enquiries about the manuscript treatise 'Liber dialogorum hierarchiae subcoelestis', held in the Emmanuel College Library, which Bedell had referenced at length in his response to William Alabaster back in 1604, but about which little was known.[90] Ward reports that he had been told that there were 'some' copies of the same treatise in French libraries.[91]

---

[88] 'D. Savillus praefectus Collegi Aetoniensis, iam aggreditur idq[ue][88] serio editionem Chrysostomi; in quem finem characteres typographicus [marginal insertion: longi pulcherrimos] quibus usus est olim Rob. Stephanus in excudendis Eusebio, et aliis patrum monumentis conquisivit, et praelum iam adven[i]at Aetoniae', Ward to Bedell, [Cambridge?], [October? 1608], Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 53r.

[89] Ibid.

[90] Cambridge, Emmanuel College Library, MS 9, fols. 176r–205v. See discussion in Ch. 2 above, pp. 84–6. Other manuscript copies of this text known today include: Basel University Library, MS A.VI.15; Besançon, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 207, fols. 1-56v; Bordeaux, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 406, fols. 173-209v; Dublin, Trinity College Library, MS 329, fols. 1-153; London, British Library, Harley MS 631, fols. 1-41; Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional de España, MS 54, fols. 1-28; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS Lat. 3184, fols. 1-35v, 3185, fols. 1-89; Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1022, fols. 85-120; Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 715; Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, MS Aug. 2° 83 (2834), fols. 1-51. See H. Millet, 'Le «Liber dialogorum hierarchiae subcoelestis» (1388)', in *Vaticana et medievalia Etudes en l'honneur de Louis Duval-Arnould* (Florence, 2008), eds. J.-M. Martin, B. Martin-Hisard and A. Paravicini Bagliani, pp. 367-94.

[91] 'nonullis', ibid.

An interest in the canons of the councils is a recurring theme in Ward's letters of this period, and it appears to have been a topic on which he focussed much of his intellectual attention. Thomas James highlighted Ward's work on the canons of the councils in his *Treatise of the corruption of Scripture, councels, and fathers* of 1611, which called for new editions of the fathers to extirpate popish corruption, expressing hope that Ward's 'worthy labours' on this topic would soon be published.[92] Despite their mutual interest in each other's work, Ward appears not to have stayed in particularly close contact with Thomas James in subsequent years, until James wrote to him rekindling the relationship (and reminding Ward of the time they had spent together years before) on 30 June 1624.[93] Ward's interest in Thomas James's project for the purification of the Church Fathers suggests that he saw his intellectual endeavours as part of a broader anti-papal intellectual project, which included the recovery of ancient texts and contributions to the King's polemical agenda. And here we find a link between the decisions Ward made as one of the translators of the King James Bible: in Ward's manuscript letter to Richard Harvey defending the inclusion of 1 and 2 Maccabees as part of the canonical Old Testament, Ward drew on conciliar history to defend his stance.[94] Thus, Ward's request that Bedell ask Sarpi about the canons of the councils and his work on the King James Bible both appear to have fed into Ward's broader ambition of refuting papalist accounts of the Greek councils.

Ward's interest in the Greek councils in this period reveal the extent of the overlap in English Reformed and anti-papal Venetian intellectual concerns during this period: we also have letters from Sarpi exchanged with Jacques Leschassier, the French lawyer who has published on the question of the authenticity of the canons of the councils, in the same period, discussing much the same topic, and a mention in Bedell's letters of him discussing Ward's interest in the canons with Sarpi. Both Ward and Sarpi's letters contain discussion of specific questions which were not raised in

---

[92] Thomas James, *A treatise of the corruption of Scripture, councels, and fathers, by the prelats, pastors, and pillars of the Church of Rome, for maintenance of popery and irreligion* (London, 1611), p. 102.
[93] James to Ward, Oxford, 30 June 1624, Bodl., Tanner MS 290, fol. 80.
[94] Miller, 'The Earliest Known Draft', p. 258; Ward to Richard Harvey, Cambridge, 12 February 1609, Sidney Sussex, MS Ward I, fols. 64v–68r.

Leschassier's printed works of the period. As we shall see, both Sarpi and Ward draw on the works of the sixth-century Scythian monk, Dionysius Exiguus, who had produced a translation of the canons of the Greek councils at the request of Stephen, bishop of Salona (now Solin in modern Croatia), at some point after the year 500, probably in the context of the Laurentian Schism of *c.* 498–506.[95] Both Sarpi and Ward offer suggestions for how the work of Dionysius might be used to shed more light on how the canons developed. These correspondences were clearly interconnected, but it is hard to discern how far the various parties involved were aware of each other and how far they were influenced by each other's thinking. In order to get closer to answering these questions, it will be necessary to try and piece together a chronology of these interactions.

On [25 August/]4 September 1607, Sarpi wrote to Leschassier posing some questions about his interpretation of the canons of the Councils; Leschassier sent a reply dated [30 September/]9 October 1607, which Sarpi noted arrived slowly in his reply, dated [1/]11 December. On 26 December[/5 January] 1608, Bedell wrote to Ward, thanking him 'largely for [his] large letters'. It is clear that in one of his letters, Ward had asked Bedell to discuss the Codex Canonum with Sarpi. Bedell gives Ward an account of the ensuing conversation:

> As touching the Canons of the Councells, I had conference with F. Paulo, he told me he could never yet come to the sight of the Codex Canonum set forth at Mentz,[96] that there is nothing that he knowes would helpe to your satisfaction in St Markes Library or that of their Monastery, but a Noble man of Venice of his acquaintance hath the Councells in Greeke, wherein he promised me as your [sic] required to search for that word φωτζανών [?][97] in the Laodicea Synod, or any thing else that you would require.[98]

[95] For a useful discussion of Dionysius Exiguus's role in contemporary debates about clerical office, see C. Leyser, 'Law, memory, and priestly office in Rome, c.500', *Early Medieval Europe* 27 (2019), pp. 61–84.

[96] Probably a reference to Johannes Cochlaeus [Johannes Wendelstein], *Canones apostolorum, veterum conciliorum constitutiones, decreta pontificum antiquiora, de primatu Romanae ecclesiae* (Mainz, 1525).

[97] The word intended in Bedell's transcription is unclear to me but is perhaps some variation on φωτία ('light' or 'illumination').

[98] Bedell to Ward, Venice, 26 December/5 January 1608, Oxford, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 3r; *Two Biographies*, pp. 224–5.

The exact point in which Ward was interested is a little unclear. One possibility that seems plausible is that he was interested in seeing if there was a Greek equivalent to the term 'inluminati' in the phrase 'inluminati baptismate' in the third canon of the Council of Laodicia, which stipulated that someone who had just been baptised should not immediately be promoted to the clerical order; Ward was particularly interested in the sacramental significance of baptism, so this seems a potentially plausible if incomplete explanation.[99] In any case, it seems that the discussion between Sarpi and Bedell took place a few months before Bedell wrote this account of it. He writes that 'a few dayes after this conference' an assassination attempt was made on Sarpi, a reference to the events of 25 September/5 October 1607.[100] Consequently, Bedell's discussion with Sarpi about the Greek Councils must have taken place in late September/early October, before Leschassier's reply was written or reached Sarpi. Bedell was thus discussing Ward's interest in the canons of the Councils with Sarpi at the same time that Sarpi was corresponding with Leschassier on the same topic.

As we have seen, Ward's letter to Bedell in Ward MS I, which appears to have been written around October 1608, contains further requests to Sarpi about the canons; this is seems likely to be a direct reply to Bedell's letter of December 1607, as it contains Ward's apologies for a slow reply and an explanation of his movements around the country earlier in 1608. We also know that Ward was also discussing the canons of the Councils with other correspondents during the period 1607–8, including James Ussher. Ussher played a galvanising role amongst Jacobean Reformed intellectuals, and his list of correspondents in the 1600s and 1610s contained numerous figures who were prominent in the Reformed conformist circles of Oxford and Cambridge. Ward appears to have sent Ussher a recent work on the ancient *Codex Canonum* undertaken in France, at some point in late 1607 or early 1608. In an undated letter, Ussher thanked Ward for

[99] See Canon CVI of the Council of Laodicea in Dionysius Exiguus, *Codex canonum ecclesiasticorum* (Paris, 1643), ed. C. Justel, p. 76: 'Quod non oporteat ad clerum statim post baptisma promoveri. De his, qui nuper sunt inluminati baptismate, quod eos in sacerdotali non conveniat ordine promoveri.'
[100] For useful discussion of the sources for Sarpi's assassination, see T.F. Mayer, *The Roman Inquisition on the Stage of Italy, c. 1590–1640* (Philadelphia, 2014), p. 265, note 142.

this work, writing, 'Yow will not beleve (good Sir) what great pleasure I took in perusing those writings which I received from yow. Especially where I found your learned Parisian so fully to agree with me, in collecting the order of the ancient Codex Canonum, out of the Councell of Chalcedon.'[101] The subsequent discussion makes clear that this book must have been Leschassier's *Consultatio Parisii cujusdam de controversia inter sanctitatem Pauli V et Sereniss. Rempublicam Venetam* (Paris, 1606).[102] It is also possible that Ward sent another work by Leschassier too: *De la Liberté ancienne et canonique de l'Eglise Gallicane* (Paris, 1606), which addressed the same theme. Ward wrote a reply to Ussher dated 6 July 1608, which was sent with additions dated 1 August.[103] The letter was clearly written at intervals and contains the same apologies that Ward repeated to correspondents throughout the summer of 1608 about his itinerant lifestyle. Towards the end of the main body of the letter, Ward writes:

> Since the tyme that I writt the former part of this letter, which was the beginning of Lent, upon the receipt of yours, I have been occasioned to be going and comming from and to Cambridg, to have some setled place of abode… This unsettled abode of myne was the cause why I finished not this letter so long since begun, and sent yt not before this.[104]

In fact, by the time Ward had signed and dated this part of the letter on 6 July, he had left Wells and was back in Cambridge.[105] Ward's apologies suggest that Ussher's letter had arrived by mid-February (Lent began on 10 February in 1608, with Easter falling on 27 March). Ussher's letter was most likely written shortly before, perhaps in January 1608. Ward could, therefore, have sent the copy of Leschassier's book to Ussher at any point in late 1607. It is even possible that he was sent this work by Bedell, and that it was this which prompted his specific requests about the Greek text of the canons to Sarpi.

---

[101] Ussher to Ward, [1608], printed in *The Correspondence of James Ussher* I, p. 45.
[102] Ibid., note 3.
[103] Ward to Ussher, Cambridge and Wells, 6 July and 1 August 1608, in *The Correspondence of James Ussher* I, pp. 51–64. Boran misidentifies the book referred to as Jacques Merlin's *Quatuor concilia generalia* (Paris, 1524; Cologne, 1530) in this edition.
[104] Ibid., p. 56.
[105] Ibid., p. 58.

In Ward MS I, there is also a draft of a lengthy letter discussing the Greek Councils addressed to Clement Colmore (d. 1619), the chancellor of the diocese of Durham, dated 15 July 1608.[106] This was signed from London, nine days after the first date on the letter to Ussher. Ward had been born near Durham, and he keep in close contact with friends and relations in the North throughout his life.[107] He and Colmore engaged in an extended correspondence, exchanging manuscripts and printed works, including several works of anti-papal jurisdictional polemic, notably George Carleton's *Jurisdiction Regall, Episcopall, Papall* (London, 1610).[108] Ward's letter to Ussher makes clear that his trip to Durham earlier in 1608 (probably the trip around Easter which he mentioned to Bedell) had furnished him with new materials for his enquiries into the canons of the councils. After the discussion of when he received Ussher's letter, Ward adds:

> I have since gott Jacob Merlins edition of Isidores collection, and before that att my beying in the North, I have borrowed out of Durham library, the manuscript of ytt, which is all one with Corpus Canonum in Benet Colledg library; and in the Trinity Colledg library newly erected there is another copy of the same. I got also in the North a fayr transcript of the Greek Canons, which as I understand Erasmus caused to be copyed out of an auncient copy which was brought to Basill, at what tyme the Councell of Basil was held. This copy Erasmus sent to Cuthbert Tunstall Bishop of Durham, wher it hath bene since. Bishop Barnes, who was the Bishop ther since gave yt to his sonne and his sonne to me. Itt is the same with that which is translated by Gentian Harvett, which Balsamon commenteth upon.[109]

Ward was evidently collecting relevant manuscripts and information, drawing on his contexts in England and Ireland, as well as Italy and France. The 'fayr transcript of the Greek Canons' referred to here is still held at Sidney Sussex College as MS 65, 'Mattei

---

[106] Ward to Colmore, London, 15 July 1608, Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fols. 41-6. On Colmore, see R. Helmholz, *The Profession of Ecclesiastical Lawyers: An Historical Introduction* (Cambridge, 2019), pp. 139–44.
[107] See J. Freeman, 'The Parish Ministry in the Diocese of Durham, c. 1570-1640' (Unpublished PhD thesis, Durham, 1979), pp. 33-4.
[108] Colmore to Ward, London, Ascension Day [10 May] 1610, Tanner MS 75, fol. 349r.
[109] Ward to Ussher, Cambridge and Wells, 6 July and 1 August 1608, in *The Correspondence of James Ussher* I, pp. 56–7.

Blastaris de sacris synodis synopsis Graece', which contains a note saying that it was given by Emmanuel Barnes (the son of Richard Barnes, bishop of Durham) to Ward.[110] In his letter to Colmore, Ward explains his latest work on the canons of the councils, stating that he had been 'seriously inquiring into the ancient government of the Church, & of its vestiges unravelled in our times & removed in past centuries' thanks to the efforts of the Pope.[111] The recent Roman edition of the *Corpus iuris canoni*, which included Gratian's *Decretum* and later collections of decretals, represented a culmination of these attempts to increase clerical power.[112] Ward explained how Dionysius Exiguus' preface and counting the number of councils revealed just how limited Dionysius' first edition of the *Codex canonum* had been; he illustrated this material with charts setting out the structure of the canons of the second Council of Constantinople and the number of canons of each of the Greek councils, which totalled 165.[113] The second chart contains notes of the number of canons 'according to my Greek example', which seems to be a reference to the copy of the Greek canons which had reportedly belonged to Cuthbert Tunstall.[114]

---

[110] Cambridge, Sidney Sussex, MS 65, 'Mattei Blastaris de sacris synodis synopsis Graece'. M.R. James misreads the name as Emmanuel Baines in *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1895), p. 48. For Richard and Emmanuel Barnes, see D. Marcombe, 'Barnes, Richard (1532?–1587)', ODNB.

[111] 'sero veterem ecclesiae disciplinam inquirerem, & eius vestigia a nostris temporibus retextis & evolutis retroactis seculis', Ward to Colmore, London, Ides of [15] July 1608, Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, f. 41r.

[112] Ibid., f. 42r; *Corpus juris canonici emendatum et notis illustratum. Gregorii XIII. pont. max. iussu editum* (Rome, 1582). On the 1582 *Corpus iuris canonici*, see M.E. Sommar, *The Correctores Romani* (Zurich, 2009).

[113] See figs. 7 and 8.

[114] 'secundem Graecum meum expemplum', see fig. 1.

Redacted for copyright reasons. Fig. 6 – Chart setting out the structure of the canons of the second Council of Constantinople, in Ward to Colmore, London, 15 July 1608, Cambridge, Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 43r. Copyright: Sidney Sussex College

Redacted for copyright reasons. Fig. 7 – Chart adding up the number of canons of each of the Greek councils, in ibid., fol. 43r. Copyright: Sidney Sussex College

After his discussion of Dionysius, Ward adds, 'It is not necessary for me to illustrate this by conjectures alone, for that very Codex that Dionysius collected still exists in the ancient libraries of France and Italy.'[115] It seems that he was building a network of informants who would give him access to these manuscripts.

[115] 'Non opus est ut solis conjecturis nitamur, nam ipse Codex a Dionysio collectus adhuc extat in Vestustis Galliae & Italiae Bibliothecis', Ward to Colmore, London, Ides of [15] July 1608, Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 42r.

Leschassier's *Consultatio* had clearly encouraged Ward to think deeply about how to historicise papal power. The question remains how far information from Sarpi shaped these enquiries. It is certainly true that Sarpi, Ward and Ussher were all interested in combining Leschassier's account with the testimony of Scythian monk, Dionysius Exiguus, who had produced the first edition of the canons of the councils in Latin (translated from the original Greek). Dionysius's work had a complex transmission history, including a second version which he appears to have revised himself.[116] The first edition of the text had included a prefatory letter to Stephen, bishop of Salona, which survived in multiple copies and had been printed in the seventh volume of Baronius's *Annales Ecclesiastici* (1596).[117] In his third volume, Baronius had also who had noted that the 95th and 96th canons of the Council of Chalcedon matched the 16th and 17th of the Council of Antioch, the same observation which had prompted as significant section Leschassier's discussion of the canons of the councils in his *Consultatio*.[118] In neither that work nor his *De la Liberté ancienne et canonique*, however, had Leschassier made any comment on Dionysius's preface. In their letters, Sarpi, Ward and Ussher all comment on this omission, suggesting that closer attention to Dionysius could be the key to proving or disproving Leschassier's conjectures.

It is not immediately clear from the surviving manuscripts whether this thought occurred to all three men independently, or whether it is evidence of one of the three's thoughts being passed on to the others by Bedell. Sarpi brings up Dionysius Exiguus's preface in his letter to Leschassier of 4 September 1607.[119] As we have already established, this letter is likely to predate Ussher's letter to Ward, although we cannot be certain; it certainly predates the discussion between Sarpi and Bedell. Sarpi's letter raises 'two scruples' which he has about Leschassier's discussion.[120] Firstly, he states that he believes Dionysius Exiguus to be a reputable authority who provided an accurate

---

[116] For a critical edition, see C.H. Turner (ed.), *Ecclesiae Occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima: canonum et conciliorum graecorum interpretationes latinae* (Oxford, 1899).
[117] Cesare Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* Vol. 7 (Rome, 1596), p. 136.
[118] Cesare Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* Vol. 3 (Rome, 1592), pp. 489–90; Leschassier, *Consultatio*, esp. pp. 18–25.
[119] Sarpi to Leschassier, Venice, [25 August]/4 September 1607, in *Lettere ai Gallicani*, p. 3.
[120] 'duos scrupolos', ibid., p. 4.

translation of the Greek canons of the councils. He cites Dionysius's statement that his work would set down 'the canons of the Apostles, of the Council of Nicaea, the others which, whether before or after, were made up until the 150 bishops of Constantinople, and comprise 165 headings, as was accepted with authority in Greece.'[121] But, Sarpi continues, if one counts the canons of the Apostles, and of the Councils of Nicaea, Ancyra, Neo-Caesarea, Gangra and 16 canons of the Council of Antioch, this does not give a total of 96. And indeed, with the addition of the Council of Laodicea, the total becomes 184, and the addition of the canons of the Apostles[122] and Constantinople, this number would far exceed 165.[123] Sarpi, unlike Ussher and Ward, was perplexed by Dionysius's numbering. His problems seem to stem from mistakenly believing that Dionysius intended the canons of the Apostles and the canons of the Constantinople to be counted as part of the 165. Sarpi's second concern was the fact that Dionysius's preface made no mention of the canons of the Council of Ephesus.[124] It seems that Leschassier was able to provide answers to Sarpi's questions and Sarpi declared himself satisfied in a subsequent letter dated 26 January/5 February 1608.[125] Sarpi's second observation was also made by Ussher and Ward, with the latter noting that this omission, could be a result of papal manipulation as much as the other suspected additions:

> As for the mutations which came after, councell of Chalcedon and after Justinians edict, I doubt butt the tymes might by diligence be observed, whether they were by subtraction or addition, the leaving out of the Ephesine canons, the altering of the Constantinopolitan, and the cutting off of the 2 or 3 last canons; also the leaving out of the last canon of the councell of Chalcedon, no doubt that was by the Romanists' means, which hence is apparent, in that all

[121] 'canones Apostolorum, Nicaenum Concilium, deinde alia quae sive antea, sive post facta sunt usque ad Constantinopoletanum 150 pontificum, et continere 165 capitula, sicut habetur in graeca auctoritate', ibid.
[122] Sarpi seems to double count the canons of the Apostles, thought this may be a transcription error. I have not been able to check the original. Ibid.
[123] Ibid.
[124] Ibid.
[125] Sarpi to Leschassier, Venice, 26 January/5 February 1608, in *Lettere ai Gallicani*, p. 8.

> these are as yett entyre in the Greek copyes, whereas all the defects are in the Codice Moguntino [*i.e.* the Mainz MS].[126]

Despite the substantial overlap in the discussion between Ward and Ussher and that of Sarpi and Leschassier, it is not possible to prove that the point about Dionysius Exiguus was passed from England to Venice or vice-versa. It remains possible that the same thought occurred to Ward, Ussher and Sarpi separately, and indeed Ward and Ussher each told the other that they had independently made that connection. However, Sarpi and Ward were at least aware that they shared an interest is the topic, even if we cannot be sure how much detailed information Bedell passed from one to the other. It is clear that Ward had first asked Bedell to discuss the Canons of the Council with Sarpi in late August/early September 1607 at the latest (letters between England and Venice took a month to reach their destination, and Bedell must have received the letter by the time he discussed the canons with Sarpi in early October). Ward also asked for more details in a letter to Bedell which cannot have been drafted earlier than 30 August 1608. He thus kept Sarpi in the loop about his sustained interest in the canons across the same twelve-month period in which Sarpi made detailed enquiries of Leschassier on the same theme. Furthermore, it seems that Ward continued to ask Bedell to pass on questions about the councils in the later years of his Venetian chaplaincy: in July 1610, Bedell's letter contains an apology that 'Touching the Forme[?] of the Councells, I yet heare nothing', suggesting that the exchange of opinions on that theme continued.[127] At the very least, it is clear that Sarpi, Ward and Ussher's intellectual interests and political viewpoints were sufficiently close to mean that they reacted to Leschassier's text in

[126] Ward to Ussher, Cambridge and Wells, 6 July and 1 August 1608, in *Correspondence of James Ussher* Vol. 1, p. 53.

[127] Bedell to Ward, Venice, 23 July 1610, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 354r. In a postscript to the same letter, Bedell adds further responses to Ward's enquiries in another letter he had just received dated June 1610, including a promise to enquire 'of Angelus Roccha and send you it as soon as I can' (fol. 354v), a reference to the Angelo Rocca (1546–1620), founder of the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome. It is not clear what enquiry Ward wanted Bedell to make (a request for a copy of a work by Rocca, or an enquiry about manuscripts held in Rocca's library?), but it may well have been a continuation of a search for information on the councils. In any case, it is evidence of Ward's serious scholarly interest in Italian intellectual culture, and Sarpi is likely to have been Bedell's source of information on Rome's literary elite.

near-identical ways. All three men viewed the canons of the early Church as a crucial battleground against papal distortions and incursions into temporal power.

The purpose of Leschassier's text was to argue that the modern ecclesiastical councils had introduced deep corruption into the Church, and that there needed to be a conscious effort to return to the purity of the early Church, as expressed in the first four ecumenical councils.[128] This was a scholarly and polemical endeavour of significance to Sarpi, Ward and Ussher alike. Tracing the corruption of the Catholic Church as a historical phenomenon was a shared interest at the heart of Anglo-Venetian interactions as early as 1607–8, over a decade before it received its best-known expression in Sarpi's *Historia del Concilio tridentino*.

VII

An account of the Venetian Connection at the Jacobean court must take into account a number of Italian converts who moved to England in the period. However, it is clear that bringing converts back to England was a task that was approached with a level of caution and ambivalence. The ever-present threat of reconversion and concern that converts who moved from one country to another were showing disloyalty to their state – and thus may soon be disloyal to their adopted state too – meant that converts were generally only welcomed if they were also viewed as involuntary exiles, who faced immediate threats to their lives if they stayed in their own countries. Five particularly noteworthy Italian converts moved to England as a consequence of the activities of Wotton and his successor in Venice, Sir Dudley Carleton: Gasparo Despotini (known in England as Jaspar Despotine), a Venetian doctor; Giovanni Francesco Biondi, a Dalmatian Protestant convert who acted as a courier for Wotton; two Carmelite friars, Giulio Cesare Vanini and Battista Maria Genocchi; and, most famously, Marc'Antonio de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalato. Sarpi himself received an invitation to England from King James in 1612, which (as we shall see) he politely refused.

The English were more wary of bringing converts back to England in this period than has often been recognised. These five Italian Protestants were not welcomed to

[128] Leschassier, *Liberté de l'Eglise Gallicane*, p. 30.

England as converts *per se*, but rather as members of a narrower category: that of the religious exile. In recent years, there has been increasing recognition of the distinctive role played by religious exiles in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe.[129] Such figures, notably Giacomo Castelvetro and Giovanni Diodati (both members of second-generation Italian Protestant refugee families), assisted the English embassy with its activities in Venice. The number of religious exiles seeking refuge across Europe had substantially increased during the sixteenth-century Wars of Religion, but war was not the only force creating religious exiles: Italian Protestants fled papal persecution. Thus, even during peacetime, the search for religious refuge provided a well-established template enabling geographical and ecclesiastical movement. This was the language in which the Italian Protestants sent to England by Wotton and Carleton were discussed.

The term 'refugee' did not enter English usage until the arrival of the French Huguenot refugees of the late seventeenth century. The language of 'seeking refuge' was, however, well known. Importantly, people who 'sought refuge' had left their own countries because of necessity and persecution. Had they instead left out of personal choice, they would have been open to accusations of disloyalty. Why would someone willing to abandon one Church and secular ruler not also abandon another? Were their convictions really sincere, or were they converting for material gain? But as those who sought refuge had no real choice, these concerns ceased to apply. We can see a clear example of the language of refuge at work in case of Despotine, who travelled back to England alongside Wotton and Bedell, making a permanent move to Bury St Edmunds (where Bedell lived before and after his time in Venice). Wotton wrote a letter introducing Despotine to his brother-in-law and Suffolk notable, Sir Edmund Bacon, describing the doctor's conversion in proud terms:

> by birth a Venetian, which though it be not *urbs ignobilis* [a lowly city] (as St. Paul said of his own mother-city), yet is his second birth the more excellent; I mean his illumination in God's saving Truth, which was the only cause of his

[129] O.P. Grell, *Brethren in Christ* (Cambridge, 2012); D. Pirillo, *The Refugee-Diplomat: Venice, England, and the Reformation (Ithaca NY, 2018).*

> remove; and I was glad to be the conductor of him where his conscience may be free, though his condition otherwise (till he shall be known) will be the poorer.[130]

Wotton here offers St Paul as a model for Despotine's conversion. Once again, however, the words 'conversion' or 'convert' are not used, with Wotton preferring the terms 'illumination' and 'truth'. Wotton emphasises that Despotine's motives were purely spiritual, and that in the short term he would be worse off, freeing him from any imputation that he had converted for material gain: he simply wanted to live a quiet life according to his conscience. In this Despotine succeeded, dying a wealthy and well-respected local doctor.[131]

However, Despotine's success in England was unusual. Of the five Italians named above, three – Vanini, Genocchi and De Dominis – would revert to the Church of Rome. This frequency of reconversions was not for want of caution on the English side. Converts who announced an interest in moving to England were carefully examined before help was offered. As Carleton explained, he assisted the two Carmelites only after they gave

> so good an account of themselves, both for their reasons grounded upon good learning of their relinquishing the Church of Rome as likewise for their resolution… of entering and preserving in ours, that I must confess I presumed more of them than of many others who have offered themselves to me in the same kind.[132]

---

[130] Wotton to Bacon, Westminster, 2 April 1611, printed in LPS I, pp. 505–6.
[131] For Despotine in Suffolk, see T.W. Jones, *A true relation of… William Bedell* (London, 1872), pp. 125–8. His estate was valued at over £2,000 at his death, 'Probate Inventory of Jasper Despotin', 27 July 1650, Suffolk Record Office, IC/500/3/3/53. He also donated two books to Bury St Edmunds Cathedral Library which are preserved there with his signature on the flyleaf: Francisco de Toledo, *Instructio sacerdotum ac poenitentium* (Cologne, 1621), shelf mark CLC T716; William of Auvergne, *Opera omnia* (Venice, 1591), shelf mark CLC G1235.
[132] Carleton to Chamberlain, Venice, 11 March 1613/14, SP 99/15, fol. 164v.

Nonetheless, Carleton's expectations were to be disappointed. After moving to England, the initially enthusiastic Carmelites became rather less enamoured of its Church. The Carmelites claimed genuine doctrinal disagreement; their English hosts alleged that it was really a matter of unsatisfied demands for monetary rewards.[133] Either way, Vanini and Genocchi fled to France in 1614, claiming never truly to have left the Church of Rome.

In the wake of Vanini and Genocchi's relapse, we find Biondi too being viewed with some suspicion by Archbishop Abbot in a letter to Carleton:

> I know nothing by Signor Francesco Biondi but good, and therefore I will hope the best. But heereafter wee shall be wary how wee hastily intertaine the Convertitoes of that nation, so inestimable hath bene the hypocrisye and lewdnesse, of the two Carmelites lately remaining with us.[134]

Abbot's choice of words underlines the fact that the category of refugee was preferable to that of the convert. His use of the term 'convertito' to describe the duplicitous Carmelites stands in contrast to Wotton's description of Despotine, which emphasised the doctor's sincerity by noting that he sought only to live according to his 'conscience', despite immediate financial uncertainty. A religious exile was acting out of necessity for their own survival, whereas a convert (still more an Italianate *convertito*) risked seeming changeable and thus faithless to all.

In fact, Biondi would not disappoint. For both Biondi and Despotine, sixteenth-century religious exiles had set useful precedents for building a new life in England. Biondi integrated into the broader Calvinist internationalist network dominated by older religious refugee families, marrying the daughter of Théodore de Mayerne, James's Royal Physician and a prominent French Calvinist.[135] He and Despotine stayed in contact; Biondi visited Bury St. Edmunds in the autumn of 1613, presumably lodging

---

[133] C.F. Senning, 'Vanini and the Diplomats, 1612-1614', *Historical Magazine* 54 (1985), pp. 219-39.
[134] Abbot to Carleton, Lambeth, 30 March [1613], SP 14/72, fol. 172r.
[135] H. Trevor-Roper, *Europe's Physician: The Various Life of Sir Theodore de Mayerne* (New Haven, 2006), p. 257.

with Despotine or Bedell, and stayed for over a month, writing that if he had the choice, he would choose to live there.[136] Like many sixteenth-century exiles, both men sought to make their own living, rather than relying on support from the Court or Church alone: Despotine prospered as a doctor, and though Biondi worked for James as a diplomatic agent, he also found other sources of income, including the publication of romances and histories.

It might appear surprising that Marc'Antonio De Dominis was welcomed to England in 1616, just two years after the messy reconversions of Vanini and Genocchi. However, this becomes easier to comprehend once we appreciate just how effectively he deployed the languages of 'reform' and 'refuge' when presenting his case. In his letters to Carleton discussing his potential move, he stated that he sought only 'some refuge in [his] persecutions'.[137] It was reported in the Venetian Senate on 9 October 1616 that De Dominis had claimed 'his intention was not to depart from the Catholic religion', and in the manifesto he published on leaving Italy, he insisted that he was not guilty of 'Schisme': 'I forsake errors, I shunne abuses and corruptions; these, and nothing else I flie.'[138] In his first sermon in England he repeated these claims, emphasising that the 'Reformed' and 'Romane' religions were the same in 'essentials'.[139] All this was in keeping with the understanding of 'reform' and 'refuge' we have seen elsewhere. Indeed, De Dominis did not claim to be converting on his return to Rome either, instead framing his return as a belated recognition that the Protestant Reformation was made 'in Schisme', and thus at fault.[140] De Dominis continued to insist, however, that he had stayed of 'one and the same minde… without

[136] Biondi to [Carleton], London, 21 October 1613, SP 14/74, fol. 169r.
[137] 'in persecutionibus meis refugiam aliquod', De Dominis to Carleton, Venice, 7 September 1614, SP 99/17, fol. 72r; W.B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 229.
[138] 'il suo fine non essere di partirsi dalla religione cattolica', quoted in S. Ljubić, 'O Markantunu Dominisu Rabljaninu', *Rad Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti* 10 (1870), p. 120; Marc'Antonio de Dominis, *A Manifestation* (London, 1616), p. 48 [first published in Latin, *Causae profectionis suae ex Italia* (s.l., 1616)].
[139] Marc'Antonio de Dominis, *A sermon preached in Italian* (London, 1617), p. 31.
[140] Malcolm, *De Dominis*, pp. 62–3.

any change' before and after coming to England; it was only his knowledge of the facts that had changed.[141]

James's invitation to Sarpi in 1612 was also framed as an offer of refuge, with the King writing that he viewed it as one mark of royal power to be able 'to protect and favor persons of quality'.[142] Sarpi's polite refusal embraces the same idiom, with the Servite making clear that he was not currently in need of a refuge, but that if the situation changed he would gladly avail himself of James's 'favour and protection'. Until then, his duty was to Venice: 'I think myself obliged by civil duty to continue serving my Patron [Venice] so long as my service is acceptable to him.'[143] James would surely have understood and entirely approved the Servite's sentiments. Framing a move to England around the idea of refuge, rather than conversion, allowed a desire for a religious reform to coexist alongside continued civil loyalty. Herein lay its value for Sarpi and James alike.

VIII

The final years of Giacomo Castelvetro are also indicative of both the depth of the Anglo-Venetian connections forged in these years, and of the damage that the death of Prince Henry did to the Venetian Connection's influence. Castelvetro was an Italian Protestant exile, who had fled Italy in young adulthood, following in the footsteps of his uncle, the well-known humanist Ludovico.[144] Like many sixteenth-century Italian Protestant exiles, Castelvetro travelled widely. Indeed, like the Diodatis, the Castelvetros can be considered one of the successful 'Calvinist International' families,

---

[141] *M. Ant. de D[omi]nis Arch-bishop of Spalato, his shiftings in religion* (London, 1624), p. 43.

[142] James to Carleton, Greenwich, 22 June 1612, SP 99/10, f. 58v; printed in E. Levi, 'King James I and Fra Paolo Sarpi in 1612', *The Athenaeum* 3869 (July 1898), p. 66.

[143] 'gratia e protettione', 'riputo esser in obligo per debito civile di perseuerar servando il mio Patrone sin che la mia servitù li è accetta', Sarpi to Carleton, Venice, 14 August 1612, SP 99/10, fol. 170v–71r; Levi, 'King James', p. 67.

[144] Castelvetro's autobiographical notes are preserved in BL, Harley MS 3344, Giacomo Castelvetro, Album amicorum. Valuable work on Castelvetro includes K.T. Butler, 'Giacomo Castelvetro 1546-1616', *Italian Studies* 5 (1950), pp. 1–42; P. Ottolenghi, *Giacopo Castelvetro esule Modenese nell'Inghilterra di Shakespeare* (Pisa, 1982); M.L. De Rinaldis, *Giacomo Castelvetro, Renaissance Translator: An Interface Between English and Italian Culture* (Lecce, 2003); Pirillo, *The Refugee Diplomat*, pp. 118–41.

who managed to capitalise on the challenges of exile and become important and influential advocates for the Protestant cause, operating across national borders.[145] Diego Pirillo has recently rightly placed Castelvetro within a longstanding tradition of Italian 'refugee diplomats' who shaped English religious policy from the reign of Henry VIII through to the early seventeenth-century.[146] Castelvetro was a notable member of the Elizabethan Italian community in London, who worked closely with the printer John Wolfe. Castelvetro was source and editor of many of Wolfe's Italian books, including Wolfe's complete edition of the works of Pietro Aretino, and probably also the controversial Italian editions of Machiavelli's *Il Principe* and his *Discorsi*, which Wolfe printed under a false imprint in 1584.[147] Interestingly, however, he first got to know James as King of Scotland; having travelled to Edinburgh, he became the young King's Italian tutor in 1592.[148]

Castelvetro made a particularly significant, but to date little recognised, contribution to anti-papal jurisdictional polemic through his work as the literary executor of Thomas Lüber, the Swiss scholar better known as Erastus, whose complaints against the power of excommunication gave us the much-abused term 'Erastianism'. Castelvetro married Erastus's widow, Isotta, in Basle in 1587. As a consequence, he gained control of the German doctor's unpublished manuscripts and it was Castelvetro who subsequently edited and published the first printed edition of Erastus's now well-known work on excommunication, *Explicatio Gravissimae Quaestionis*, at London in 1589.[149] Erastus' political thought had a complex later reception history in England, coming to be substantially reinterpreted during the Civil

---

[145] The Castelvetro family is thus similar to those discussed in O.P. Grell, *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, 2011), though not included in that study.
[146] Pirillo, *The Refugee Diplomat*, esp. pp. 118–41.
[147] For Castelvetro's activities as Wolfe's editor, see K. De Rycker, 'The Italian Job: John Wolfe, Giacomo Castelvetro and Printing Pietro Aretino', in *Specialist Markets in the Early Modern Book World* (Leiden, 2015), ed. R. Kirwan and S. Mullins, pp. 241–57. A strong case for Castelvetro as the driving force behind the editions of Machiavelli is made in P. Ottolenghi, *Giacopo Castelvetro esule Modenese nell'Inghilterra di Shakespeare* (Pisa, 1982), pp. 39–43.
[148] Butler, 'Castelvetro', p. 14.
[149] Thomas Erastus, *Explicatio Gravissimae Quaestionis utrum Exommunicatio . . . mandato nitatur Divino, an excogitata sit ab hominibus* ([London], 1589), [ed. Giacomo Castelvetro].

War.[150] In its original form, however, the main thrust of his argument is of the danger of spiritual authorities interfering in temporal affairs. His arguments against excommunication on these grounds had clear resonance with the arguments the Venetian anti-papal party made against the Interdict. It appears that Castelvetro and Wolfe published the *Explicatio* with the direct support of John Whitgift, the then archbishop of Canterbury.[151] The work was controversial in European Reformed circles, because it was critical of Theodore Beza, who had not wanted it published. For Whitgift, however, Erastus's tract had great value as a defence against Presbyterian religious government.

Following the death of his wife in Edinburgh in 1594, Castelvetro travelled first to Denmark and Sweden, and then, in 1598, back to Venice, where he remained until 1612.[152] It is clear that he worked closely with Wotton's first embassy, and he clearly had a good relationship with William Bedell, with whom he corresponded.[153] While in Venice, Castelvetro worked for and lodged with the Venetian bookseller Giovanni Battista Ciotti.[154] Ciotti himself is a somewhat ambiguous figure: Wotton refers to him as a contact of the English embassy, but as 'of all owre Stationers the most Jesuitical'.[155] By this, Wotton seems to have meant that Ciotti was willing to equivocate and ally with whoever would give him a commercial advantage. On at least one occasion, Ciotti informed on Roberto Meietti, the leading anti-papal publisher of the Interdict period; but in 1599, Ciotti had himself been arrested (alongside Meietti) for smuggling copies

[150] See, in particular, C.D. Gunnoe, *Thomas Erastus and the Palatinate: A Renaissance Physician in the Second Reformation* (Leiden, 2011), pp. 406–10.
[151] For Wickliffe's support, and the reaction to the publication of Erastus's *Explicatio*, see ibid., pp. 388–91, esp. p. 389 note 53. Despite Whitgift's support, the work was printed with a false imprint, perhaps because Castelvetro and Wolfe hoped to avoid some of Beza's ire.
[152] Isotta's will is preserved in BL, Harl. MS 7004, fols. 21r-2v; Butler, 'Castelvetro', pp. 16–17.
[153] Only one of these letters survives (Bedell to Castelvetro, Padua, 24 January/3 February 1611, TNA, SP 85/3, fol. 74r). Castelvetro also made a note of a letter which he sent to Bedell in late 1611 or early 1612, which is no longer extant. Castelvetro's list of correspondence sent between October 1611 and May 1612 is preserved in BL, Harl. MS. 3344, fols. 132r–4v; noted and discussed in Butler, 'Castelvetro', p. 31.
[154] Pirillo, *The Refugee Diplomat*, p. 154
[155] Wotton to Salisbury, Venice, 18/28 August 1609, TNA, SP 99/5, fol. 296v; LPS I, p. 469.

of the *Madgeburg Centuries*.[156] Even if driven by commercial rather than ideological imperatives, Ciotti played an important role in enabling the publication of anti-papal texts during the crucial post-Interdict period of Anglo-Venetian exchange.

Castelvetro's position in Venice became less secure as the hopes of the Venetian anti-papal party faded. Bedell wrote to him in early 1611, recognising Castelvetro's increasingly exposed position and suggesting that he return to England.[157] Castelvetro did not take this advice, but Bedell's words proved unfortunately prescient when Castelvetro was imprisoned by the Inquisition the following year.[158] On his release after Catleton's intervention, Castelvetro left Italy for the last time, seeking a permanent refuge in England. Castelvetro evidently hoped that he could make a living in the service of the English Court in London. In England, Castelvetro drew on the support of various friends, including Sir John Harington, to whom he had acted as an Italian tutor in Venice, and Sir Adam Newton, whom he will have known through Harington. Castelvetro lived with Newton during his final years, and it was thus Newton who was left in possession of Castelvetro's manuscript archive after the Italian's death in 1616.[159] In turn, these manuscripts passed to Newton's son, Sir Henry Puckering (who had taken the name of his uncle, Sir Thomas Puckering), who left them to Trinity College, Cambridge, where they remain today.[160]

The cache of Castelvetro manuscripts at Trinity is a valuable source for the history of Anglo-Venetian relations, the significance of which has gained increasing recognition since the early work of Kathleen Butler, up to the recent analysis offered by Diego Pirillo.[161] It offers further evidence for the existence of an influential network of individuals whose world view was particularly shaped by an anti-papal interpretation of the Venetian Interdict controversy in these years. During his time working at Ciotti's

---

[156] D.E. Rhodes, *Giovanni Battista Ciotti (1562–1627?): Publisher Extraordinary at Venice* (Venice, 2013), p. 63; P.F. Grendler, *The Roman Inquisition and the Venetian Press, 1540–1605* (Princeton, 1977), p. 280.
[157] Bedell to Castelvetro, Padua, 24 January/3 February 1611, TNA, SP 85/3, fol. 74r; see also Pirillo, *The Refugee Diplomat*, p. 161.
[158] For the fullest account of this episode, see Butler, 'Castelvetro', pp. 26–30.
[159] Butler, 'Castelvetro', p. 38.
[160] See J. Broadway, 'Puckering [formerly Newton], Sir Henry, third baronet (bap. 1618, d. 1701)', ODNB.
[161] Butler, 'Castelvetro', pp. 1–42; Pirillo, *The Refugee Diplomat*, pp. 118–41.

shop, Castelvetro edited a number of manuscripts which he appears to have intended for publication, which can be found preserved amongst the papers he left with Newton.[162] It is also amongst Castelvetro's papers that we find the manuscript copy of the Italian version of Sarpi's annotations to Edwin Sandys's *Relation*, which were discussed in the previous chapter.[163] This manuscript copy of Sarpi's annotations to Sandys's *Relation* must have been produced well before the Geneva edition was printed, and proves that the text had some manuscript circulation.[164] Another glimpse of Castelvetro role in Venice is provided by a list of books seized from the factor of the Venetian printer Roberto Meietti by papal agents in October 1606, while the Interdict was still in force. Amongst the seizures were two copies of Castelvetro's edition of Erastus' *Explicatio*, one of which was inscribed to Sarpi.[165] This seems likely to have been a delivery Castelvetro arranged himself. It certainly provides evidence that contemporaries drew the link between Sarpi's case in the Interdict controversy and Erastus' arguments against the abuse of excommunication in his *Explicatio*. It is clear that Castelvetro played a longstanding role in producing and distributing works linked to the activities of the Anglo-Venetian network in Venice.

Even after his final exile from Venice, Castelvetro continued to focus on producing translations on anti-papal themes, and with a Venetian audience in mind. During his time in Paris in 1612, he produced an Italian translation of John Barclay's refutation of the French Dominican Nicholas Coeffeteau's reply to James's 'Premonition' in the 1609 *Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance.*[166] Barclay's work had been printed in French by the King's printer John Norton in 1610 as part of James's

---

[162] These include several works Thomas Campanella, which had been entrusted to Ciotti, see Butler, 'Castelvetro', p. 22; TCC, MS R.4.39, works of Campanella.
[163] TCC, MS R.4.36, 'Relatione delle essere della Religione', fols. 43r–8r.
[164] See Chapter 3.
[165] 'Per il Reverendo Prete Paolo de Servi Theologo del Senato. Vinetia', quoted in P.F. Grendler, 'Books for Sarpi: the smuggling of prohibited books into Venice during the Interdict of 1606–1607', in *Essays presented to Myron P. Gilmore* (Florence, 1978), eds. S. Bertelli and G. Ramakus, p. 109. The other copy was addressed to Giacopo di Lorenzo Barrozzi, an associate of Sarpi's. The list is preserved at the Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Fondo Borghese IV, Vol. 12, fols. 157r–58v.
[166] TCC, MS R.4.36, 'Replica al signor Coeffetteau', fols. 139r–91v; Barclay's original published as [John Barclay], *Replique au sieur Coeffeteau, sur sa responce à l'aduertissement du roy aux princes & potentats de la Chrestienté* (London, 1610). Butler mistakenly identifies this text as Coeffeteau's own reply to James in 'Castelvetro', p. 31.

efforts to defend his stance in the Oath of Allegiance controversy; a note of Castelvetro's at the end of this copy of the translation adds that on 24 November 1615 he had finished a fair copy 'to send to the faithful who dwell in Venice'.[167] After his return to England, Castelvetro translated James's *Remonstrance for the Right of Kings* (1615) into Italian, apparently hoping to receive financial patronage in return.[168] In this, he would be disappointed; this was perhaps a function of a period of suspicion following the disappointing reconversion of Genocchi and Vanini, which led to increased suspicion of Italians in England. More significantly, however, it also appears to be indicative of the sharp loss of influence of the circle around Prince Henry after the Prince's death – a process which was quickened by the death of Harington, Henry's close friend, soon afterwards. As well as his relations with Newton and Harington, Castelvetro also had a close relationship with Lucy Russell, Countess of Bedford, Harington's sister. The most charming product of Castelvetro's last years in England was an Italian manuscript work entitled 'A Brief Account of all the Roots, Herbs and Fruits eaten raw or cooked in Italy', written in 1614, which he dedicated to the Countess.[169] This fascinating document is testament to the breadth of cultural interests displayed by the members of the Venetian Connection. Wotton and Bedell were both interested in plants and gardens, and it is likely that an interest in these matters – like Venetian art and architecture – smoothed the way for the acceptance of more polemical Venetian writings amongst the Jacobean elite.[170] In the manuscript work addressed to

---

[167] 'per mandarla a fedeli, che in Vinetia si dimorano', TCC, MS R.4.36, 'Replica al signor Coeffetteau', fol. 191v.

[168] BL, Royal MS 14 A XIV, James VI & I, 'Dichiaratione del serenissimo re della Gran Bretagna . . . per la ragione dei re et per la independenza delle loro corone', trans. Giacomo Castelvetro. The text includes a dedicatory letter from Castelvetro to James, dated London, 22 October 1615; a second holograph copy of the letter is preserved in BL, Lansdowne MS 93, fol. 59r; another holograph copy of the translation is held at TCC, MS R.5.23; see also Butler, 'Castelvetro', p. 40.

[169] TCC, MS R.3.44a, MS R.3.44b and MS R.14.19, Giacomo Castelvetro, 'Brieve Raccontro di tutte le Radici, di tutte l'Herbe e di tutti i Frutti che crudi o cotti in Italia si mangiano'; printed in English translation as Giacomo Castelvetro, *The fruit and Vegetables of Italy* (London, 1989) ed. J. Grigson. As well as the three copies held at TCC, Kathleen Butler identifies a further 3 extant copies and one copy known in the nineteenth century, suggesting the work had a wide circulation. See K.T. Butler, 'An Italian's message to England in 1614: "Eat more fruit and vegetables"', *Italian Studies* 2 (1938), p. 4 note 11.

[170] Wotton published his thoughts on architecture and gardens in Henry Wotton, *The Elements of Architecture* (London, 1624); Bedell's interest in gardening runs through his correspondence. See, for instance, his request for Ward to ask Chaderton 'if he will bestow upon me 2 or 3 of his white Mulbery

her, Castelvetro complains of English reluctance to eat enough fruit and vegetables, and expresses his hope that a better acquaintance with the wide array plant matter eaten in Italy would make the English more enthusiastic about the idea. The work was well-suited to the interests of the Countess, and it may well be that if the Countess had not been suffering her own financial difficulties and a fall from grace at Court, she would have offered Castelvetro the support he needed in the run-up to his death, continuing the support provided by her brother John before his untimely death.[171]

In fact, however, this was not to be, and Castelvetro spent his last months beset by ill-health and poverty. He briefly took up a post teaching Italian at Cambridge and wrote a manuscript work of Italian conversational phrases translated into English for his students, which is preserved in two copies amongst the Puckering papers.[172] However, it seems that Castelvetro's always weak constitution would not allow him to continue in this role, and he retired in ill health, still hoping – in vain – to receive some level of pension from the public purse. Castelvetro died a man with no money and little influence: his story is therefore also an example of the limitations of the hold possessed by the Venetian Connection on court patronage by the middle of the 1610s.

IX

Wotton was succeeded as Ambassador to Venice by Sir Dudley Carleton, who was subsequently English appointed English Ambassador to The Hague, and thus acted as an important conduit for information about the Synod for observers in both England and Venice. It is well known that Carleton was personally critical of Wotton: in his

---

trees', and for Ward himself 'to get me some graftes out of Emmanuel College orchard of the tymely Cherries', in Bedell to Ward, Bury St Edmunds, 17 February 1619, Bodl., Tanner MS 74, fol. 164v; *Two Biographies,* p. 258. English interest in Venetian art (and particularly the case of Prince Henry) is discussed above. The Countess of Bedford's own interest in Italy is attested by the inclusion of a number of works on Italian history and architecture, which are found amongst the works she donated to Sidney Sussex: Thomas de Fougasses, *The general historie of the magnificent state of Venice: from the first foundation thereof untill this present* (London, 1612), shelf mark L.3.26; Vitruvius, *De architectura libri decem* (Venice, 1567), shelf mark H.2.30.

[171] For the financial difficulties of Lucy, Countess of Bedford, following the death of her father and brother, see H. Payne, 'Russell [née Harington], Lucy, countess of Bedford (bap. 1581, d. 1627)', ODNB.

[172] TCC, MS R.10.6 and MS R.10.7, 'Libretto di varie materie di parlare della Italica' and incomplete fair copy (missing the English); see also discussion in Butler, 'Castelvetro', pp. 34–7.

detailed, gossipy correspondence with John Chamberlain, Carleton regularly referred to Wotton as 'Fabritio', a nickname based on Wotton's penchant for drama and – in Carleton's view – fabrication. However, it is important not to overstate the significance of Carleton's dislike of his predecessor. Despite finding Wotton personally irritating, Carleton's religious and political sympathies were broadly similar to those of his predecessor.[173]

During his time in Venice, he both built on the networks Wotton had established and drew further individuals into the Anglo-Venetian orbit. Particularly prominent in Carleton's network were former members of Merton College. This knot of Mertonians would, like the knot of Emmanuel men seen in the previous chapter, sustain a lasting interest in Venice. Carleton's wife, Anne, was the stepdaughter of Sir Henry Savile, a mathematician and classical scholar highly regarded across Europe, Warden of Merton and Provost of Eton (a post to which Carleton would later try to be appointed himself, but lose to Wotton).[174] Carleton was close to his father-in-law, and before moving to Venice he had lived with him at Eton, assisting with Savile's work on what would become his impressive edition of the works of St John Chrysostom.[175] Savile and Carleton were instrumental in giving a number of individuals from their Merton and Eton circles prominent roles in Anglo-Venetian relations. This Merton-Eton grouping can be distinguished from the Cambridge-Suffolk milieu which united Wotton and Bedell. However, as Ward's letters to Bedell (which mentioned both Savile and Savile's Oxford associate, Thomas James) show, these circles overlapped.[176] Furthermore, like the figures we have traced in Cambridge and Suffolk, Savile's Oxford and Eton network was characterised by a commitment to both conformity and a self-consciously Reformed theological stance. Overall, Wotton and Carleton embassies were

[173] Robert Hill offers a useful rejoinder to claims that Wotton and Carleton were 'enemies' in R. Hill, 'Art and Patronage: Sir Henry Wotton and the Venetian Embassy 1604–1624', in *Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, 2011), eds. M. Keblusek and B.V. Noldus, p. 39 note 63.
[174] R.D. Goulding, 'Savile, Sir Henry (1549–1622)', ODNB.
[175] See Sir Dudley Carleton to John Chamberlain, Eton, 11 December 1608, TNA, SP 14/38, fol. 22r.
[176] Ward to Bedell, [Cambridge?], [October? 1608], Sidney Sussex, Ward MS I, fol. 53r. Carleton also continued to make use of non-Mertonian employees of Wotton's, including Gregorio Monti, who stayed in close contact with Carleton after the ambassador's move to The Hague in 1616. See Monti's letters to Carleton in SP 99.

underpinned by similar theological and political agendas, despite the ambassadors' differing personalities.

The preface to his Savile's Chrysostom includes a statement of thanks to 'the celebrated ambassadors of our most serene King at the courts of foreign princes'.[177] The blanket thanks for the ambassadors covers help he received during both Wotton and Carleton's embassies to Venice.[178] In 1614, Carleton presented a copy of his father-in-law's complete edition to the Collegio, which is still held in the Biblioteca Marciana today.[179] The work was well received.[180] Carleton appears to have seen Savile's volumes as a means to both magnify James's image in the eyes of the Venetians, and to assuage Venetian fears that the Church of England was a factious and divisive influence on European religious debate. The use of Chrysostom as a shared authority is particularly striking, as William Bedell had turned to Chrysostom for much the same reasons during his meetings with Sarpi and Micanzio a few years earlier.[181] Here again we see the Venetian Connection united by a shared fascination with ecclesiastical history.

X

Thus, from 1607 onwards, a substantial number of individuals at the Court of James VI & I took a close interest in Venetian affairs. They viewed close relations with Venice as an important central plank of a firmly anti-papal foreign policy. The Reformed

---

[177] 'Serenissimi Regis nostri apud exteros principes clarissimis legatis', John Chrysostom, *Tou en hagiois patros hēmōn Iōannou Archiepiskopou Kōnstantinoupoleōs tou Chrysostomou tōn heuriskomenōn* Vol. 1 (Eton, 1613), ed. Henry Savile, sig. ¶4r. This preface is not included in all editions.

[178] For Wotton and Sarpi's contributions, see LPS I, p. 428; TNA, SP 14/ 8, fol. 53r; see also J.-L. Quantin, 'Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec: Une histoire européenne (1588-1613)', in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters* (Berlin, 2008), eds. M. Wallraff and R. Brändle, pp. 314-15.

[179] CSPV X, 2 Jan. 1613/14; ASV, Collegio, Secreta, Esposizioni Principi, 2 Jan. 1613/14. John Chrysostom, *Tou en hagiois patros hēmōn Iōannou Archiepiskopou Kōnstantinoupoleōs tou Chrysostomou tōn heuriskomenōn*, 8 vols. (Eton, 1613), ed. Henry Savile, BNM Shelf mark: D 049D 090–97. I have not been able to see this copy. The inclusion of the Doge's name is not noted in the Marciana's catalogue.

[180] Carleton to King James, Venice, 3/13 January 1613/14, SP 99/15, fols. 2v–3r. Sarpi also wrote a note in particular praise of Savile's accurate interpretation of history, see next chapter.

[181] One of the texts Bedell had chosen to read and translate into Italian with the friars was Chrysostom's third discourse on Lazarus, which he probably chose for its emphasis on reading the Scriptures. See Bedell to Ward, 30 November 1613, Tanner MS 74, fol. 31r; *Two Biographies*, p. 254.

coterie which took charge of the education of Prince Henry viewed Venice's struggles with the papacy as a valuable case study, through which the Prince's anti-papal instincts could be further strengthened. Venice was chosen as an important stop on the travels of Sir John Harington for the same reason, who in turn reported back to Henry in detail on events unfolding in the maritime republic.

The group of advisors chosen by the king to lead the education of Prince Henry also overlapped with the group that James chose to advise him on the production of his own polemical works in the period. Though Henry's inclinations do seem to have been more militaristic than James's, and the Venetian Connection looked to the Prince to take his father's anti-papal efforts to a new level in his future reign, it is important not to overstate the extent to which Henry's household represented a 'reversionary interest' in the early years of James's reign. Henry's education was led by Reformed conformists, because in the early stages of his reign James viewed individuals with strong sympathies with European Reform, but who also obediently conformed to the Church of England as the best bulwark against the dangers of popery – dangers which the Gunpowder Plot and the Venetian Interdict crisis had both been important in clarifying.

This chapter has also drawn attention to the important role played by Samuel Ward, which has previously gone unnoticed. Samuel Ward was once viewed as a relatively isolated figure in Cambridge. Stark contrasts have been drawn between him and James Ussher, with latter presented as the sole Reformed divine with notable European connections.[182] Far from being an isolated figure in Cambridge, however, Ward appears to have played an important and active role in forging intellectual connections between Venice and England. He requested information from Bedell which he believed to be of particular value, and in at least two cases it appears that this information sent by Bedell was directly inserted into James VI & I's polemical writings. There has recently been fresh interest in Ward's contribution to the translation of the

[182] See in particular, H. Trevor-Roper, 'James Ussher, archbishop of Armagh', in *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays* (London, 1987).

King James Bible; his role in the dissemination of Venetian arguments in the wake of the Interdict also requires greater attention.[183]

Men such as Ward, Montagu, Newton, Wotton and Bedell succeeded in bringing Venetian arguments to bear at the centre of royal government. We will continue to see the intellectual tendrils of this group entwined in political controversies stretching into 1630s and even beyond. All did not go entirely to plan. Prince Henry's untimely death in 1612, and James's increasing reluctance to lend military support to cause of European Protestantism were both sources of grave disappointment. Nonetheless, the influence of this group's thinking was substantial and long-lasting. The Reformed interest in Venice at the Jacobean Court is therefore indicative of the wealth of theological and political positions available within the English Reformed tradition, which were always firmly anti-papal but not always so firmly anti-Catholic. Venice's battles with the papacy proved a long-standing and politically important reference point in these debates.

By the mid-1610s, the Venetian Connection's military programme already seemed to have failed: James VI & I sought to continue to pursue diplomatic rather than military solutions toward Spain in Europe, and the death of Prince Henry dashed hopes for a more militarily minded successor. However, the young Prince Charles offered another chance, and James's religious policy was still largely in keeping with that promoted by the Venetian Connection, even if he not did seem as willing to back it up with force as the members of the Connection would have liked. In the second half of the 1610s, then, we move into a new phase of the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian network's influence.

[183] J. A. Miller, 'The Earliest Known Draft of the King James Bible: Samuel Ward's Draft of 1 Esdras and Wisdom 3–4', in *Labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord: Erudition and the Making of the King James Version of the Bible* (Leiden, 2018), ed. M. Feingold, pp. 187–265.

Chapter 5: Venice, England and the Synod of Dort

By the time William Bedell left Venice in early 1611, the chances of the maritime republic breaking with the Papacy already looked increasingly slim. In Venice, the influence of the Venetian anti-papal party in the Collegio and Senate was waning. Nonetheless, though the 1610s would not see a repeat of the drama of Micanzio's sermons, still less the hopes for the foundation of a Venetian Reformed community, close cooperation between the English and the Venetian anti-papal party continued throughout the decade. Wotton's successor in Venice, Sir Dudley Carleton (1574–1632), continued to pay close attention to Sarpi, Micanzio and other members of the Venetian anti-papal party. Carleton had left Italy in 1615 and took up the role of English ambassador to The Hague from 1616. In this capacity, he played an important role at the Synod of Dort (1618–19), alongside several other figures linked to the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian network: Samuel Ward, Joseph Hall and George Carleton (Dudley's cousin) all attended the Synod as members of the English ecclesiastical delegation.[1] Significantly, Carleton also kept in close contact with interested correspondents in Venice. The Synod of Dort was a subject of great interest to Sarpi and Micanzio. As Frances Yates and Gaetano Cozzi noted long ago, it is no coincidence that Sarpi's *Historia del Concilio tridentino* was published in three languages in London in 1619 and 1620 in the immediate aftermath of the Synod.[2] The stories of these two events were closely connected, and contemporaries recognised that there was a parallel to be

[1] On Carleton's role at Dort, see A.H. Marshall, 'Sir Dudley Carleton and English diplomacy in the United Provinces, 1616-1628' (unpublished thesis, Rutgers University, 1978). On the role of the English ecclesiastical delegation, see W.B. Patterson, *James VI and I and the reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 260–90; A. Milton (ed.), *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618-1619)* (Woodbridge, 2005); S. Hampton, 'Samuel Ward and the Defense of Dort in England', in *Beyond Dordt and De Auxiliis: The Dynamics of Protestant and Catholic Soteriology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 2019), eds. J. Ballor, M. Gaetano and D. Sytsma, pp. 200–18.

[2] F.A. Yates, 'Paolo Sarpi's "History of the Council of Trent"', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 7 (1944), pp. 123-43; G. Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo e la «Historia del Concilio tridentino»', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 68 (1956), pp. 559–619; Cozzi and Cozzi, *Opere*, pp. 721–41. The three editions were: [Paolo Sarpi], *Historia del Concilio tridentino* (London, 1619); [Paolo Sarpi], *The Historie of the Councel of Trent* (London, 1620), trans. Nathaniel Brent; [Paolo Sarpi], *Historiae Concilii Tridentini libri octo* (London, 1620), [trans. Adam Newton and William Bedell?].

drawn between Trent, which had been a chance to re-establish unity in the Catholic Church, and Dort, which attempted to combat the forces of disintegration amongst the Reformed.

Sarpi wrote his *Historia del Concilio tridentino* in order to diagnose what had gone wrong in the Catholic Church. It offered a historical account of progressive doctrinal corruptions introduced at the heart of the Church of Rome by overambitious Popes, who had wrongfully usurped powers that rightly belonged to temporal rulers. The anti-papal narrative is a familiar one to readers of Sarpi's earlier writings, including the Interdict pamphlets and the *aggiunte* to Edwin Sandys's *Relation of the State of Religion*. The *Historia del Concilio tridentino*, however, presented this account in a new form that was both more detailed and more dramatic. This was a searing Tacitean critique of the Counter-Reformation papacy, which attracted admiration and opprobrium from a readership across Europe and across confessions. This was one of the most important publishing events of the reign of James VI & I, viewed in England as second only to the King James Bible as a contribution to 'the advancement of true pietie and Religion'.[3] In terms of its European impact, it was surely of even greater significance. Its publication was widely regarded as a major propaganda coup for James, bolstering his claims to be the Reformed champion of Europe and embarrassing the Pope.[4] But it was not aimed only as an attack on papalist Catholicism; Sarpi, and his English patrons, also hoped to influence the course taken by participants in the controversy between the Dutch Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants. The problem which the Synod of Dort aimed to combat was, on Sarpi's interpretation, much the same as that which had been faced at the Council of Trent: a particular faction that threatened to undermine the correct order of spiritual and temporal authority. In a letter of 1620, Archbishop George Abbot described the decrees of the Synod of Dort as an 'antidote to the papists and Jesuits'.[5] As we shall see, this view of the Synod was much the same

[3] For this claim, see Nathaniel Brent, 'Epistle Dedicatorie', in [Sarpi], *Historie of the Councel of Trent*, sig. ¶3v.
[4] On the *Historia* as a coup for James, see especially Patterson, *James VI and I*, pp. 246–51.
[5] George Abbot to the States General, 15/25 June 1620, in *British Delegation*, ed. Milton, p. 380.

as that of Sarpi and Micanzio, who also viewed the threat of Dutch Arminianism as parallel to that of papalism and Jesuitism.

However, this shared Anglo-Venetian conviction that Arminianism and Jesuitism were twin threats has not been widely commented on, nor has the intellectual foundations of this belief been unpicked. Indeed, Sarpi's support for the Counter-Remonstrant, rather than the Remonstrant, case at Dort has struck some observers as deeply surprising. This has led to the suggestion that Sarpi's stance on the Synod was a 'political' rather than a 'religious' judgement. Hugh Trevor-Roper went as far as to say that Sarpi's decision to support 'the bigots of Predestination' over 'the Arminians, the party of liberal Calvinists who were the natural allies of liberal Catholics', was 'on merely intellectual grounds' entirely 'unintelligible', and 'assumes significance only if we see it in a political light', as a judgement made in response to the threat of war.[6] It is true that we should be wary of labelling Sarpi a 'Calvinist' as a consequence of his pronouncements; but, as we have already established, the label 'Calvinist' would equally be too blunt a label for many English supporters of the Counter-Remonstrant stance at Dort – though their support for the Synod was certainly a 'religious' matter.[7] Sarpi returned to the doctrine of human grace repeatedly during his career, and this longstanding and committed insistence on its importance makes clear that it is insufficient to characterise Sarpi's disapproval of the Remonstrant position as a narrowly politique stance, taken because he judged the Counter-Remonstrants to be a more reliable ally against Spain. This shared preoccupation with the doctrine of grace was another area in which Sarpi and Micanzio's views substantially overlapped with those of Reformed conformists at the Court of James VI & I and is crucial to understanding the aims of both English Reformed conformists and anti-papal Venetians in the latter part of James's reign.

In recent years, there has been increasing interest in considering the Synod of Dort within its broader European context. Recent scholarship has emphasised that

---

[6] H.R. Trevor-Roper, *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (Indianapolis IN, 1967), p. 217.
[7] On this point, see earlier chapters, and S. Hampton, *Grace and Conformity: The Reformed Conformist Tradition and the Early Stuart Church of England* (Oxford, 2021), esp. pp. 13–15.

contemporaries often compared the dispute between the Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants, which centred on the question of predestination, to the controversy *de auxiliis* of the 1590s and 1600s, which had seen the Dominicans and Jesuits debate the operation of divine grace between themselves. This comparison emphasised the similarities between the positions of the Counter-Remonstrants and the Dominicans on the one hand (who were caricatured as denying any human agency), and the Remonstrants and the Jesuits on the other (who were lambasted for exalting human freewill above the will of God). However, as the editors of a recent volume of essays observe, such comparisons were not used to purely negative effect, and to assume that they were is to fail to recognise 'the self-conscious catholicity of the Reformed response to Arminianism'.[8] As Anthony Milton puts it, Protestants 'did not read Catholic authors merely in order to refute them'.[9] Reformed writers were willing to acknowledge and cite Dominican authors whose judgements were considered sound; Samuel Ward, for instance, cited the Spanish Dominican Domingo Báñez (1528–1604) in defence of the Synod's decisions.[10] Sarpi and Micanzio's writings on the debate *de auxiliis* and Dort allow us to expand this picture, providing yet more evidence of the close connection between the Catholic and Protestant controversies over grace in this period.

The 'self-conscious catholicity' of the English Reformed response to Dutch Arminianism also underpinned the deep interest of English Calvinists in Sarpi's *Historia del Concilio tridentino*, a work which allowed them to identify the Reformed religion with a purer pre-Tridentine and truly 'Catholic' faith. At the moment of the triumph of a Calvinist interpretation of grace at Dort, the Reformed conformists at the English Court were keen to emphasise a vision of the Church of Rome that was anti-papal, anti-Jesuit and anti-Arminian – all viewed as essentially variants upon the same

---

[8] J. Ballor, M. Gaetano and D. Sytsma, 'Introduction: Augustinian Soteriology in the Context of the Congregatio *De Auxiliis* and the Synod of Dordt', in *Beyond Dordt and De Auxiliis*, p. 2. On the overlap between Dort and *de auxiliis*, see also E. Dekker, 'Was Arminius a Molinist?', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 27 (1996), pp. 337-52.

[9] A. Milton, 'A Qualified Intolerance: The Limits and Ambiguities of Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism', in *Catholicism and Anti- Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (Basingstoke, 1999), ed. A.F. Marotti, p. 94.

[10] Ballor, Gaetano and Sytsma, 'Introduction', p. 7; Samuel Ward, *Gratia discriminans* (London, 1626), pp. 40–41.

form of corruption – but, crucially, not anti-Catholic. Sarpi's historical narrative had much to offer in defence of this vision, and consequently in defence of the settlement reached at Dort.

I

Dudley Carleton spent a substantial proportion of his time in Venice trying to be moved to a more politically significant ambassadorial position elsewhere. However, he was sympathetic to the Republic's hostility to the papacy and continued to cultivate links with the leading members of the anti-papal party. Indeed, in contrast to Wotton, extensive correspondence between Carleton and both Sarpi and Micanzio survives.[11] Carleton's letters also attest to a particular respect for Giovanni Marsilio, another of the leading divines on the Venetian side of the Interdict controversy (though Marsilio hailed from Naples).[12] Marsilio died during the course of Carleton's embassy and, for Carleton, this was a great blow for the hopes that Venice might become a significant anti-papal force in European diplomacy. From 1612 onwards, when Carleton made contact with Sarpi to pass on an offer of refuge from James VI & I, Carleton took a keen interest in Sarpi and Micanzio too.[13] Though Carleton was clear that Venice was unlikely to be making further anti-papal waves on a European stage, he continued to seek Sarpi's advice on geopolitical questions, continuing to pursue the hope of Venice joining a cross-confessional defensive alliance. Carleton also recognised the potential for focussed statements from leading anti-papal Venetians to make a substantial contribution to European confessional debate. To this end, he solicited Sarpi's thoughts on a range of religious and political questions which he deemed particularly important.

---

[11] This correspondence can be found in the relevant volumes of TNA, SP 99; correspondence between Sarpi and Carleton printed in Sarpi, *Opere*, pp. 643–719; correspondence between Micanzio and Carleton printed in M.P. Terzi, 'Una vicenda della Venezia seicentesca: l'amicizia e la corrispondenza tra Fulgenzio Micanzio e Sir Dudley Carleton' (unpublished thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, 1979).
[12] Carleton to Chamberlain, Venice, 7 February 1612, TNA, SP 99/9, fol. 65r. Carleton also facilitated a brief correspondence between Marsilio and Lancelot Andrewes.
[13] James to Carleton, Greenwich, 22 June 1612, TNA, SP 99/10, fol. 58r–v; Sarpi to Carleton, Venice, 14 August 1612, TNA, SP 99/10, fols. 170v–71r; printed in E. Levi, 'King James I and Fra Paolo Sarpi in 1612', *The Athenaeum* 3869 (1898), pp. 66–7.

These statements of opinion from the Servites elucidate with particular clarity the core themes around which Anglo-Venetian cooperation was built in the 1610s.

The opinions which Sarpi gave Carleton included his judgement on the controversial works of the Dutch Remonstrant theologian Conrad Vorstius, the successor to Arminius as professor of divinity at Leiden.[14] James VI & I was deeply concerned by Vorstius' works and wrote against him.[15] Sarpi condemned Vorstius as an innovator, who had stirred up trouble by publishing works which were likely to be misunderstood; the argument bears some resemblance to the reasons Sarpi offered for praising the decisions of Dort in his letter to Daniel Heinsius, which will be discussed later in this chapter. Carleton also sent back to England Sarpi's very favourable judgement on Savile's edition of Chrysostom, and well as a short statement of Sarpi's views on the possibility of Italian marriages for Prince Henry and Princess Elizabeth.[16] Perhaps most intriguing, however, are the views Carleton solicited from Sarpi on a book on the Council of Trent, entitled *Consensus Ecclesiae Catholicae contra Tridentinos* (London, 1613), written by Carleton's cousin, George Carleton, bishop of Llandaff. As Dudley Carleton explained in a letter to his cousin, Sarpi and his Venetian associates had three complaints about his analysis: firstly, that the book suggested that all corruptions of the Church of Rome were products of Council of Trent, rather than a process of longer-term papal corruption; secondly, that he endorsed the authority of traditions, and therefore opened a 'window' for papal corruptions; and thirdly, that he insisted on ordination by bishops only, which Sarpi and Micanzio held to be purely a matter of convention.[17] Interestingly, Sarpi had expressed discomfort with English thinking about episcopal powers as early as 1609, when he wrote in a letter to the French jurist Leschassier:

---

[14] Paolo Sarpi, 'Notes out of Vorstius', TNA, SP 14/65, fols. 145r–7r; printed in Sarpi, *Opere*, pp. 713–19.
[15] See F. Shriver, 'Orthodoxy and Diplomacy: James I and the Vorstius Affair', *The English Historical Review* 85 (1970), pp. 449–74; and the Cozzis' discussion in Sarpi, *Opere*, pp. 701–13.
[16] Both printed in Sarpi, *Opere*, pp. 697–700.
[17] Dudley Carleton to George Carleton, Venice, 20/30 April 1614, SP 14/77 fol. 14r.

> that great power of bishops, allowed under the [English] King, is certainly suspect to me. When either an idle king will be born, or they have an archbishop of great spirit, royal authority will be weakened, and bishops will aspire to absolute rule. I seem to see in England a saddled horse, and predict that it will soon be mounted by an ancient rider.[18]

It is a striking image and one which, with hindsight, reads like a prophetic vision of England's Laudian future. It is not surprising to find Sarpi repeating his earlier objections. But it is important to note how seriously Dudley Carleton took Venetian concerns about excessive episcopal power, suggesting that his cousin George, rather than Paolo Sarpi, was the one who should change his stance. These discussions seem to have encouraged Sarpi in his resolution to produce his own history of the Council.

Sarpi's suspicion of bishops is important because it has been presented as one of the fundamental differences between Sarpi and the English, which stymied cooperation between the two nations once the immediate controversy over the Interdict had blown over. Sarpi's lack of enthusiasm for distinguishing bishops from other clergymen might seem an obvious stumbling-block in communication with James VI & I, who built his monarchy on the principle 'No Bishop, no King' (as he put it in his famous declaration at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604). To treat Sarpi's views on episcopacy as a stark difference between his stance of that of the Church of England, however, is to miss an important element of his appeal in England: in fact, it might reasonably be argued that the way in which the English understood Sarpi's stance on episcopacy made an important contribution to this appeal. Sarpi – like many of the Jacobean Calvinist conformists – feared that appeals to episcopacy could be used to undermine the absolute nature of temporal sovereign power. But by interpreting Sarpi's suspicions as applying specifically to *de iure divino* forms of episcopacy (while assuming that he was less concerned by episcopacy as mere convention – the argument that Carleton has attributed to the Servites in his letter to his cousin George), English

[18] 'episcoporum magna illa potestas, licet sub rege, prorsus mihi suspecta est; ubi vel regem desidem nacti fuerint, vel magni spiritus archiepiscopum habuerint, regia authoritas pessundabitur, et episcopi ad absolutam dominationem aspirabunt. Ego equum ephippiatum in Anglia videre videor, et ascensurum propediem equitem antiquum divino', Sarpi to Leschassier, Venice, 6 January 1609, *Lettere ai Gallicani*, p. 37.

conformists found one way in which potential tensions between episcopal and royal power could be reconciled. It was also this same analysis of Church government which would make Sarpi so appealing to authors interested in the theme of 'civil religion' later in the seventeenth century and into the early eighteenth.

Doctrines of *de iure divino* episcopacy in early seventeenth-century England and Venice are decidedly difficult to unpick. Divine-right thinking about the role of the clergy can be broken down into multiple categories. The Interdict controversy had revolved around the question of *clerical* divine right, while the question of *episcopal* divine right entailed its own set of difficulties. Furthermore, even within the categories of clerical or episcopal divine right, the nature of the divine right being advocated varied. It was possible to believe that episcopacy was supported by apostolic authority without believing that it was an immutable divinely ordained necessity; however, this justification *de iure apostolico* was often described as a form of 'divine right' by its proponents, because it was still rooted in divine authority, albeit as a recommendation, which could be adapted to particular circumstance, rather than as a rigid prescription.[19] There was, then, uncertainty about exactly what sort of 'divine right' was being discussed.

William Bedell in his writings very clearly rejects the stronger interpretation of 'divine right'. In his 'Defence of the Answer', written in 1604, Bedell had taken a clear stance against this view of episcopacy. In this manuscript work, Bedell defends the Church of England against the standard Catholic claim that it did not have a lawful ministry.[20] Bedell offers a two-pronged attack. Firstly, he defends the Church of England on historic grounds, asserting that 'we [members of the Church of England] have an outward ordination by imposition of hands of those that had authority to ordaine' and debunking the myth that the Elizabethan Archbishop Matthew Parker had been ordained by a drunk Catholic bishop in the Nag's Head tavern in Cheapside, which had been referenced by Alabaster in his discussions with Hall and Bedell, and then

[19] For the interchangeable use of the terms *iure apostolico* and *iure divino* in discussions of episcopacy, see Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 459–60.
[20] William Bedell, 'Defence of the Answer to Mr. Alabaster's Four Demands', LPL, MS 772, p. 110.

alluded to by the Replier in his text.[21] Mention of the Nag's Head Fable was made in a pamphlet, often cited as the origin of the fable, written by the Irish Jesuit Christopher Holywood and printed that same year (1604).[22] However, Bedell, Alabaster and the Replier appear to have been closer to the source than Holywood. Bedell complained that the story was an invention of the Catholic prisoners held at Wisbech and Framlingham, Alabaster amongst them, in the 1590s.[23] This origin for the fable can be corroborated in Alabaster's own biographical writings.[24] In fact, Bedell explains, there had been a continuous succession of bishops in the Church of England who were able to ordain new bishops: Bedell cites the episcopal authors of *The Institution of a Christen Man* (1537) as proof that bishops played an enthusiastic role in the Henrician Reformation and notes that 'some of the antient Bishops that were in King Edward's dayes did yet survive in the beginninge of Queene Elizabeths raigne'.[25] Therefore Bedell is able to assure the Replier that 'if it bee of the essence of a lawfull calling, to fetch our ordination from Bishops', the Church of England fulfils the requirement.

Having asserted that the Church of England had a continuous succession of bishops, all of whom had been ordained by other bishops, Bedell also goes on, however, to make the broader argument that it would not matter if this *had not* been the case. As might be expected, these arguments are important to Bedell because he also wants to defend the status of European Protestant churches against the Romanist claim that they were not true churches. Like many apologists for the Church of England in the period, he asserts that presbyters could ordain a bishop in cases of necessity and that this had been permitted in the primitive church. In particular, Bedell cites Jerome's letter to

---

[21] Ibid., p. 122 and 135.

[22] Christopher Holywood, *De Investiganda Vera Ac Visibili Christi Ecclesia*, *Libellus* (London, 1604), p. 17. Bedell seems to have been writing before the publication of this work (or at least before he became aware of it). He complains to the Replier that 'you durst not commit it [the Nag's Head fable] to the writing least it should prove a Lie; yet for a politique respect, to keepe the authority of it in the mindes of such as hath beene reported unto, you make a reference to it in a generall sentence, sayeing the memory of the liveing can cleare that point', Bedell, 'Defence', p. 136. He had learnt of Holywood's account by the time of his letters to Wadsworth, in which he mocks the timing: 'After fortie five yeeres, there is found at last an Irish Jesuite that dares put it in print', *Certaine Letters*, p. 142.

[23] Bedell, 'Defence', p. 135.

[24] See William Alabaster, 'Alabaster's Conversion', in *Unpublished Works by William Alabaster (1568–1640)* (Salzberg, 1997), ed. D.F. Sutton, p. 161.

[25] Bedell, 'Defence', p. 124 and p. 135.

Evagrius in which Jerome offers scriptural evidence that presbyters have the same authority to ordain as bishops.[26] For Bedell, as for Jerome, 'a Bishop and a Presbyter are not divers orders but degrees in the Same.'[27] Indeed, bishops had been introduced only because it was convenient to have one Presbyter set above the rest to remove 'the seeds of schisme' which might have been sown by competing authorities. Thus bishops should recognise 'that they are more by Custome, then the verity of the Lords appointment greater than the Presbyters & ought to governe the Church in Common.'[28] Bedell remained steadfast in his belief that bishops and presbyters should govern the Church in common later in his career when he himself was appointed a bishop, inviting lower members of the clergy to judge alongside him when he sat in the ecclesiastical courts of Ireland.[29] Thus, the ordination of bishops is *de iure humano*: 'invincibly it follows if the ordination which Bishops have, bee but from man, it is mutable in the whole kind (being but a matter of Solemnity which pertains to comlynesse and good orders)'.[30] Following on from this conclusion, Bedell argues that the European Protestant churches did not deny the legitimacy of an episcopal structure:

> the world knows that both in Germany & England, the reformed Churches have Bishops still, & even those which have them not, deny not but their offices though instituted by men yet may serve to good purpose in the Church, if they were well executed as even by Calvins testimony wee have seene before.[31]

Bedell's view of episcopacy leaves space for a large degree of flexibility in the practice of Church government. As we would expect in the light of his emphasis on ceremonies as 'matters indifferent' during the subscription controversy, Bedell emphasised that

---

[26] Ibid., p. 147. This letter is now usually thought to have been addressed to Evangelus, see Jerome's Epistola 146, Ad Evangelum, in Jerome, *Epistularum pars III: Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* Vol. 56 (Leipzig, 1910), ed. I. Hilberg, pp. 308–310. In 1538, Martin Luther had published an edition of this letter with his own preface attached: Jerome *Epistola sancti Hieronymi ad evagrium de potestate papae. Cum praefatione D. Martini Lutheri* (Wittenberg, 1538), ed. Martin Luther.
[27] Bedell, 'Defence', p. 144.
[28] Ibid. p. 152.
[29] For this practice, see William Bedell (son), 'Life and Death of William Bedell', Oxford, Bodl., Tanner MS 278, fol. 32r; *Two Biographies,* p. 38.
[30] Bedell, 'Defence', p. 153.
[31] Ibid., p. 161.

Church government could – and most probably should – vary according to particular circumstances.

Bedell recognises that his stance on the ordination of bishops opens up a gap between divine law and the law of a secular state. He is happy to concede the Replier's point that 'if two or three Presbyters should take upon them to ordaine' a bishop in England, the English 'Archbishops would take them for unconsecrate and uselesse.'[32] Indeed, Bedell adds, 'well they [the Archbishops] might, considering wee have noe such custome, nay we have law to the contrary'. The essential point for Bedell, however, is the fact that human law is a subset of divine law. The fact that in England ordination must be done by bishops does not change the fact that a broader range of possibilities would also be possible under divine law:

> if ye Presbyters of a Diocesse should ordaine one of their number Bishop, the same were good & lawfull as to Gods law, for you must remember wee are now speaking of such an ordination as it is in it selfe, and a parte rei in which sence whatsoever forme the Scriptures forbid not, is lawfull iure divino, though any such Act in as much as it differs from orders established, it is to be judged by humane law standing in force, utterly void.[33]

The Church of England, then, offers only one legitimate form of Church government amongst the many other possibilities also allowed under divine law. Bedell also pushes the distinction between the visible *iure humano* Church and the true *iure divino* Church a step further, making a forthright defence of the possibility of an extraordinary calling. Here Bedell lists numerous figures, including laypeople, whom he suggests might have been inspired by God to fulfil a particular, extraordinary role in the Church. Bedell notes that there had been figures within the Church of Rome, as well, whose role seemed to be defended on the grounds of an extraordinary calling: he includes Francis of Assisi, Dominic, and Ignatius Loyola.[34] The danger of a doctrine of an extraordinary calling was that potential antichristian innovators might bring false doctrines under the

[32] Ibid., p. 163.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid., pp. 174-5.

cloak of special revelation from God. Bedell goes on to address the question of how to spot false prophets, tying this into a historical narrative of how the Church of Rome was corrupted. Bedell suggests that the visible Roman Church had degenerated so far that members of the invisible true Church received an extraordinary calling from God to renew it. He is eager to emphasise, however, that the means of this renewal were spiritual: unlike the proponents of Arianism and Islam, Protestantism had not been spread by the violence of its proponents, but rather by preaching.[35] Some rulers, such as Henry VIII, had been persuaded, and so it had become a state religion, but true Christianity, on Bedell's view, could not claim coercive powers of its own. The true Church, *iure divino*, was invisible and did not claim jurisdiction in this world. The fact that the Pope *did* claim the right to interfere in secular jurisdiction was the foremost reason for identifying him with the Antichrist.[36]

Bedell's belief that both episcopal and presbyterian forms of government could be legitimate forms of Church government, according to the particular circumstances, was one of the reasons that he was well-suited to taking up a posting in Venice, as the Venetians did not place as much emphasis on episcopal hierarchy as the English did. Bedell offered a detailed analysis of Venetian Church government in his letters to Adam Newton, noting this difference:

> The Signory of Venice hath not any one Ecclesiasticall person, to whom the rest are subordinate. For though there be a Patriarch here, who also stileth himself Primate of Dalmatia, yet this is but a name of honour. He is not so much as an Archbishop, according to the ancient account, but onely bishop of Venice: neither when he calls his Synod, doe any other but the Clergy of this Citty meet.

Bedell's account emphasises the difficulties caused by the disjuncture between temporal and spiritual jurisdictions, drawing a comparison between the Venetian jurisdiction possessed by the Archbishop of Milan and the Scottish jurisdiction once possessed by the Archbishop of York:

---

[35] Ibid., p. 265.
[36] Ibid, esp. p. 203.

> The other Citties of this estate (as are Padua, Vicenza, Verona, Brescia) are distinct jurisdictions; and some pertaining to the Archbishop of Millaine, which is the self-same inconvenience which was found in our Island while the Bishops of Scotland were under the Archbishop of Yorke.

He also notes that the Venetians approach these potential clashes of jurisdiction defensively, taking steps to ensure that the papacy did not seize control of the Patriarchate during a vacancy, for instance:

> It is true, that some one or two towns and Islands this Patriarch hath under him in Dalmatia, which are Episcopall Sees; And the revenue of the ancient Patriarch of Aquileia for a great part (a towne almost now desolate of inhabitants), and whereby, and his other means here, he receiveth yearly 13000 Duckatts of revenue: which is the cause, that this place is still furnish'd with some one of the nobility, and to be sure that the Pope should not encroach upon them in the vacancy, they have used always to have a new-elect, besides him who occupieth the place, in readiness.[37]

Bedell explained that the current Patriarch was ill and weak, and that this was the excuse that the Venetians were using to explain why he could not go to Rome for a confirmation. He added that 'if this excuse should faile, they would soon find another, or two, ere they would send him'. Indeed, only one Venetian Patriarch had ever been confirmed in Rome, and that had been 'for fear of the arms of Spaine'.[38]

Bedell goes on to describe the lower echelons of the Venetian Church, addressing the structure of the Inquisition, the 'ordinary Priests and Clergy of the several churches of the Citty', and the friars, who were responsible for preaching. Venetian Church structures were unsatisfactory to Bedell, but the problem lay in the way in which they were manipulated by papal interference (including the role of the papal nuncio in the College of the Inquisition and the fact that the ordinary clergy were obliged to preach according to the teachings of the Council of Trent, which was also a compulsory element of education in schools, thanks to the Patriarch), rather than in the

[37] Bedell to Newton, Venice, 1/11 January 1608, BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 107r; *Two Biographies*, p. 227.
[38] Bedell to Newton, Venice, 1/11 January 1608, BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 107r–v; *Two Biographies*, p. 227.

structures themselves.[39] Moreover, for Bedell, 'the church' was composed of laymen as much as clergymen. After telling Newton that he was going to give an account of the 'the church', Bedell adds a note in parentheses, which makes clear his objection to narrow definitions which equated the 'the church' with 'the clergy': 'First, for the church (which Name, I know not by what right, by universall custome, and long prescription we Clergy-men have engross'd to our Selves).'[40] This emphasis on the role of laymen in the Church is an area in which Bedell and Sarpi's ecclesiological sympathies overlapped.

The significance of Sarpi's ecclesiological thinking for this later reception has been noted by Mark Goldie: 'Like Marsilius, Luther and Sarpi before him, [James] Harrington's reading of the Scriptural text "My kingdom is not of this world" allowed him to subject all the externals of religion to the vicissitudes of human history.'[41] Goldie notes that Sarpi became an important authority for later English writers like Harrington who wanted to argue that any distinct form of clerical power was akin to popery. Sarpi can indeed be read as advocating a 'priesthood of all believers', which challenged the idea of a separate clerical order. This seems an obvious point of tension which would be likely to get in the way of any serious cooperation with members of the Church of England. However, as Carleton's letter shows, at least some members of the English embassy took Sarpi's ecclesiological views very seriously.

When we look at the passages of Sarpi's writings which explore the question of clerical divine right, it is clear that his writings do leave open the possibility of a priesthood of all believers. Sarpi ultimately insists that each believer has to examine the instructions they are given by the clergy according to their own consciences.[42] However, this does not mean that Sarpi is necessarily as hostile to the idea of a separate clerical order as some of his later readers suggest. As Boris Ulianich puts it, Sarpi's

---

[39] Bedell to Newton, Venice, 1/11 January 1608, BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 107v; *Two Biographies*, p. 228.
[40] Bedell to Newton, Venice, 1/11 January 1608, BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 107r; *Two Biographies*, p. 227.
[41] M. Goldie, 'The civil religion of James Harrington', in *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1987), ed. A. Pagden, p. 209.
[42] This can be seen particularly clearly in Sarpi's discussion of Christian liberty at the start of his *Considerazioni sopra le censure* (Venice, 1606).

works generally accept the fact of ordination: the question is what value he attributed to it.[43] Sarpi also talks about the clergy as individuals with the distinctive right to administer the sacraments, which was *not* a right which Sarpi extended to secular rulers (just as Bedell baulked at this idea in his discussion of Henry VIII's Six Articles). In a particularly interesting *consulto* of 1606, written in response to the Interdict controversy and addressing the question of how the guilt of ecclesiastical persons should be judged, Sarpi sets out this limitation to the secular ruler's powers: 'they are not able to prescribe the articles of faith, what one should believe, how God should be adored, in what way one should receive the sacraments, nor by whom the sacraments should be administered.'[44] Sarpi sets out these limits as part of a stark division between spiritual and temporal power which pervades much of his writing. However, it is usually on the converse restrictions – the prohibition on the clergy interfering in the temporal sphere – that Sarpi focusses. Sarpi's sharp separation between spiritual and temporal power has led some historians, notably Stefania Tutino, to suggest that this dualist system is central to Sarpi's thought, and that it was this way of thinking which fundamentally distanced Sarpi from the English way of thinking, in which the monarch had extensive control over Church government.[45]

As has already been discussed in an earlier chapter, however, I regard this as a distorted view of Sarpi's thought. It is true that Sarpi did think that the temporal and the spiritual were very separate spheres which should not be mixed. However, the visible *Church* was not a purely spiritual institution. Insofar as the Church existed as a visible institution in possession of jurisdiction, it was not a spiritual entity but a temporal one, and all its jurisdiction flowed from the temporal ruler. Matters of Church government were not, therefore, questions decided directly by divine law: they were instituted by the human laws of a temporal sovereign. The sovereign's own power was given directly from God, and on the basis of this authority, they had the right to decide

---

[43] Ulianich, 'Per una ecclesiologia', p. 371.
[44] 'non possono prescrivere né quali siano li articoli della fede, che cosa si debba credere, né come Dio si debbia adorare, né in che muodo si debbano ricevere li sacramenti, né da chi debbano essere amministrati', Consulto 5 in *Consulti (1606–1609)* Vol. 1 Pt 1 (Pisa, 2001), ed. C. Pin; discussed in Ulianich, 'Per una ecclesiologia', p. 387.
[45] Tutino, *Empire of Souls*, passim.

matters of Church government, which were adiaphora. Sarpi sets out this vision particularly clearly in his correspondence with Gillot, discussed in Chapter 3 above. It is summed up in a statement made in his letter of 12 May 1609 that the Prince was 'the highest authority in deciding ecclesiastical discipline'.[46] Of course, there were always going to be some cases in which it was difficult to determine what counted as a matter of Church government or merely a spiritual matter, for instance in the case in which the question of who could be given the sacrament was being manipulated for political purposes. Sarpi would examine this possibility in detail in the work translated under the title *The Free Schoole of Warre* (1625), which will be discussed in a subsequent chapter. In such cases, however, Sarpi had a clear answer: the temporal ruler decided the boundaries. The Church had no coercive, temporal powers to defend itself, and could only advise, preach and pray for a ruler to change their mind.

As the letter to Carleton suggested, bishops were one (amongst many) acceptable forms of Church government in Sarpi's view. Like Bedell, Sarpi uses a historical narrative to emphasise that the powers of bishops were instituted over time for the sake of convenience, and that therefore the jurisdiction and privileges they had acquired were *de iure humano* and subject to change at the ruler's will. This process is described in particular detail in the *History of the Council of Trent*, which first explains how rulers such as Justinian had given particular rights to bishops, and then how the bishops had started to claim that these rights were not revocable grants by temporal rulers, but rather 'essential to episcopal dignity, and given to [the bishop] by Christ'.[47] Here then, Sarpi's narrative is very similar to that of Bedell's 'Defence'. Major problems occurred when spiritual authorities attempted to usurp temporal powers, and Sarpi's problem with episcopal power was not a complete rejection, but rather a suspicion that bishops were more likely to start to claim that their jurisdiction was *de iure divino* than ordinary priests. This was just the sort of suspicion that the Reformed clergy of the Church of England harboured about the Laudian reforms of the 1620s and

[46] 'summa potestas in disciplina ecclesiastica constituenda', Sarpi to Gillot, Venice, 12 May 1609, *Lettere ai Gallicani*, p.131.
[47] 'essentiale alla degnitá Episcopale, & datagli da Christo', [Paolo Sarpi], *Historia del Concilio Tridentino* (London, 1619), Book 4, p. 326. See in general pp. 324–327.

30s and made Sarpi's works more amenable to their purposes rather than less. His was a philosophy which combined loyalty to an absolute prince with a suspicion of an episcopacy which thought too highly of itself.

II

The letter from Carleton about his cousin's account of the Council of Trent encouraged Sarpi to work seriously on his own, and he informed Carleton of his plan to write such a work.[48] The English were thus aware that Sarpi's *Historia* was on its way for a number of years, and on his return to Venice to begin his second embassy in 1616, Wotton reported to James that the work was 'newely finished'.[49] However, transporting the manuscript to England for printing was no straightforward matter. It was not until early 1618, as tensions between the Remonstrants and Counter-Remonstrants became a matter of ever greater concern for English observers, that the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot (1562–1633), decided to take decisive action to ensure the receipt of Sarpi's work as soon as possible. He dispatched Nathaniel Brent to Venice (Brent had already spent time in the city during Carleton's embassy) to arrange for Sarpi's book to be sent back to England in a series of smaller sections which he and Abbot referred to as *canzoni* (songs) in their letters, in an effort to disguise their true content.[50] It seems to have initially been hoped that Sarpi's *Historia* might be published in time for the beginning of the Synod of Dort in November 1618, offering participants at Dort the

[48] See Carleton to Robert Carr, first earl of Somerset, Venice, [21?/]31 March 1614, TNA, SP 99/15, fol. 207v; Cozzi. 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo', pp. 601–2. However, a set of notes on Antonio Milledonne's *Istoria del concilio di Trento* with Sarpi's autograph annotations (BMV, MS It. V 115 (=5829), c. 6v) can be dated with certainty to the period 1606–9, clear evidence that Sarpi took a particular interest in the Council before 1614 too, see G. Da Pozzo, 'Il problema filologico del testo sarpiano dell'*Istoria del Concilio tridentino'*, in *Ripensando Sarpi*, p. 125 note 28. An image of this page of notes is printed in *Ripensando Sarpi*, p. 330.

[49] Wotton to James VI & I, Venice, 30 July/9 August 1616, TNA, SP 99/21, fol. 143v.

[50] The process is described in detail by Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo'. The original letters exchanged between Brent and Abbot during this period can be found in Bodl., MS. 659. These letters were owned by Lewis Atterbury, who published them under the title *Some Letters Relating to the History of the Council of Trent* (London, 1705) before donating them to the Bodleian. Atterbury was given the letters by Brent's son, Basil Brent; the Bodleian MS contains a note from Basil Brent to Atterbury giving his recollections of his father's activities.

opportunity to learn from mistakes at Trent.[51] Micanzio referenced hopes of a slightly earlier publication in a letter he wrote to Carleton at The Hague on 28 May/7 June 1619:

> The fame has spread here, and in Rome, that the archbishop of Spalato [i.e. Marc'Antonio de Dominis, former archbishop of Spalato, modern-day Split] has printed a history of the Council of Trent, and it was believed that he would be able to publish it alongside the proclamation of the Synod of Holland, but he must have reason to do otherwise.[52]

In fact, as Micanzio's letter makes clear, the book was printed only in early months of 1619, reaching Europe only after the end of the Synod and the execution of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt on 13 May 1619: by this time, the Counter-Remonstrants' victory over the Remonstrants in the United Provinces was secure.[53] Nonetheless, Sarpi's work offered a buttress to the apparent victory of the Reformed cause. It proved extremely popular across Protestant Europe and provoked great consternation in Rome, providing a historical account of the growth of Roman abuses and a staunch defence of the claim that all temporal jurisdiction flowed from the authority of secular rulers, rather than the Pope.[54] In 1620, Latin and English translations were published at London. Like the Italian edition, these translations were produced as special editions by John Bill, the

---

[51] Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo', p. 583.

[52] 'Si ha sparso la fama et qui, et a Roma, che l'arcivescovo di Spalato ha stampato un' historia del Concilio di Trento, et si credeva la potesse publicare alla publicatione del sinodo di Holanda, ma deve havere raggioni di far altrimente', [Micanzio] to Carleton, [Venice], 28 May/7 June 1619, TNA, SP 99/22, fol. 293r; G. Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo', p. 611.

[53] De Dominis's preface was dated 1 January 1619, see [Paolo Sarpi], *Historia del Concilio Tridentino* (London, 1619), ed. Marc'Antonio de Dominis, sig. a4r; but it was probably a few months later that printing was complete. Pierre Du Puy asked William Camden to send him a copy in April 1619, while Micanzio had only heard rumours of publication on 28 May/7 June 1619. See Yates, 'Paolo Sarpi's "History"', p. 131; Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo', p. 583.

[54] For discussion of the nature of Sarpi's historical scholarship, see especially P. Burke, 'Sarpi storico', in *Ripensando Sarpi*, pp. 103–9; and C. Petrolini and D. Pirillo, 'Anglo-Venetian networks: Paolo Sarpi in early modern England', in *The Routledge Research Companion to Anglo-Italian Renaissance Literature and Culture* (Abingdon, 2019), ed. M. Marrapodi, pp. 442–4.

King's printer.[55] Other translations, including a French one by Giovanni Diodati, would soon follow.[56]

Sarpi and Micanzio both enthusiastically endorsed the outcome of the Synod and encouraged the close association between the events at Dort and the publication of Sarpi's *Historia del Concilio tridentino*. At the start of the same letter to Carleton in 1619, Micanzio offered forthright approval of Oldenbarnvelt's execution:

> The execution of Barnevelt is such a great conclusion, which shows that the rulers of the States possess great vigor and knowledge of government: because the greatness of the person and the guilt expressed and insinuated in the sentence[57] make it very clear that a moderate decision, as might have been taken elsewhere, would have been pernicious.[58]

Micanzio viewed the Remonstrants as a serious threat to the unity of the Reformed Churches which had successfully been combatted, and he ends his letter (immediately after his mention of the printing of the *Historia*) with the statement 'If the end of the said synod continues in union, it is certainly a work of the hand of God that is rarely seen.'[59] Sarpi too wrote approvingly of the Synod, expressing his views in two letters, one to the Dutch Counter-Remonstrant theologian Daniel Heinsius and the other to the Arminian-sympathising Jan van Meurs. Both letters were brought to scholarly attention in the mid-twentieth century by Boris Ulianich and Gaetano Cozzi as part of a wave of

---

[55] [Paolo Sarpi], *The historie of the Councel of Trent* (London, 1620), trans. Nathaniel Brent; [Paolo Sarpi], *Historiae Concilii Tridentini libri octo* (London, 1620), [trans. Adam Newton and William Bedell]. For the role of the King's printers, see G. Rees and M. Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture: The King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford, 2009), pp. 106–11.

[56] [Paolo Sarpi], *Histoire du Concile de Trente* (Geneva, 1621), trans. Giovanni Diodati.

[57] A reference to the *Sententia Lata et pronuntiata adversus Joannem ab Oldenbarnevelt... executioni mandata 13 Maij 1619 in area interiori Aulae Hagae Comitanae* (The Hague, 1619).

[58] 'L'essecutione contro il Barnevelt è risolutione tanto grande, che mostra nei Signori Stati gran vigore et sapere di governo: perche la grandezza della persona et le colpe espresse et insinuate nella s[ententi]a fanno ben chiaro che un partito mezzano, come si sarebbe preso altrove, saria stato pernicioso', [Micanzio] to Carleton, [Venice], 28 May/7 June 1619, TNA, SP 99/22, fol. 293r; printed (and discussed) in G. Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo', p. 608.

[59] 'S'il fine del detto sinodo continua con unione, é opra certo della mano di Dio poche volte veduta', [Micanzio] to Carleton, [Venice], 28 May/7 June 1619, TNA, SP 99/22, fol. 293r; G. Cozzi, 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo', p. 611.

historiography emphasising the close intellectual ties between Sarpi and Calvinism.[60] In the letter to Heinsius, sent in 1620, Sarpi applauded the stance that Heinsius had taken on grace in his *Homilia in locum Johannis Cap. XVII vers. IX* (Leiden, 1619), a work which endorsed the Calvinist side of the debates at Dort. Responding to this work, Sarpi wrote:

> The opinion of the apostles John and Paul was without doubt that which you narrated in your *Homilia*, and only those who are damned by blindness of mind could disbelieve that this was orthodox; namely, that only the elect are participants in divine grace and adoption.[61]

Sarpi links this approval of Heinsius's judgements with his own favourable judgement on the Synod of Dort:

> That Christian Synod distinguished apostolic opinion from the earthly, and having banished this [the earthly], piously embraced that [the apostolic]. And prudently these abundant orders commanded your adversaries to hold their tongue, having undertaken the office that is particular to the Prince in the church.[62]

By contrast, after reading the Remonstrant Jan van Meurs's *Meditationes christianae in Psalmum CXVI et tres priores partes CXIX* ([Heidelberg,] 1604), sent to him by the author in 1622, Sarpi responded coolly. In the accompanying letter, Meurs, a classical philologist and Professor of Greek at the University of Leiden, set out his conviction that Christians 'should meditate more on the commandments of God, than on scriptural

---

[60] B. Ulianich, 'La lettera del Sarpi allo Heinsius ', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 68 (1956), pp. pp. 425-456; G. Cozzi, 'Paolo Sarpi e Jan van Meurs', *Bollettino dell'istituto di storia delta società e dello stato veneziano* 1 (1959), pp. 179-86.

[61] 'Fuit procul dubio Apostolorum Johannis et Pauli sententia, quam in tua *Homilia* enarrasti, eamque orthodoxam esse soli non credunt qui caecitate mentis damnati sunt; nam, ut divinae gratiae et adoptionis soli electionis soli electi participes sunt', Sarpi to Heinsius, Venice, 29 May 1620, *Lettere ai Protestanti* II, p. 223.

[62] 'Christiana ista synodus apostolicam sententiam a carnali discrevit, et hac damnata, illam pie amplexa est. Et prudenter amplissimi ordines adversarios vestros linguam coercere isserunt, defuncti munere quod principis proprium est in ecclesia', ibid.

disputes', adding that 'the sum of this theology is to do, not to know'.[63] It is clear from this that Meurs hoped and expected that Sarpi would share with him his wish that 'we may be united, in one God, who has a single sheepfold'.[64] Sarpi's short reply, however, was not the ringing endorsement for which Meurs hoped (and which Heinsius had received). Instead, Sarpi offered a series of scriptural references from John and Paul – the very same apostles to whom he had likened Heinsius's stance – which emphasised humanity's complete reliance on God's saving grace rather than works (John 17.3, Romans 4.5, and Philippians 3.8-10).[65] Though polite, this list of references can only be read as a gentle rebuke of Meurs, whose letter had, in Sarpi's view, pushed the doctrine of 'doing', rather than 'knowing', too far.[66]

III

Sarpi has been grouped with Grotius and others who tried to solve the problem of religious division in Europe by moving beyond confessional boundaries.[67] However, it is important to note quite how different the solutions offered by Sarpi and Grotius were, particularly on the question of free will. Grotius is one of the best-known advocates of this stance as a leading member of the Dutch Remonstrant movement. It is clear that he was a great admirer of both Sarpi and James VI and I's Church settlement.[68] The admiration, however, cut one way: James and his core agents at the Synod – most importantly Carleton – viewed Grotius as a trouble-maker, and did not take kindly to his efforts to make contact with English bishops and central members of the Anglo-

[63] 'mandata potius Dei meditanda, quam scripturas disputandas. Summa haec theologia est, facere, non scire', Meurs to Sarpi, Leiden, 12 June 1622, printed in Cozzi, 'Jan van Meurs', p. 185; original in ASV, Consultori in jure, fol. 453.
[64] Discussed in Cozzi, 'Jan van Meurs', p. 184; 'uniti simus, in uno Deo, cuius unum est ovile', Meurs to Sarpi, Leiden, 12 June 1622, in Cozzi, 'Jan van Meurs', p. 185.
[65] Meurs to Sarpi, Leiden, 12 June 1622, in Cozzi, 'Jan van Meurs', p. 186.
[66] Cozzi, 'Jan van Meurs', p. 184.
[67] Most notably Trevor-Roper, *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century*, esp. pp. 185–7; E. de Mas, *Sovranità politica e unità cristiana nel seicento anglo-veneto* (Ravenna, 1975), esp. pp. 71–7 on Dort.
[68] For Grotius's interest in Sarpi, see H.–J. Van Dam, 'Italian Friends: Grotius, De Dominis, Sarpi and the Church of England', *Dutch Review of Church History* 75 (1995), pp. 198-215; P. van Heck, 'La fortuna di Paolo Sarpi in Olanda [suivi de] Appendice groziana', in *Paolo Sarpi: Politique et religion en Europe* (Paris, 2010), ed. M. Viallon, pp. 369–405.

Venetian network, including De Dominis.[69] Sarpi does not appear to have been aware of Grotius's works and, as we have seen, he and Micanzio strongly approved of the outcome of the Synod of Dort, viewing free will as a question on which the Reformed churches should not compromise. Like the English Reformed conformists, such as Bedell, Ward and Abbot, Sarpi and Micanzio viewed any hint of Arminianism with deep concern. This was another unifying pole to which the members of the Venetian Connection were attracted.

In his *Vita* of Sarpi, Micanzio mentions that Sarpi had been deeply interested in the controversy *de auxiliis*, which had pitted the Dominicans and Jesuits against each other over the correct way to understand the doctrine of grace. Micanzio writes that in the period 1597 to 1603, 'that famous controversy, which by virtue of the Dominican and Jesuit factions, remains still undecided, over the efficacy of divine grace, called *de auxiliis'* was one of just two 'deviations' into public affairs which took Sarpi away from his more abstract studies.[70] An examination of Sarpi's views in light of the Anglo-Venetian connection provides further evidence of his interest in the dispute *de auxiliis,* as well as evidence that he viewed the Dutch debate over free-will as a directly parallel controversy. In his letters to Ward, Bedell recounts how he had discussed the debate *de auxiliis* with Sarpi. The Venetian had given Bedell some papers on the controversy, who in turn gave them to Ward, as Bedell reminded Ward in a letter dated 14 November 1630:

> Touching the Propositions of Molina opposed by the Dominicans & the letters of Hippolytus de Monte-Peloso, I am glad you have met with them. For I sent you the originals which P. Paulo gave me upon occasion of speech with him touching that controversy, reserving no Coppy to my selfe. The occasion was the contention of the Jesuites & Dominicans, before P. Clement the 8th. And

[69] For James and Carleton's hostility and Grotius's failed efforts to solicit advice from the English bishops, see Van Dam, 'Italian Friends', esp. pp. 205–6.

[70] 'la famosa difficoltà, che per la potenza delle fattioni Domenicana, e Giesuitica, resta tuttavia indecisa, dell'efficacia della quale gratia divina, detta de auxiliis', [Fulgenzio Micanzio], *Vita del padre Paolo* (Leiden, 1646)

> these letters were week by week sent from Rome to Padre Paulo of the carriage of the busines.[71]

These comments confirm the account given by Micanzio of Sarpi's interest in the controversy, and further suggest that this was an important talking point while Bedell was in Venice. Furthermore, Sarpi's surviving papers include a forthright defence of the Dominican stance on free will against that of the Jesuits.[72] As Corrado Pin has noted, two of the three surviving manuscript copies must date from 1609 at the earliest (the period of Bedell's residence in Venice) as they were written in the hand of Marco Fanzano, who only started as Sarpi's amanuensis in February or March that year.[73] One of these copies is labelled July 1609, suggesting this is the most likely date of its production, and though it is still possible that the text was composed earlier, the manuscripts at least prove that Sarpi was interested in revisiting the *de auxiliis* debate in the 1609: one of manuscripts features his autograph annotations alongside Fanzano's hand.[74] It is even possible that these copies were made specifically for Bedell's perusal. Sarpi's argument sets out clear objections to the Jesuit's doctrinal position on free will. He places the Jesuit position within a long history of Pelagianism but adds that it had received its clearest formulation in the works of Luis de Molina, who was the first to dare to write without 'reservation and palliations'.[75] The Jesuit doctrine of grace drew on the human tendency towards 'excessive love of ourselves' to encourage believers to assume that 'human things' operate in the same way as 'the supernatural'. The effect was to make believers 'more distant from God' and instead place greater 'dependence

---

[71] Bedell to Ward, 14 November 1630, Bodl. Tanner MS 76, fol. 58v; *Two Biographies*, p. 323. A partial copy of this letter (the text differs slightly but is of the same substance) in Bedell's own hand can be found in Bodl., MS Rawlinson C 922, fol. 15r.

[72] Paolo Sarpi, 'Della controversy de auxiliis che è tra li padri deminicani e giesuiti: narrazione et esplicazione', printed as Consulto 72 in *Consulti (1606–1609)* Vol. 1 Pt 2 (Pisa, 2001), ed. C. Pin, pp. 845–54.

[73] See discussion in Pin, *Consulti* Vol. 1 Pt 2, pp. 840–44. Here Pin revises previous datings which had assumed, on the evidence of the *Vita*, that the document dated from before the Interdict.

[74] These copies are ASV, Consultore in iure 7, cc. 49r–53r; and BMV, MS It. XI 176 [=6519], cc. 272r–5v. See descriptions in Pin, *Consulti* Vol. 1 Pt 2, p. 845.

[75] 'riserva e palliazioni', ibid., p. 849.

on men'. This serves 'political causes, into which religion is transformed'.[76] At the centre of his critique lies the conviction that the Jesuits placed too much faith in humanity, rather than recognising themselves as entirely dependent on God's will (which entailed obedience to the secular ruler). This, in Sarpi's view, was the reason that Jesuit teachings inevitably led to the usurpation of temporal power and posed one of greatest threats to the political stability of Europe.

Similarly, as the letter to Van Meurs implies, it was the Remonstrant's failure to recognise humanity's ultimate dependence on God that made Sarpi view them as pernicious. This was a theological position which Sarpi thought substantively the same as that of the Jesuits, and which underpinned the Jesuit tendency to usurp powers that did not belong to them. In both cases – the Jesuit and the Arminian – what Sarpi saw was a political problem rooted in flawed doctrine. This was also the reason that Micanzio wrote to Carleton so approvingly of the execution of Oldenbarnevelt, and of his (and Sarpi's) hopes that the *Historia del Concilio tridentino* would be published alongside the proceedings at Dort: the Servites believed the agenda of the *Historia* and the Synod to be closely related. Micanzio gave this perception of a twin Jesuit and Remonstrant threat its clearest expression in a letter he wrote to De Dominis, in response to the former Archbishop of Spalato expressing some sympathy for the Remonstrants. Micanzio, by contrast, expressed the view that the Remonstrant cause was dangerous and analogous to the that of the Jesuits:

> I remember that in a summary of the opinions of the Arminians, not only myselfe but Padre Paolo had a conceit that howsoever it be esteemed, yet that it is a very dangerous doctrine unto the Reformed Religion, and that going along by a Pelagianism it would introduce Jesuitism which in very deed tends convertly to displant Christianism.[77]

---

[76] 'eccessivo amore di noi medesimi che ci fa parere… che così operiamo nelle cose umane, cavando per analogia che l'istesso debbia avvenire anco nelle sopranaturali', 'questa lontana più da Dio, e mette qualche dependenza dagli uomini, che serve alle raggioni politiche in quali è trasmuta la religione', ibid.
[77] This letter only survives in English translation, see Micanzio to De Dominis, [Venice?], [date unknown], West Sussex Record Office, Petworth House Archive (property of Lord Egremont), HMC 62, pp. 119–25. Quoted in V. Gabrieli, 'Bacone, la Riforma e Roma nella versione hobbesiana di un carteggio di Fulgenzio Micanzio', *English Miscellany* 8 (1957), p. 227 note 41; catalogued in the *Sixth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts* Pt. 1: Report and Appendix (London, 1877), p. 306. [Not seen due to Covid.]

The Jesuit doctrine of grace laid the intellectual foundations for papal usurpation for temporal power; and if the Reformed were not careful, the Remonstrants would introduce the same corruption into the Protestant churches.

To see the similar way in which the doctrinal objections to Jesuitism worked for both Bedell and the Servites, we can also return to Sarpi's annotations to Sandys's *Relation* and to Bedell's 'View of Religion'. Both works highlight the papal justification for indulgences as particularly unsatisfactory. Sarpi and Bedell both express scepticism about the possibility of the Pope possessing a 'treasure' built up by the superabundant virtue of Christ and the Saints' outweighing their sins. Sarpi mocks disagreement amongst theologians about the exact source of this treasure:

> Some are saying that these indulgences are merits of Christ, other that they superabundant satisfactions of the saints, and others say that they are the one and the other together, that are placed in a treasury, of which the Roman Pope holds the keys and would be its dispenser.[78]

Bedell also takes a sarcastic tone, saying that this so-called treasure was only very recently discovered by the Church of Rome:

> The overmeasure of the Saints sufferings which endured more than ther sinnes came joined with the sufferings of Christ make that treasure wherof the Pope hath the Key to grant indulgences & pardons to those who will purchase them. This treasure was but very latly found in the Church of Rome.[79]

Bedell adds that that since its discovery, the Pope had given away so many indulgences that any treasure the Pope had had must already be exhausted. Sarcasm aside, both Sarpi and Bedell see the same root problem underpinning the concept of indulgences: the fact

[78] 'Dicendo alcuni che queste [indulgenze] sieno i meriti di Christo, altri che sieno sodisfazzioni de santi soprabondanti, et altri dicono esser l'uno e l'altro insieme, che son poste in un tesoro, del quale il pontifice romano tenga le chiavi e ne sia dispensore', Sarpi, 'Relatione dello stato', in *Opere*, pp. 312–3.
[79] Bedell, 'View of Religion', fol. 18r–v.

they detract from Christ's unique status as saviour of mankind, blasphemously inserting the saints and the papacy into the process.

For similar reasons, they also strongly object to the use of images in worship, and to the idea of praying to the Saints. Both Sarpi and Bedell note that Papal theologians do not openly endorse idolatry, and instead argue that the prayers are not directed to the Saints themselves, but to God himself, with the Saints simply acting as intercessors. Nonetheless, both Sarpi and Bedell add that this subtle distinction was not maintained in practice, with believers thus encouraged to put their faith in saints and images rather than Christ himself. As Sarpi puts it, 'In the schools, recourse to the saints is not allowed, as givers of grace, but only as intercessors with God: in practice, however, graces are asked of them'.[80] Meanwhile, for Bedell:

> The present faction of Rome committeth most horrible Idolatry to them, placeth faith in them, demandeth of them both grace and glory. And yett dares not determine that wee are bound to pray to them, but only that it is expedient, good and profitable.[81]

The problem with both the doctrine of indulgences and praying before images is that it encourages believers to put their trust in something other than God alone. Specifically, it exalts humans to the status of the supranatural. As we have seen in earlier chapters, this was the fundamental problem with the papacy, which placed one human in the position of 'Vice-God' on earth. It was from the Pope, and his too-loyal Jesuit supporters, that these doctrinal distortions emanated.

Sarpi clearly found English experiences with the Jesuits a useful and authoritative example to draw on to demonstrate the dangers of allowing the Jesuits to remain in Venice. One of the volumes of papers found at the Servite monastery at the time of Sarpi's death in 1623 was a collection of papers about the Jesuits; that fact that Sarpi still had these papers at the monastery when many other papers relating to his earlier work has already been deposited in the archives of the Secreta is testament to

---

[80] 'Nelle scuole non si concede il ricorso a' santi, come a datori della grazia, ma solo come ad intercessori appresso Dio: nella practica però le grazie si domandano a loro', Sarpi, 'Relatione dello stato', p. 299.
[81] Bedell, 'View of Religion', fol. 10r.

his continued interest.[82] This volume included copies of reports made by Wotton to the Collegio about the Jesuit threat during the period of the Interdict controversy.[83] Sarpi's correspondence with Jérôme Groslot de l'Isle also provides evidence of the links between Sarpi's interest in England and his interest in finding out more about the techniques of the Jesuits. Sarpi asked Groslot about a particular treatise, *De modo agendi Jesuitarum*, said to have been written in manuscript form but left unpublished by a former Jesuit now at the English Court, of which he hoped Groslot might be able to procure a copy for him. Groslot does not seem to have known of the treatise and, after making enquiries of contacts in England, appears to have suggested that it might not really exist.[84] This was a conclusion which Sarpi initially accepted but later returned to with the new information (possibly from Bedell or another member of the English embassy?) that the author's name was 'Carlo Perchinson'.[85] Sarpi was evidently well-informed about its existence and the author's identity: the erstwhile Jesuit Sir Christopher Parkins did defect from the order to become an agent at the English Court, and he did write a pamphlet which he refers to as 'de reibus [sic] agenda Jesuitarum' in a letter to Sir Robert Cecil of 10 November 1595.[86] T.M. McCoog mentions this piece of writing, but states that no extant copies are known.[87] However, it seems likely that the document entitled 'De Rationibus agendi Jesuitarum', held in the British Library's Lansdowne collection, is the work referred to, and that which Sarpi sought.[88] Eventually, in 1610, Sarpi reported to Groslot that he had been given a partial copy of the text from Francesco Contarini, whom Sarpi had asked to investigate the text during his trip to England as Ambassador Extraordinary earlier in 1610.[89] However, Sarpi noted that Contarini's copy appeared incomplete and expressed his hopes of obtaining

---

[82] C. Pin, 'Le scritture pubbliche trovate alla morte di fra Paolo Sarpi nel convento dei Servi', *Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 2 (1978), p. 333.
[83] ASV, Consultore in iure 451, fols. 5r–6r and fol. 73r. These are copies of Wotton's information on the Jesuits from Esposizioni Principi and one of Wotton's report to Collegio on 21 June 1606 (CSPV X, pp. 362-3).
[84] Sarpi to Groslot de L'Isle, Venice, 9 December 1609, *Lettres italiennes*, p. 550.
[85] Sarpi to Groslot de L'Isle, Venice, 3 February 1610, *Lettres italiennes*, p. 595.
[86] Christopher Parkins to Sir Robert Cecil, 10 November 1595, National Archives, SP 12/254, fol. 128r.
[87] T.M. McCoog, 'Perkins [Parkins], Sir Christopher (1542/3–1622)', ODNB.
[88] 'De Rationibus agendi Jesuitarum', BL, Lansdowne MS 97, fols. 128r–39v.
[89] Sarpi to Groslot de L'Isle, Venice, 8 June 1610, *Lettres italiennes*, p. 641.

a better copy when his friend Antonio Foscarini took up the role of Venetian Ambassador to England.[90]

Sarpi's interest in the treatise 'De Rationibus agendi Jesuitarum' stemmed from an interest in the internal government of Jesuits which he shared with Bedell. In their letters, both Sarpi and Bedell report that when the Jesuits were exiled from Venetian territory, the Jesuits of Padua left behind them numerous copies of the 'rules' of the order.[91] Both Sarpi and Bedell were very intrigued by how the Jesuits governed themselves, and this discovery of so many copies of the rules prompted particular comment in both their writings. The discovery of these rules featured prominently in Sarpi's history of the Interdict. He described the incident as follows:

> In Padua there remained [at the Jesuit's departure] many copies of a manuscript containing 18 rules with this title, *Some rules to be followed, so that we may truly agree with the orthodox Church*. In which the 17th of these commands preachers to beware of preaching, or inculcating too much the grace of God. And in the [1]3th, one is ordered to believe in the hierarchical Church, if she says that is black, which to one's eyes appears white.[92]

Bedell sent a copy of the 'Rules' to both Ward and Newton, writing 'there came to my hands certain rules of theirs, which it seems were observ'd by them in preaching, whereof there were found in their college at Padua, when they departed thence, about

[90] Sarpi to Groslot de L'Isle, Venice, 3 August 1610, *Lettres italiennes*, p. 662.

[91] These rules were genuine; Ignatius Loyola appears to composed them as a later addition at the end of the Jesuits' 'Spiritual Exercises', see H. Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c.1540–1630* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 32–4.

[92] 'Ma in Padoa restarono molte copie d'una scrittura continente 18. Regole con questo titolo, *Regulae aliquot servandae, ut cum Orthodoxa Ecclesia sentiamus.* Nella 17. Delle quali si commanda di guardarsi dal predicare, o inculcare troppo la gratia di Dio. & nella [1]3. Si ordina di creder alla Chiesa Hierarchica, se ella dirà esser negro quello, che a gli occhi par' bianco', Paolo Sarpi, *Historia particolare delle cose passate tra 'l sommo pontefice Paolo V e la serenissima republica di Venetia* ([Venice], 1624), pp. 67–8. In the Italian editions of the history, the injunction to believe white things are black is attributed to rule '3'. This is a mistake for '13', which is corrected in Bedell's Latin edition. This is further evidence that Bedell got his version of the history direct from Sarpi, rather than translating from an Italian print edition. Christopher Potter, however, translated his English edition from the Italian, so repeats this mistake, see [Paolo Sarpi], *The history of the quarrels of Pope Paul V with the state of Venice* (London, 1626), trans. C[hristopher] P[otter], p. 96.

400 copies, written all after one manner'.[93] In his letter to Ward, Bedell adds that he had written 'long since certaine Annotations to [the rules] which this bearer bringeth with him into England, & I have entreated your Pupill Mr Lorkin to Copy them out for you'.[94] He also raised the possibility that Ward might print these annotations, though he caveats the suggestion with the comments 'I know they are not worthy, neither doth it seeme to me very convenient'. However, Bedell requested that if they were to be printed, Ward might print them under his own name or otherwise disguise his (Bedell's) identity.[95] The request for anonymity probably reflects Bedell's recognition that as an ambassadorial chaplain, it was important for him not to be seen to be openly deploying information from Venice for polemical purposes. Bedell also sent a copy of his annotations to Newton, but again adds that 'if you thinke good to communicate [them] to others, I desire it may be concealed that they came from me'.[96] Bedell's annotations do not in fact seem to have been printed, although he did append a copy of the rules of the Jesuits to his Latin translation of Sarpi's history of the Interdict, as further evidence of Sarpi's discussion of the rules in the main body of the text.[97] However, I have been able to identify a manuscript copy of the annotations in Bedell's hand amongst the Puckering papers at Trinity College, Cambridge, which must be the copy Bedell sent to Newton in early 1608.[98] As in other texts we have seen, Bedell is critical of the Jesuits' doctrine of grace, and like Sarpi, he particularly highlights the dangers of the

---

[93] Bedell to Newton, Venice, 1/11 January 1608, BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 107v; *Two Biographies*, p. 228. For Bedell's mention of the rules to Ward, see Bedell to Ward, Venice, 26 December/5 January 1607/8, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 3r; *Two Biographies*, p. 225.

[94] Bedell to Ward, Venice, 26 December/5 January 1607/8, Bodl., Tanner MS 75, fol. 3r; *Two Biographies*, p. 225. Lorkin is surely Thomas Lorkin, whose career is discussed in Chapter 4. A copy for Ward was needed as Bedell explains that he was sending the original to John Knewstub (for whom see Chapter 2). Shuckburgh mistakes the name for Jorkin in *Two Biographies*.

[95] Ibid.

[96] Bedell to Newton, Venice, 1/11 January 1608, BL, Lansdowne MS 90, fol. 107v; *Two Biographies*, p. 228.

[97] 'Regulae Jesuitarum', appended to Paolo Sarpi, *Interdicti Veneti historia de motu Italiæ sub initia Pontificatus Pauli V commentarius* (Cambridge, 1626), trans. William Bedell, sigs. Ff2r–3v. For Sarpi's mention of the rules in Bedell's translation, see p. 48.

[98] TCC, MS R.10.9, fols. 53r–58r. Some pages appear to be missing. It may be possible to locate these elsewhere amongst the Puckering papers, some volumes of which contain disorganised fragments.

thirteenth rule on these grounds, labelling the Jesuits 'the new adherents of old Pelagius'.[99]

Though the rules initially struck both Sarpi and Bedell as important, by September 1608, however, we find Sarpi in his letters to Groslot de L'Isle, trying to push further in his investigations of the government of the Jesuits. By this time, Sarpi writes that he is not interested in copies of the rules, which are 'childish things' which had already been printed in Lyons.[100] Instead, he asks for Groslot's help in locating a copy of the Jesuits' 'Constitutions', which Sarpi had heard had also been printed, but went further in revealing the secrets of the Jesuits and were thus harder to come by.[101] It was this quest for the Jesuits' constitutions that led him on to the interest in Parkins's account. It seems quite plausible – though impossible to verify – that it may have been Ward who told Bedell and consequently Sarpi that the rules of the Jesuits had already been published elsewhere. This provides one possible explanation for why Ward did not follow up Bedell's suggestion about printing the rules and his attached annotations in England. He may well have written back to Bedell in the intervening months, saying that as the rules were already printed, a new edition did not seem worth pursuing, and thus encouraged both Bedell and Sarpi to continue pursuing other routes to learn more about the Jesuits' internal government. In any case, it seems clear from the close overlap between the content of Bedell's unpublished annotations and Sarpi's *History of the Interdict* that the rules of the Jesuits were another important topic of discussion between Sarpi, Bedell and Micanzio.

This was also an interest which all three men continued to pursue, confirming that suspicion of the Jesuits (and their doctrine of grace) lay at the heart of their political understanding. In 1617, another anti-Jesuit work appeared in Venice, entitled *Intruzione ai prencipi della maniera con la quale governo li Padri Giesuiti,* which warned temporal rulers of the efforts of the Jesuits to usurp their powers. Though

---

[99] Ibid., fol. 55v.
[100] Sarpi to Groslot de L'Isle, Venice, 2 September 1608, *Lettres italiennes*, p. 229.
[101] Ibid. Sarpi's interest in the secret constitutions of the Jesuits places him within a broader group of anti-Jesuit thinkers who sought to undermine the Jesuits by revealing their inner workings, a trend discussed in S. Pavone, *Le astuzie dei gesuiti: Le false 'Instruzioni segrete' della Compagnia di Gesú e la polemica antigesuita nei secoli XVII e XVIII* (Rome, 2000).

published anonymously and under a false imprint, this work has plausibly been attributed to Micanzio.[102] In 1619, the successor to Bedell and Horne as chaplain to the English Ambassador in Venice, Isaac Bargrave, published an English translation of this work in London, saying in the preface that it had been 'lent [him] by one of the most Learned, Grave, and Wisest Papistes that breaths that Ayre'.[103] In his prefatory letter to the reader, Bargrave notes that this text shows that 'all division and distraction is to be found at Amsterdam, or in our Church', as it makes clear that the Jesuits are divided against other Catholics too.[104] By publishing his translation at the time of the Synod of Dort, Bargrave encouraged readers to draw parallels between the forms of division at work in the Protestant and Catholic churches. In both England and Venice, concern about the political dangers posed by the Jesuits also provided a framework for understanding the debates at Dort.

IV

It is also worth noting that the reported successes of the Jesuit missions in India and China fed into Anglo-Venetian hostility to the Jesuits. The importance of this extra-European context for the members of the English embassy in Venice has not often been noted, but it is clear that an awareness of the Jesuits' desire to characterise themselves as a missionary order fed into the fervent anti-Jesuitism of the English and Venetian anti-papal parties. Wotton mentioned Jesuit claims to have made converts in Russia and Africa in a speech to the Venetian Collegio in May 1606. Noting that Russia and Africa were a very long way away, making these claims extremely difficult to verify, Wotton scornfully added that the Jesuits might as well have publicised 'the

[102] [Fulgenzio Micanzio], *Intruzione ai prencipi della maniera con la quale governo li Padri Giesuiti* ([Venice], 1617). For this attribution, see Pavone, *Le astuzie dei gesuiti*, p. 168 note 57. The fact that the work was published by Isaac Bargrave soon after his return from Venice certainly seems solid evidence that one of the two Servites wrote it, though as so often, it is hard to prove which of Sarpi and Micanzio was the primary author.
[103] [Fulgenzio Micanzio], *An exact and sound discovery of the chiefe mysteries of jesuiticall iniquity* (London, 1619), trans. Isaac Bargrave, sig. A6r.
[104] Ibid., sigs, A6r–v.

conversion—God forgive me—of a crocodile'.[105] Wotton's irreverent comment represents one of the simplest techniques used by Protestants to negate the propaganda benefits of the Jesuit missions: simply asserting that they were made up, and linking this to the Jesuits' reputation for dishonesty within Europe. At other times, however, Wotton's analysis of Jesuitical conversion moves beyond mere flippancy: he wrote several detailed dispatches cataloguing the techniques used on English visitors to Italy, noting that the Jesuits had started to describe their focus on 'the work of conversion' as 'their essential difference from other orders'.[106]

Evidence that Bedell too took an interest in the Jesuits' extra-European missions can be found in a letter which survives in a single transcribed copy at Lambeth Palace Library, addressed to 'Jaspar Despotine', the Venetian doctor that Bedell had brought back to Bury St Edmunds with him on his return to Venice.[107] This is a fascinating and unusual document: Bedell, writing to a man he converted, about the latest news of Jesuit conversions. The purpose of Bedell's letter is to say how much he had enjoyed reading a book 'about the expedition to China' that Despotine had lent him. Though the letter is undated, this book must surely be Matteo Ricci's *De Christiana expeditione apud Sinas* in the Latin translation by Nicolas Trigault (Augsburg, 1615). Bedell found it gripping reading:

> I did not (as I often do with other [books]) just flick through it, but rather read it from top to toe, indeed I read it repeatedly and so avidly, that sometimes I resented the announcement that dinner was ready; I had already (as the person says in the Comedy[108]) eaten too freely of this History.[109]

---

[105] CSPV, Vol. 10, 346. Original Italian in Archivio di Stato, Venezia, Collegio, Esposizioni Roma, 6 May 1606.

[106] Wotton to Salisbury, Venice, 18 August 1605, LPS I, 333. On crocodiles as animals of particular spiritual significance, see S.J. Weinreich, 'Thinking with Crocodiles: An Iconic Animal at the Intersection of Early-Modern Religion and Natural Philosophy', Early Science and Medicine 20 (2015), pp. 209–40.

[107] Bedell to Despotine, [Horningerth?], [c. 1616?], LPL, MS 595, No. XIX, unfoliated.

[108] Probably a reference to Plautus's *Poenulus*, I.8 ('qui non edistis, saturi fite fabulis').

[109] 'Remitto tibi, Despotine charissime, libellum tuum de Expeditione Sinensi: quem ego non (quod saepe alias soleo) pervolutari tantum sed a capite calcem, & quidem iterato perlegi tantam aviditate, ut indignatus sim interdum mensam instructam nuntiantibus; adeo nimis libenter (quod ait ille in Comoedia) hanc Historiam edi.', Bedell to Despotine, [Horningerth?], [c. 1616?], LPL, MS 595, No. XIX, unfoliated.

He goes on to explain he did not think that the Jesuits were sincerely preaching Christ. Rather they were preaching

> For the amplification of the domination of the Roman Pope, or for the ennoblement of their Society (certainly, the Superiors of this order are perpetual flatterers of the Curia, modifying everything at the nod and will of the Pope; the Inferiors practice blind obedience, doing what they are ordered).[110]

Consequently, he asserts that Jesuit conversion 'will instil idolatry and all types of Papist superstition more than the Christian faith in the Chinese',[111] and compares them to the hypocritical biblical Pharisees to whom Jesus says 'ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves'.[112]

Bedell did not, however, see the Jesuit missions as entirely worthless. Quoting Paul, he says that it is always good for Christ's name to be preached – even if it is done by hypocrites to further their own ends.[113] Perhaps the most interesting aspect of Bedell's response is the admiration he expresses for Chinese culture. The Chinese, he noted, were not 'barbarous or fierce' people, but in fact had 'cultivated cities, laws and arts', which – most strikingly of all – 'are able to challenge our Europe, and perhaps even surpass it.'[114] This is a fascinating passage, in which Bedell addresses a society which he views as flourishing but not Christian: the Chinese, for Bedell, appear to represent a political entity founded on natural law at its very best. Bedell ends his

---

[110] 'Christum a Jesuitis haud sincero amnio praedicari; sed vel ad amplificandam Rom[ani] Pontificis Dominationem, aut ad nobilitandam Societatem suam; (Nempe, Superiores huius Ordinis, perpetuos Asseclas Curiae, omnia moderari ad nutum, & Arbitrium papae; Inferiores caeco obediendi studio ferri, facere quod iubetur:)', ibid.

[111] 'Tum a[d] Idololatriam, & omne genus Superstitionis papisticarum potius, quam Christianam Fidem Sinensib[us] instillari', ibid.

[112] Matt. 23.15. 'circuitis Mare, & Aridam, ut faciatis proselytum unum, & cum fuerit factus, facitis illum filum Gehennae duplo magis, q[uam] vos sitis', ibid.

[113] Phil. 1.17–18. Ibid.

[114] 'quid nihilo minus interest, Gentibus non barberis, & immanibus sed Urbibus, Legibusque, Artibusque ita excultis, ut Europam nostrum possit provocare, fortasse etiam superare', Bedell to Despotine, [Horningerth?], [c. 1616?], LPL, MS 595, No. XIX, unfoliated.

discussion of China with the words '[Europe] indeed does not know, whether she will rejoice, like him who has found an unknown brother; or will be more fearful to have encountered a new rival, with whom she competes for true merit'.[115] To Bedell, then, China appears to operate much like Europe, and conversion is thus also likely to work in the same way: the Jesuits' superficial conversion efforts will pave the way for truer forms of religion, freed of papal corruptions.

This letter is frustratingly short; it may be only an extract from the original. Bedell's full correspondence with Despotine – which continued until his death in 1642 – is a great loss. But the letter is nonetheless significant, representing one of the earliest Protestant responses to the Jesuits' Chinese mission. Accusations of Jesuitical fraud would be repeated by English observers throughout the seventeenth century, though Bedell's analysis places more emphasis on the political ambitions of the Pope than many other accounts.[116] In Italy, as we have seen, Bedell thought there was still a true Church, labouring under the yoke of Popish corruption. Similarly, Bedell believed that truth of the Gospel would shine through in China, even when preached hypocritically. The emphasis is clearly on the word of God, rather than ceremonial aspects of the conversion, which Bedell assumes will be full of Idolatry and Popish superstition. In the end, whatever the ceremonial corruptions, God's word would out, in China as in the Republic of Venice.

V

The problem with the papacy and the Jesuits, then, was the fact they accorded too much authority to human agency and human institutions, not recognising these as fundamentally weakened and corrupted by comparison to the one authority which was truly divinely ordained: that of the prince. The process by which the clergy had usurped the powers of the divinely instituted prince and claimed these usurpations as divinely authorised was the major narrative of Sarpi's *Historia*. This work was meant to offer a

[115] 'Quae quidem nescit an gaudebit, ut Ille, qui germanum fratrem insperate invenit; an verebitur potius, ut qui egregium Aemulum nactus est, quocum de vera laude certet.', ibid.
[116] Cf. J. Coffey, '"The Jesuits Have Shed Much Blood for Christ": Early Modern Protestants and the Problem of Catholic Overseas Missions', in *British Protestant Missions*, 38–43.

lesson to the Protestant world not to fall for the same tricks at their own Synod. By historicising the Pope's power, its limited, human scope could be recognised, and usurpations could be combatted. The *Historia del Concilio tridentino* was, in this sense, pursuing much the same intellectual agenda which had concerned Samuel Ward in his pursuit of the true canons of the Councils.

Sarpi's *Historia* was particularly concerned with showing that canon law was for the most part merely human law instituted by the Papacy, which could thus be changed according to the preferences of the relevant temporal ruler, rather than divine law, which would have been immutable. Some evidence of this narrative can also be found in both Bedell's 'View of Religion' and Sarpi's *aggiunte* to Sandys's *Relation*, albeit pursued in less detail. Both of those works attribute a particular role to Canon Law in the process of papal corruption, arguing that the glossators deliberately worked to undermine the correct structure of Church-State relations. Sarpi claims that Canon Law was developed in the schools to mimic Civil Law, with the express purpose of expanding papal authority:

> a body of papal law was made in imitation of the imperial laws, which was amplified with glosses, until they had been reduced to terms… [and] settled on the Roman Pope absolute power over all people.[117]

Comparable comments can also be found in Bedell's 'View of religion', which describes how

> By certain degrees the popes of Rome spoiled the emperors of the East of their rights… & will now needs bee Lords & Monarckes of the world. In their Decretalls & the Blasphemous Glosses on them, they take fullnes of power to doe what they list.[118]

[117] 'fu fatto un corpo di legge pontificie ad emulazione delle imperiali, le quali anco fecero amplificare con glose, sin che le han ridotte a'termini [... e] constituisce nel pontifice romano un imperio assoluto sopra tutti', Sarpi, 'Relazione dello stato', p. 298.
[118] Bedell, ['View'], [fols. 7r-v].

For both Sarpi and Bedell, the sixteenth-century Reformation marked an important turning point. They describe this new development in similar terms, stating that it had 'pleased God' to bring forth criticisms of Roman practices and noting the Reformers' emphasis on a return to the purity of the Scriptures.[119]

Bedell makes a similar point about canon law as a process of corruption in the lengthy letter-cum-treatise he had sent to the Catholic convert James Wadsworth. Bedell tells an anecdote about an encounter in a Venetian stationer's shop – an important centre of Venetian sociability.[120] One customer asked what the difference was between the Church of England and the Catholic Church. Someone (perhaps Bedell himself) offered a simple reply: 'none: for we account ourselves good Catholics.'[121] The replier went on to explain that members of both the Churches of England and Rome believed in twelve original articles of the Apostles' Creed. However, in the Church of Rome, the Pope had added a 'thirteenth article', which declared papal authority a necessary part of salvation. When the questioner replied that he did not know of any such article, Bedell writes that 'the Extravagant[122] of Pope Boniface was brought, where hee *defines it to bee altogether of necessitie to salvation, to every humane creature to bee under the Bishop of Rome*', and thus the point was proven.[123] Here Bedell quotes, in translation, Boniface VIII's controversial papal bull 'Unam Sanctam' (1302), which had entered canon law through the *Extravagantes Decretales Communes*, first printed in Paris in 1500, and was then appended to the 1582 Roman edition of the *Corpus iuris canonici* issued by Pope Gregory XIII.[124] Bedell describes Boniface's addition as 'the

---

[119] 'Ha piacuto a Dio', Sarpi, 'Relazione dello stato', p. 321; Bedell, ['View'], [fol. 10r].

[120] This may have been the book shop of Giovanni Battista Ciotti (where Giacomo Castelvetro, a close contact of the English embassy, lodged and worked, see D. Pirillo, *The Refugee Diplomat* (Ithaca, 2018), p. 154) or Roberto Meietti (a leading anti-papal printer with close links to Sarpi's circles, see P.F. Grendler, 'Books for Sarpi: The Smuggling of Prohibited Books into Venice during the Interdict of 1606–6', in *Essays Presented to Myron P. Gilmore* (Florence, 1976), eds. S. Bertelli and G. Ramakus, pp. 105–14). More generally, see F. de Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice* (Oxford, 2007).

[121] Bedell, *Certaine Letters*, p. 33 [41].

[122] The term used for a papal decretal not included in Gratian's *Decretum* or the three official collections of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*.

[123] Bedell, *Certaine Letters*, p. 42. Emphasis original.

[124] The original Latin is 'Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanae creaturae declaramus dicimus, deffinimus et pronuntiamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis', *Corpus juris canonici emendatum et notis illustratum. Gregorii XIII. pont. max. iussu editum* (Rome, 1582) Part III Vol. 4, I.8.1, col. 212. On the 1582 *Corpus iuris canonici*, see M.E. Sommar, *The Correctores Romani* (Zurich, 2009).

thirteenth Article of the thirteenth Apostle'.[125] Returning to draw out a moral for Wadsworth, Bedell sums up his view of what Wadsworth's so-called conversion had really entailed: 'by straitening your faith to Rome, you have not altered it'; nor 'by becoming Roman [have you] left off being Catholicke.'[126] All Wadsworth had done was make unnecessary additions to a purer faith. Bedell applied the same reasoning to the individual case of Wadsworth and the case of the Church of Rome in general. What was needed was not an entirely different religion, but rather the excision of papalist corruptions.

Sarpi's *Historia del Concilio tridentino* redrew this same story, but on a far broader canvas. It is clear that Ward and Bedell understood the significance of this narrative very well. They were also engaged in the task of revealing this story of historical corruption and were also deeply interested in undermining the authority of canon law, and offering up the civil law, flowing from a secular emperor as the true source of all coercive jurisdiction. One interesting insight into the significance of this narrative for the two men is given by a letter written by Bedell to Ward in 1627, complaining about a new Latin edition of Procopius's *Secret History*, published by the Vatican Librarian Nicholas Alemanni (Lyons, 1623).[127] Bedell tells Ward that Biondi had asked him about a response by an Englishman, which had apparently argued that Alemanni's text represented a deliberate 'depression of the name and memory of the Emperour Justinian', by which

> the Court of Rome prepares the way to the condemnation of the Lawes made by the sayd Emperour which are read in the Code, which clearely besides other thinges shew the falsehood of their pretence of beeng exempted from the judgement of Secular Princes. From which they meane to proceed further to bring in an absolute Monarchy and Despoticall Dominion over all Princes &c.[128]

---

[125] Bedell, *Certaine Letters*, p. 42.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Procopius, *Arcana Historia* (Lyons, 1623) ed. Niccolò Alemanni.
[128] Bedell to Ward, Horningerth, 16 April 1627, Bodl., Tanner MS 72, fol. 190r; *Two Biographies*, p. 267.

Bedell tells Ward that Despotine had suggested that the English response in question might be Richard Crakanthorpe's *Justinian the Emperor defended* (1616), but noted that as that work had been aimed at Baronius not Alemanni, he and Despotine both 'intreate[d]' Ward 'to signifie what other Author it should bee', if he knew of any who had written a more direct response.[129] Once again, we find various members of the Anglo-Venetian network drawn together by a particular analysis of history which placed the origins of jurisdiction with temporal rather than spiritual rulers. In this case, this led them to cohere around efforts to defend Justinian's reputation from papal slights.

Furthermore, it is seems that for Bedell, the method used by Sarpi in his *Historia* could and should be applied specifically to the relationship between the papacy and the Church of England too. In an intriguing letter to Sir Robert Cotton, preserved in the notes of the early eighteenth-century antiquary Thomas Hearne, Bedell describes a 'Roll' in his possession in which Cotton had expressed an interest. This was a Roll 'in paper' about the history of Bury Abbey, of 'no great antiquity, but of good use', which 'begins much about the conquest, at P[ope] Alexander the Second [1061–73], & continues successively to Calistus the third [1455–8], what time Johannes Boon [John Bohun] was Abbat: But written much later: (as I guess by the hands.)'[130] Bedell believed that this document might indeed be of interest, and made it clear that he thought it would be a particularly valuable source for anyone who wanted to write an anti-papal history of England:

> for the publicke good you shall command [this Roll] at any time. And it may be of very good use to one, that would write our Ecclesiastical history, to show how the See & Court of Rome incroached upon the jurisdiction of Bishops and Princes by Exemptions, Appropriations, Provisions, & Collations. Pensions upon churches &c. granted to Religious houses with indulgences to those that visited their churches, exempting their lands from payment of Tythes, with many like particulars.[131]

---

[129] Richard Crakanthorpe, *Justinian the Emperor defended, against Cardinal Baronius* (London, 1616); Bedell to Ward, Horningerth, 16 April 1627, Bodl., Tanner MS 72, fol. 190r; *Two Biographies*, p. 267.
[130] Bedell to Sir Robert Cotton, Horningerth, 10 December 1627, transcript in Bodl., MS Smith 71, p. 149.
[131] Ibid., pp. 151–2.

Bedell was clearly interested in the historical aspects of Sarpi's anti-papal project, hoping to encourage them to be applied more widely. His translations of Sarpi's other works formed part of this effort, as did the anti-papal histories which featured in his own works.

Finally, Bedell continued to develop antiquarian expertise of his own, pursuing interest in historical documents. Preserved in Trinity College is a copy of the medieval anti-papal tract, 'De hierarchiae subcoelestis', which we saw Bedell and Ward discussing in Chapters 2 and 4. The TCD copy is in Ward's hand with additional corrections by Bedell, and discussion of this text recurs in the two men's correspondence.[132] Bedell's correspondence also gives some evidence of historical discussions with Ussher, to whom he at one point lent the Ricemarch Psalter, to assist with the Archbishop's own historical studies, and further discussion of the canons of the councils with Ward, as Bedell developed an increasing interest in how to run his own ecclesiastical courts.[133] The evidence of the letter to Cotton helps us understand that Bedell saw these historical projects as another way to further his anti-papal agenda.

VI

An important aspect of English and anti-papal Venetian responses to the Jesuits is, therefore, the perception of the similarity between Arminianism and Jesuitism. Due to their stance on free will, both the Jesuits and the Dutch Remonstrants were viewed as placing too much confidence in humanity's ability to save itself, rather than recognising that salvation was entirely dependent on God's grace. This was the reasoning that underpinned Sarpi and Micanzio's positive reactions to the Synod of Dort; it was also the logic that characterised the response of English Reformed conformists – including

[132] TCD, MS 329, 'De hierarchiae subcoelestis'. The corrections are mentioned in Bedell to Ward, Bury St Edmunds, 17 February 1619, Bodl., Tanner MS 74, fol. 164v; *Two Biographies*, p. 257.
[133] Mention of lending the Psalter (TCD, MS 50) to Ussher is made in Bedell to Cotton, Horningerth, 10 December 1627, Bodl., MS Smith 71, p. 151. For Bedell's interest in the canons see *Two Biographies*, pp. 333, 338, 357 and 365.

Carleton and Ward on the ground in Dort, and observers including Bedell and Abbot elsewhere – to the Synod.

The Remonstrant challenge helped transform English and Venetian hostility to the Jesuits into a broader diagnosis of the problem of Church and State. By imbuing humans with more agency than their flawed, fallen natures justified, Jesuit and Arminian doctrines of grace also imbued *iure humano* ecclesiastical structures with excessive authority. This was an insidious error, which distracted and derogated from a recognition of humanity's absolute dependency on divine grace – and divinely-ordained rulers. Therefore, although leading Remonstrants, notably Hugo Grotius, made arguments about the subjugation of Church to State which might, on the face of it, have been expected to appeal to members of the Anglo-Venetian network, this was a vision of secular primacy which differed from that of the Venetian Connection in several crucial respects. For the anti-papal Venetians and the English Reformed conformists discussed here, the secular prince was the only source of coercive jurisdiction, and every subject had an absolute duty to obey. However, both prince and subject remained fallen, flawed beings. This was a vital check on earthly institutions becoming valued too highly, and thus claiming powers of coercive jurisdiction that did not belong to them. The risk posed by the Remonstrants was that of a progressive dilution of the recognition of the absolute primacy of the prince as the sole source of coercive jurisdiction. Just as in Sarpi's *Historia del Concilio tridentino* the bishops had come to see their jurisdictional rights not as grants from the emperor but as something God-given, so Sarpi (and others in the Anglo-Venetian network) feared that a Remonstrant doctrine of grace would open the way for confusion and usurpation in the Reformed churches. This excessive faith in human institutions had been the major factor in the corruption of the Church of Rome. The moral of the *Historia* was that this corrupting force had to be kept out of the Reformed churches at all costs. If it was not, the Reformed churches would eventually become just as corrupt as their Roman counterpart. This was a fear shared by all members of the Venetian Connection.

Chapter 6: The Venetian Connection in the 1620s and 30s

James's foreign policy in the last years of his reign, and particularly his failure to take decisive action to defend the rights of his son-in-law in the Palatinate, had been a substantial disappointment to Sarpi, Micanzio and their English contacts in the wake of the Interdict controversy. However, in the mid-1620s, the failure of the Spanish Match and the willingness of James's second son and heir, Charles, to promote an anti-Spanish agenda offered fresh cause for optimism. Charles had returned to England in October 1623, to much popular celebration, determined to agitate for war with Spain in support of his sister's Palatinate claims.[1] Charles was a firm advocate of anti-Spanish policy during the Parliament of 1624, despite King James's desire to continue to pursue a diplomatic solution to the Palatinate crisis.[2] In 1624, therefore, Charles became a focus of an anti-Spanish reversionary interest. It is not surprising to find several of those who had encouraged the late Prince Henry to take up an anti-papal programme also congregated around Charles in this period. The years 1624–6 saw a flourishing of publications that can be linked to members of the Venetian Connection. With James's death, on 27 March 1625, the path to a militant anti-Spanish foreign policy was opened once again. This new anti-papal and anti-Spanish moment was accompanied by a number of new publications which drew on the events of the Venetian Interdict crisis in an attempt to shape the agenda of a new reign.

Three books stand out. The first, Bedell's *Copie of Certaine Letters*, was entered in the Stationer's register on 7 April 1624.[3] The second, published in '1625' (i.e. before March 1626), was an English translation – probably by Nathaniel Brent – of a short text by Sarpi, arguing that it was licit to fight for a sovereign of another religion; this text would be republished in a Latin translation by Bedell in Cambridge in 1630.[4] The third

---

[1] B.C. Pursell, 'The End of the Spanish Match', *The Historical Journal* 45 (2002), p. 720.
[2] C.R. Kyle, 'Prince Charles in the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624', *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998), pp. 603-624.
[3] William Bedell, *The Copies of Certaine Letters which Have Passed Betweene Spaine and England in Matter of Religion* (London, 1624).
[4] [Paolo Sarpi], *Free schoole of warre, or, A treatise, whether it be lawfull to beare armes for the service of a prince that is of a divers religion* (London, 1625), trans. W.B. [Nathaniel Brent?]; [Paolo Sarpi],

was Sarpi's history of the Interdict controversy, published in Latin translation by Bedell at Cambridge in 1626 and also in English translation by Christopher Potter at London in the same year.[5] These were all texts which seem to have had close links to the centre of power: Brent's translation of the treatise on war and the Potter's history of the Interdict were both published by John Bill, the royal printer. Bedell's *Copies of Certaine Letters* was not printed by the royal printer, but contained a dedicatory epistle addressed to Prince Charles; his Latin translation of Sarpi's *Interdicti Veneti historia* was also dedicated to Charles, who was by that time King.[6] Bedell and Brent's continued involvement in propagating texts linked to Sarpi provides evidence of how the preoccupations of the Jacobean Venetian Connection retained their relevance at the dawn of Charles's reign. In the works published in the 1620s, we can see more clearly how the events of the Interdict controversy shaped Sarpi and Bedell's understanding of the law of nations, the right to form leagues and the right to resist.

Christopher Potter's interest in Venice, meanwhile, offers us a new departure in how Venetian ideas influenced English politics. Potter, who had not been involved in the Jacobean Venetian Connection as described in earlier chapters, brought his interest in Venice to bear in his qualified defences of Laudianism, as well as in his discussions with friends in the Great Tew circle. This section will end with discussion of the relationship between the Jacobean connection and the Great Tew circle. It was once commonplace to assert that members of the so-called Great Tew circle were influenced by Venetian polemic in general and Sarpi in particular; this was a central contention in the work of Hugh Trevor-Roper, whose arguments on this point continue to influence later accounts.[7] But the exact nature of this influence has not been uncovered in any

---

Quæstio quodlibetica. An liceat stipendia sub principe religione discrepante merere (Cambridge, 1630), [trans. William Bedell].

[5] [Paolo Sarpi], *The history of the quarrels of Pope Paul. V. with the state of Venice. In seven books. Faithfully translated out of the Italian, and compared with the French copie* (London, 1626), trans. C[hristopher] P[otter]; Paolo Sarpi, *Interdicti Veneti historia de motu Italiæ sub initia Pontificatus Pauli V commentarius. Authore R.P. Paulo Sarpio Veneto. Recèns ex Italico conversus* (Cambridge, 1626), trans. William Bedell.

[6] Bedell's dedicatory epistle in the Latin *Interdicti Veneti historia* is dated V Kal. April 1626 (28 March), sig. ¶4r.

[7] H. Trevor-Roper, 'The Great Tew Circle', in *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays* (Chicago, 1987); for a more recent portrayal of Sarpi as a 'nicodemite' whose thought was echoed

detail, leaving scholars with misconceptions about the role that Venetian thinkers played. For Trevor-Roper, Venetian polemic was one strand of the 'Erasmian' European influences which allowed Great Tew to develop proto-Latitudinarian views on religious toleration.[8] But the equation of Sarpi's influence with that of other thinkers often labelled 'Erasmian' (notably Grotius) has contributed to an overemphasis on how far Arminianism (or even Socinianism) were central to the circle's intellectual projects, and a neglect of 'anti-Arminian' influences from abroad in this period.[9] Sarpi, Bedell and Potter were not Arminians, and their significance for the story of Great Tew – and indeed, the 'latitudinariansim' of the later seventeenth century – lies elsewhere. But before we can address these longer-term questions, it is necessary to discuss the developments of 1620s in greater depth.

I

Particularly helpful as evidence for the Anglo-Venetian Connection's attitude to James's Spanish policy is the well-known correspondence between Micanzio and Sir William Cavendish (the future second Earl of Devonshire), which started in 1615, following a visit to Venice in 1614–15 by Cavendish and his tutor, Thomas Hobbes.[10] It continued until the Earl's death in 1628. Micanzio wrote in Italian and Thomas Hobbes, by that time the Earl's secretary, was responsible for writing English translations. The surviving portion of this correspondence consists of 75 letters written by Micanzio to Cavendish, in an English translation produced by the Earl's secretary, Thomas Hobbes.[11] As Filippo De Vivo has suggested, it seems likely that Hobbes

by the Great Tew circle, see M.A. Overell, *Nicodemites: Faith and Concealment between Italy and Tudor England* (Leiden, 2019), pp. 222–32.

[8] On Sarpi as a precursor to 'latitudinarianism', see also E. de Mas, *Sovranità politica e unità cristiana nel seicento anglo-veneto* (Ravenna, 1975), esp. pp. 71–7.

[9] The most forthright argument for Socinian influence is that of Sarah Mortimer in her *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, 2010).

[10] For this trip, see N. Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 76–9.

[11] Two MS copies survive: Chatsworth, Hobbes MSS, unnumbered; and BL, MS Add. 11309. Printed as Fulgenzio Micanzio, *Lettere a William Cavendish, nella versione inglese di Thomas Hobbes*, ed. R. Ferrini (Rome, 1987) on the basis of a manuscript copy in the British Library; a new edition edited by Filippo de Vivo, based on the Chatsworth MS, is in progress. This correspondence was first brought to light in V. Gabrieli, 'Bacone, la Riforma e Roma nella versione hobbesiana di un carteggio di Fulgenzio Micanzio', *English Miscellany* 8 (1957), pp. 195–250.

produced this translation in around 1624, with the specific goal of giving the letters a wider circulation at an important moment in British foreign policy.[12] The news and views offered by Micanzio helped the anti-Spanish party at Court, criticising James's non-combative stance in the Palatinate and making the case for a more bellicose stance. In his letters, Micanzio offers remarkably frank views of English foreign policy; as De Vivo notes, 'Intimacy was perhaps possible because geographical distance alleviated social difference.'[13] When criticising James, Micanzio generally affects an air of naïve disbelief, suggesting that though all indications suggested that James's failure to take action was a sign of dangerous irresolution which was helping the papacy, Micanzio himself was sure that James would have some 'secret end' in mind, that he had as yet failed to grasp:

> I have ever bene of opinion that though the world says, nothing could be done worse for the ruin of State Religion and blood, and of his concurrents in the common safety yet that Great King hath had his secret end, whereunto he hath directed all.[14]

The subtext, however, is clear: the King's failure to support his daughter and son-in-law was causing deep damage to his European reputation and influence.

Another of the major themes of the Micanzio-Cavendish correspondence is the work of Francis Bacon, another noted proponent of anti-Spanish war.[15] With Cavendish's encouragement, Micanzio began to correspond with Bacon, whose work he greatly admired. Only one of Bacon's letters to Micanzio survives, though Micanzio

---

[12] Cavendish himself would have been able to read the letters without the help of a translation. See F. de Vivo, 'Making Sense of the News: Micanzio's letters, Cavendish, Bacon, and the Thirty Years' War', in *The Renaissance of Letters: Knowledge and Community in Italy, 1300–1650* (London, 2019), eds. P. Findlen and S. Sutherland, p. 308.

[13] Ibid., p. 298.

[14] [Micanzio] to Cavendish, [Venice], 26 May 1623, 'Lettere a William Cavendish', p. 233. Sarpi's own growing disappointment with James during the 1610s is traced in detail in J.L. Lievsay, 'Paolo Sarpi's Appraisal of James I', in *Essays in History and Literature Presented by Fellows of the Newberry Library to Stanley Pargellis* (Chicago, 1965), ed. H. Bluhm, pp. 109–17.

[15] For Malcolm, *De Dominis*, pp. 49–54. For Bacon's attitudes to war more generally, see S.G. Zeitlin, 'War and Peace in the Political Thought of Francis Bacon' (unpublished thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 2018); and S.G. Zeitlin, 'Francis Bacon on religious warfare', *Global Intellectual History* 6 (2021), pp. 158–89.

refers to other letters in his correspondence with Cavendish. Spedding convincingly dates this surviving letter to late 1625, on the basis of Bacon's description of an illness which seems likely to have been the plague of October 1625.[16] The letter is well known, because Bacon sets out a list of his Latin works, providing a useful summary for other admirers too; it is not surprising, therefore, to find it printed in the *Opuscula varia posthuma*, a volume of Bacon's works published by William Rawley, Bacon's former chaplain and literary editor, in 1658.[17] Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this letter for the history of Anglo-Venetian relations is the greeting that Bacon sends to Domenico Molino (1572–1635), the Venetian senator whom we have already encountered as a prominent member of Sarpi and Micanzio's circles and a correspondent of Casaubon's.[18] Bacon states that he will reply to Molino's 'most agreeable and prudent letter as soon as possible', indicating lost correspondence with Molino too.[19] Micanzio's letters often discuss the political uses of religion. Micanzio expressed his disappointment that the Italian edition of Bacon's *Essays* did not include two essays, 'Of Religion' and 'Of Superstition', which discussed Catholicism as political religion.[20] Also intriguing is the analysis that Micanzio offers of Church–State relations in the Ottoman empire. Micanzio used the information he has on Ottoman religion to draw comparisons with western Europe, and denounces the destabilising influence of Muslim clerics in the Ottoman empire, just as he does the role of the papalist clergy in Western Europe.[21]

The Micanzio–Cavendish correspondence were not the only letters from the Venetian Servites that circulated at the English Court. One of the complaints made

---

[16] J. Spedding, *The Letters and the Life of Francis Bacon* Vol. 7 (London, 1874), p. 533.
[17] Francis Bacon to Fulgenzio Micanzio, [1625], in Spedding, *Letters and the Life* 7 (London, 1874), pp. 531–2; Francis Bacon, *Opuscula varia posthuma, philosophica, civilia, et theologica* (London, 1658), ed. William Rawley, pp. 172–4.
[18] For Molino, see S. Signaroli, 'Il trattato De Archivis di Baldassarre Bonifacio e Domenico Molino: politica, storia e archivi nel primo Seicento Veneto', *Archivi* 10 (2015), pp. 76–90, esp. 80–83; S. Signaroli, *Domenico Molino e Isaac Casaubon: con l'edizione di sette lettere da Venezia a Parigi* (1609-1610) (Milan, 2017).
[19] 'suavissimis et prudentissimis literis quam primum', Spedding, *Letters and the Life* 7, p. 532.
[20] [Micanzio] to Cavendish, [Venice], 1 December 1618, 'Lettere a William Cavendish', p. 88; Malcolm, *De Dominis*, p. 51.
[21] Discussed in detail in De Vivo, 'Making Sense of the News', p. 304; see esp. [Micanzio] to Cavendish, Venice, 24 June 1622, 'Lettere a William Cavendish', p. 186.

against Marc'Antonio de Dominis on his return to Rome was the fact that he seemed to have had secret correspondence with the Pope, about which James was given 'never so much as … the least signification, whereas at the same time he imparted diligently all letters that came to him P. Paolo and F. Fulgentio, and his other friends in those parts.'[22] I am only aware of one letter from Micanzio to De Dominis that survives, in a fragmentary English translation, but it appears there was once a greater volume of correspondence between the three men.[23] Furthermore, as we have seen, Biondi, Despotine and Bedell appear to have corresponded regularly too; it is clear that several correspondences between members of the Venetian Connection have been lost, but that a strong network of connections persisted into the 1620s.

In the same year, 1624, another Reformed clergyman and friend of Bedell's since the latter's Emmanuel days, Thomas Gataker, wrote to Ward to ask whether his nephew's degree might be conferred in the near future, to enable him to travel to Venice with a schoolfellow. As Gataker explained to Ward:

> There is a young gentleman, one Mr Evans that goeth to reside a while with Sir Isaac Wake at Venice, who in regard that my Nephew & He hath been Schoolfellows formerly, and somewhat inward … both he by letter to my Nephew and his Friends by word of mouth to my Brother in Law his Father have been very instant to have my Nephew accompany him, who (it seemeth) also much affecteth it himself they offering also very willingly to defray part of his charge.[24]

Sir Isaac Wake's Venetian embassy, like those that had come before it, continued to appeal to young members of Reformed circles who wanted to improve their grasp of languages and politics by travelling to Europe. Under Samuel Ward's watchful eye, there continued to be a well-trodden path from Sidney Sussex to Venice in the mid-1620s.

---

[22] Anon., *M. Ant. de D[omi]nis Arch-bishop of Spalato, his shiftings in religion: A man for many masters* (London, 1624), p. 7.
[23] Micanzio to De Dominis, [Venice?], [date unknown], West Sussex Record Office, Petworth House Archive (property of Lord Egremont), HMC 62, pp. 119–25 [not seen due to Covid].
[24] Thomas Gataker to Samuel Ward, [s.l.], 4 June 1624, Bodl., Tanner MS 290, fol. 78r.

II

Bedell and Ward's correspondence from the 1620s bears witness to the two men's discomfort with the Church of England's direction of travel, and to enthusiastic efforts to seize back the initiative following the collapse of the Spanish match. Particularly interesting are letters exchanged by the two men about the parliament of 1624. Bedell was in attendance as a member of Convocation (possibly not for the first time, as discussed in Chapter 2). These letters reveal particular concern about the censorship of books. On 1 June 1624, Bedell sent Ward a 'copie of the Act of our house, touching the Proposition of revising the Fathers etc'. Bedell evidently played a central role in the production of this document: he writes that 'the penning of it was committed to Mr Dalby and me'.[25] Included with this letter is a draft Act of Convocation, dated 28 May 1624, which asserts a need for 'manuscript books and diverse editions of the fathers, councils, and other Greek and Latin ecclesiastical writings … to be scrutinised, inspected, changed, secured' so that 'the falsifications of the Popes' can be detected and corrected.[26] Bedell's efforts in the Convocation of 1624 tried to further the task of removing papalist distortions of the Church fathers and other texts about the early Church. This was the task set out by Thomas James in the early 1610s, and to which various members of the Anglo-Venetian network, including Savile, Ward and Bedell himself, had contributed.[27]

However, while Bedell in 1624 seems to have been taking advantage of the new anti-papal moment that followed the collapse of the Spanish match, his letters to Ward also show uncertainty about the future of anti-papal writing in England. In the same letter, Bedell mentions with concern the fact that Daniel Featley's recently-printed book *The Romish Fisher Caught* was not yet permitted to be sold. Bedell obliquely blames this on 'some [who] have taken themselves personally touched in a passage therof',

---

[25] Bedell to Ward, London, 1 June 1624, Bodl., Tanner MS 73, fol. 443r; *Two Biographies*, p. 262.

[26] 'MSS. libros et diversas editiones patrum, conciliorum, et aliorum scriptorum ecclesiaticorum Gaecos et Latinos… perscutandi, inspiciendi, evolvendi, conserendi, et, si opus fuerit, transcribendi, variasque lectiones colligendi', 'pontificorum fraudes', 'Negotium consensis domini prolocutoris, caeterorum decanorum, archdiaconorum, et procuratorum cleri provinciae Cant… de libris theolog. Examinandis', 28 May 1604, Bodl., Tanner MS 114, fol. 127r; printed in Wilkins, *Consilia* Vol. 4 (London, 1737), p. 469.

[27] As we saw in Chapter 4.

which seems to be a reference to the Bishop of Durham, Richard Neile, and adds 'I am sory that by this meanes Fisher [Featley's Jesuit target] and his Compagnions are joyed.'[28] On 28 May, the same day as the date on the Act *De libris examinandi* that Bedell had prepared for Convocation, the Commons had sent a request to the king for action against 'the multitude of popish and seditious books' that had recently appeared.[29] It seems that the Commons subsequently drew up a Proclamation about recusant books, which required all books on matters of religion to be 'perused, corrected, and allowed' by the Archbishops of Canterbury or York, the Bishop of London, or the Vice-Chancellors of Oxford or Cambridge. James refused to sign the Proclamation until 'puritan' books were also listed as 'scandalous'.[30] Bedell was probably aware of these parallel developments in the Commons, given that he had mentioned activities in the Lower House in an earlier letter to Ward dated 16 April 1624. Indeed, it seems likely that the Commons' letter of grievance and the Act of Convocation, both dated 28 May 1624, formed part of a joint assault on papalist texts.[31] James's reluctance to support these initiatives may lie behind Bedell's comments that 'the Parliament is ended, yet not with so universall satisfaction as was wished, and by some hoped.'[32] The year 1624 had offered the members of the Venetian Connection a fresh window of opportunity to promote the cause of anti-popery, but had not lived up to all its members' expectations.

Bedell also seized the 1624 moment to publish his book *The Copies of Certaine Letters*. As we have seen, this text consisted of a series of letters exchanged with

---

[28] Bedell to Ward, London, 1 June 1624, Bodl., Tanner MS 73, fol. 443r; *Two Biographies*, p. 262. Shuckburgh mistakenly identifies the relevant Bishop of Durham as Thomas Morton in the *Two Biographies*. For the story of Featley's censorship, see G. Salazar, 'Polemicist as Pastor: Daniel Featley's Anti-Catholic Polemic and Countering Lay Doubt in England during the early 1620s', *Studies in Church History* 52 (2016), pp. 315–30.

[29] Commons to James V & I, [28 May] 1624, 'Against the multitude of popish and seditious books', in TNA, SP 14/165, fol. 111r.

[30] For James's objections, see Conway to Coventry, [Houghton], 21 July 1624, TNA, SP 14/170, fol. 53r. The Proclamation was eventually issued with this addition, see James VI & I, 'A Proclamation against Seditious, Popish, and Puritanical Books and Pamphlets', [Nottingham], [15 August 1624], in *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol. 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I 1603–1625* (Oxford, 1973), eds. J.F. Larkin and P.L. Hughes, pp. 599–600. See also C.S. Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England* (Cambridge, 2008), p. 15.

[31] Bedell to Ward, London, 16 April 1624, Tanner MS 73, fol. 425r–v; *Two Biographies*, pp. 261–2.

[32] Bedell to Ward, London, 1 June 1624, Bodl., Tanner MS 73, fol. 443r; *Two Biographies*, p. 262

Bedell's former Emmanuel contemporary, James Wadsworth, who had been appointed chaplain to the English Ambassador to Spain and had subsequently converted to Catholicism. Bedell's final letter contained what was essentially a treatise (constituting 123 pages, divided into twelve chapters). The correspondence began with a letter sent by Wadsworth on 1 April 1615 and ended with Bedell sending this treatise on 22 October 1620. Why, then, did Bedell chose to publish these letters in 1624? In his dedicatory epistle to Prince Charles, Bedell explains that he had hoped to receive a response from Wadsworth, having heard from other correspondents that Wadsworth had promised to write one but kept pleading ill health. However, Bedell reports that he has heard that 'presently after your Highnesse [Charles] departure from Spain', Wadsworth had 'departed this life'.[33] Thus, by late 1623, the correspondence was certainly over, and Bedell could publish them. But while it seems certain that Wadsworth's death was one of the reasons to publish in 1624, the preface also suggests that Bedell thought the moment was ripe for other reasons too. He ties the work closely to the context of the failure of the Spanish Match, writing to Charles that 'There is nothing can see the light, which hath the name of Spaine in it, which seemes not now properly yours, ever since it pleased you to honor that Countrie with your presence.'[34]

The dedication is characteristically mild in its wording, with Bedell describing the letters as examining 'Motives to Roman Obedience… charitably and calmly', and it was the charitable tone of Bedell's letters which stood out to many of his later admirers, including Izaak Walton, Gilbert Burnet and Samuel Taylor Coleridge.[35]

---

[33] Bedell, *Copies of Certaine Letters*, sig. *4r.

[34] Ibid., sig. *3r-v.

[35] Walton described the exchange between Bedell and Wadsworth as 'a controversie not of Religion only, but who should answer each other with most love and meekness' in his 'Life of Sir Henry Wotton'; Burnet reprinted Bedell's *Copies of Certaine Letters* as an addendum to his own *Life of Bishop Bedell* (London, 1685), and also praised Bedell's work as 'one of the best Books of that Time' in a speech delivered in the House of Lords, printed in 1710, printed as Gilbert Burnet, *The Bishop of Salisbury His Speech in the House of Lords, on the First Article of the Impeachment of Dr. Henry Sacheverell* (London, 1710), quote at sig. A4v; Coleridge (in a set of notes on Burnet's *Life of Bishop Bedell* dating from 1810) expressed a wish that 'this book [be] printed in a convenient form, and distributed through every house, at least, through every village and parish throughout the kingdom … What a picture of goodness! I confess, in all Ecclesiastical History I have read of no man so spotless, though of hundreds in which the biographers have painted them as masters of perfection: but the moral tact soon feels the truth', see Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Notes on English Divines* Vol. II (London, 1853), 2 vols, ed. D. Coleridge, p. 5.

Nonetheless, despite the careful tone throughout, the text expresses some clear hostility to Spain, which Bedell criticises for 'concurr[ing] in practice and promising aide to that detestable conspiracie that was plotted against [Elizabeth I] by Pius V'.[36] He also firmly asserts the legitimacy of the Dutch revolt, against Wadsworth's suggestion that this was rebellion.[37] Bedell will have published in the knowledge that Charles had returned to England increasingly hostile to Spain. However, as we will discuss further below, Bedell is not as critical of Spain as he might be: his real target is the papacy. Bedell probably hoped that this work would encourage Charles to view the conflict with Spain in the broader context of the struggle against the papacy. He may also have recognised an opportunity to bring himself to Charles's attention. If this was the goal, it succeeded: Bedell was appointed Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, in 1627, and Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh in 1629.[38] It is not entirely clear how far Bedell's decision to publish was a consequence of official encouragement or Bedell's own initiative, but he certainly would have had some grounds for believing it would be well received.[39]

III

The circumstances in which the English translation of Sarpi's *Free Schoole of Warre* was printed the following year (1625) are somewhat unclear, but also appear to be part of a flourishing of texts advocating a more bellicose foreign policy. The work was printed by the King's Printer, John Bill, although it is not immediately clear whether it was printed late in the reign of James, or early in the reign of Charles.[40] Its main

[36] Bedell, *Copies of Certaine Letters*, p. 135.
[37] Ibid., pp. 133–5.
[38] For Bedell's appointment as Provost, see Charles I to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, 29 May 1627, TNA, SP 63/244 fol. 301. Bedell relinquished the title of Ardagh in 1633.
[39] Charles had certainly known Wadsworth in Spain, where Wadsworth acted as English tutor to the Spanish Infanta while negotiations were ongoing. More light may be shed on these relationships by Wadsworth's correspondence with Sir Robert Phelips about the Spanish Match, which is unpublished but preserved at the Somerset County Record Office, Taunton, Phelips MSS, Royal and Other Letters. One published discussion of these letters notes that they contain Wadsworth's queries about old friends in England, see K.S. Van Eerde, 'The Spanish Match through an English Protestant's Eyes', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 32 (1968), p. 62.
[40] The best history of the Royal printers has little to say on this book, which is mentioned only in passing, see G. Rees and M. Wakely, *Publishing, Politics, and Culture: The King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford, 2009), p. 212.

argument is that it is not illegitimate to fight for a prince of an opposing religion; this is not a ringing endorsement of confessionally-driven warfare along the lines supported by the most zealous of Calvinists. Nonetheless, the text certainly is strongly anti-papal and strongly anti-Spanish. It endorses the cause of the Dutch against Spain not on the grounds of confession, but rather on the grounds of the right to resist, which is rooted in the law of nations (in turn rooted in the law of nature). The work has a confessional polemic, but it is anti-'popish' rather than anti-'Catholic'. Indeed, it helps us distinguish the particular anti-papal vision of foreign policy promoted by various members of the Venetian Connection from the vision of confessional warfare promoted by more enthusiastic members of the 'Calvinist international'. On balance, therefore, it seems likely that this text was printed after James's death in 1625, with Charles's future foreign policy in mind.

When analysing the domestic divisions in England over questions of foreign policy, histories have usually described early Stuart foreign policy as characterised by competition between advocates of either a dynastic and financial, or a more actively confessional vision of Britain's interests.[41] However, there has also been increasing recognition that the dynastic and confessional were closely intertwined. In his domestic policy, King James had emphasised a distinction between 'spiritual issues' and 'attempts by the Roman Church to meddle in secular politics', a distinction which also gave his foreign policy a subtlety which is not sufficiently captured by his reputation as a King who sought peace at any cost.[42] James opposed war for purely 'religious' reasons, in the true sense of the word; however, war against those who were using religious justifications to meddle in a sphere which was purely political (as Spain and the Pope were accused of doing) was justifiable. However, accusing Spain of abusing its power in this way was not a necessary part of his geopolitical vision: Spain could also be seen as another monarchical power, which though a rival of England's, was pursuing this rivalry using legitimate (political) means. This was the stance that James

[41] For the classic statement, see S. Adams, 'Spain or the Netherlands? The Dilemmas of Early Stuart Foreign Policy', in *Before the English Civil War* (London, 1983), ed. H. Tomlinson, pp. 79–101.
[42] A point made in R.M. Smuts, 'International Politics and Jacobean Statecraft', in *The Oxford Handbook of John Donne* (Oxford, 2011), eds. D. Flynn, M.T. Hester, and J. Shami, p. 591.

took in the early 1620s, as it became clearer to him that England would not be capable of waging a successful war for the recovery of the Palatinate, and that an alliance with Spain might well be the only way to avoid England ending up on the losing side of a major European war.[43]

However, many at Court – including many of the figures who had hoped for an Anglo-Venetian alliance – still saw Spain as the agent of papalist domination. Following the failure of the Spanish match, these men could place renewed hopes in Charles, and revive the polemic which criticised Spain not for its Catholicism, but for using religion as a pretext to cover up secular political goals. The publication of the *Free Schoole of Warre* appears to have been one means by which this particular geopolitical stance was promoted. The translator's preface attacks the perceived mixing up of spiritual and temporal power right at the start of the text, promising to 'open the understandings of sober and dispassionate men' so that 'they may detest the Practices of Factious Papalines, and discern with what impious cunning they adulterate Religion, and force her to play a part on the Stage of their State-reasons, and Temporall interests'.[44] It goes on to note that the author of the text (who is left unnamed) is an Italian and a 'Romanist in Religion', who lives 'neere these Motions, and [is] therefore the better able to distinguish the Obliquities of them'.[45] It is clear that the translator thought that the fact these criticisms were made by a Roman Catholic made them more powerful; he evidently wanted to emphasise a distinction between papalist and non-papalist Catholics.

The identity of the translator is uncertain. Bedell thought that it was translated by Nathaniel Brent, Warden of Merton College, Oxford, who had helped transport the manuscript of Sarpi's *History of the Council of Trent* to England, writing to Ward in 1628 that the tract was 'Englished…, as I thinck, by Dr Brent of Merton College'.[46]

---

[43] For a convincing and sympathetic account of James's reasoning during this period, see P.H. Wilson, 'The Stuarts, the Palatinate and the Thirty Years' War', in *Stuart Marriage Diplomacy: Dynastic Politics in their European Context, 1604–1630* (Woodbridge, 2018), eds. V. Caldari and S.J. Wolfson, pp. 141–156.
[44] Sarpi, *Free Schoole of Warre*, sig. A3v.
[45] Ibid., sig. A4r.
[46] Bedell to Ward, 28 April 1628, Tanner MS 72, fol. 177r; *Two Biographies*, p. 287.

This seems likely; Brent may have transported the short tract to England in a similar manner to Sarpi's *History*. The preface to the English translation is labelled 'W. B.', which has encouraged misattributions to Bedell (this error is made in the English Short Title Catalogue, for instance).[47] However, this seems unlikely. As Gaetano and Luisa Cozzi note, the style of the preface is very similar to the rest of the translation, and not especially similar to Bedell's own.[48] The most conclusive evidence against Bedell's authorship of the English preface is his professed dissatisfaction with the English translation as a whole. In a letter of 7 May 1628, Bedell explained to Ward his decision to publish a Latin translation of the text, stating that 'The English Translator in sundry things understood not the Author, especially towards the latter end.'[49] Comparison of the English text to Bedell's Latin suggests that this is something of an overstatement, as the differences are for the most part not substantial. Nonetheless, Bedell's Latin translation of the Italian certainly contains fewer ambiguous formulations, and corrects some clear confusions of the terms 'spiritual' and 'temporal'. This is most notable in the last line of the text, where the English translator talks of 'one spiritual pope and one temporall king', which Bedell corrects to 'unicus… papa temporalis, et unicus rex spiritualis' (one temporal pope and one spiritual king).[50]

The original Italian version of this text was published anonymously in around 1625, but it seems to have been written in the early 1620s (probably *c*. 1622–3), in response to a Bull promulgated by Pope Gregory XV, in which the Pope tried to prohibit non-Catholics from residing in Italy.[51] It contains arguments comparable to other texts

---

[47] ESTC No. S116734. I have written to the ESTC.

[48] Sarpi, *Opere*, p. 1217.

[49] Bedell to Ward, Horningerth, 7 May 1628, Bodl., Tanner MS 72, fol. 281r; *Two Biographies*, p. 291. It seems most likely that the preface too was written by Brent. Whether 'W.B.' is a misprint or a deliberate attempt to mislead (and perhaps encourage an attribution to Bedell) is unclear. Possibly W.B. was 'Warden Brent', though this seems unlikely.

[50] [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 divers religion* (London, 1625), trans. W.B. [Nathaniel Brent?], K4r; [Paolo Sarpi], *Quaestio Quodlibetica: an liceat stipendia sub Principe religione discrepante merere* (Cambridge, 1630), [trans. William Bedell]. All major differences between the English and Latin text are footnoted in Cozzi and Cozzi's edition of Bedell's Latin, see *Opere*, pp. 1221–75.

[51] [Paolo Sarpi], *Trattato se sia lecito di maneggiar l'armi in servicio di principe di diversa religione* ([Venice?], [1625?]). This first Italian edition was identified by Giuseppe Trebbi, and is discussed in G. Trebbi, 'Il processo stracciato. Interventi veneziani di metà Seicento in materia di confessione e Sant'Ufficio', *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 161 (2002–2003), p. 179 note 23. See

that Sarpi wrote on that topic.[52] *The Free Schoole of Warre* looks back to an earlier and comparable Bull issued by Pope Clement VIII in 1595, which had stipulated that Italians must not travel to countries where mass was not celebrated according to the Roman rite without a license.[53] Sarpi approaches this question through the case of a Roman Catholic confessor at The Hague who had refused absolution to a group of Italian soldiers on the grounds that they were fighting in the Dutch Protestant army. The author examines whether there might be any just reason for the confessor to deny absolution (and access to the sacraments) in this way, and concludes that there are not. In order to come to this conclusion, he argues that Clement's bull was invalid, as Italians could not be banned from travelling to non-Catholic countries. Moreover, all people (these Italian soldiers included) have a right to fight for a Prince who follows a different religion. Thus, via a somewhat circuitous route, Sarpi offers an affirmative answer to the title question of whether it is 'lawfull to beare Armes for the Service of a Prince that is of a divers religion', as the English translation put it.[54] As ever, Sarpi's tract emphasises the role of the prince as the highest authority in any state. The prince alone has the 'authority to make peace, warre, leagues, alliances, as he shall conceive it necessary and convenient'. The 'Soveraigne alone' is the 'soul' given to the state by 'God and nature' and is the only one that 'can govern and actuate' the body politic.[55] The sovereign's power originates with God and the sovereign (whether an individual or a political body) can make positive law for their own realm. Jurisdiction within a

---

also M. Infelise, *I padroni dei libri: Il controllo sulla stampa nella prima età moderna* (Rome, 2014), pp. 112–13.

[52] 1622–3 is the most likely date of writing as the subject matter is similar to another piece written by Sarpi at the time, on a papal bull against heretics living in Italy (see Sarpi, 'Sopra una bolla pontificia in materia delli eretici abitanti in Italia, 5 January 1622', discussed and printed in Sarpi, *Opere*, pp. 1212–15 and pp. 1120–23). Sarpi's death in 1623 gives a firm last possible date of writing. Bedell, who is likely to have known for sure that the text was Sarpi's own work, published the Latin edition with Sarpi's name attached. It seems Bedell must have had the Italian sent to him between 1625 and 1630, perhaps with the help of Biondi or Despotine.

[53] Sarpi, *Free Schoole of Warre*, sig. D3r.

[54] Bedell translates this title as 'an liceat stipendia sub Principe religione discrepante merere', in the Latin, placing more emphasis on the mercenary element.

[55] Sarpi, *Free Schoole of Warre*, sig. G3r; 'facultatem dedit pacem , & bellum, foederaque & societates faciendi, prout necessarium & opportunum iudicaverit', 'Soli… Supremo', 'anima', 'Deus & natura', Sarpi, *Quaestio Quodlibetica*, p. 19.

state was thus a straightforward matter: the sovereign was responsible only to God and would be judged after death on that basis.

The question of relations *between* states, however, posed more complicated questions. Sarpi discusses the role of an ambassador mediating the relations between states. He cites the arguments of 'good Authours' (he may be thinking of someone like Alberico Gentili) who maintained that ambassadors 'are not assubiected to Princes where they reside, but by the Law of Nations are exempt and free, and onely owe submission unto their naturall Lords'.[56] But as Sarpi recognises, this creates complexities, especially in matters of religion. Strikingly, given his own experiences with Bedell, Sarpi is particularly concerned with the figure of the ambassadorial chaplain. He accuses the papacy of planting chaplains loyal to Rome with ambassadors from Catholic countries, such as France and Spain. This system of papal infiltration can cause substantial 'inconvenience', allowing papal agents to manipulate the ambassador's policy in the interests of Rome and Spain.[57] Sarpi applies this to the case of the chaplain discussed in the text, who had refused the Sacrament to the Italian soldiers fighting on the side of the Dutch. Sarpi suggests that represented a plot to strengthen the Spanish war effort by disbanding the soldiers on the Dutch side:

> Who can doubt, but that such a one will trie to doe all the mischiefe hee is able, especially by disbanding the souldiers that serue the other side, as is apparant in this very Case? yet it cannot without horror be conceived, how great an injurie is done to the Majestie of God, and to Religion, to make it like unto Medusas Head, a Bug-beare to scare and intimidate mens Consciences, for ends meerely mundane, and peradventure for designes that tast of tyranny and injustice, as to seise upon and take away Countries from those persons unto whom God hath given them.[58]

---

[56] Sarpi, *Free Schoole of Warre*, sig. D2r; 'bonis authoribus', 'Principibus apud quos non sint, sed iure gentium liberi et exempti, solique naturali Superiori suo suppositi', Sarpi, *Quaestio Quodlibetica*, p. 8.
[57] Sarpi, *Free Schoole of Warre*, sig. D2r; 'absurdum', Sarpi, *Quaestio Quodlibetica*, p. 8.
[58] Sarpi, *Free Schoole of Warre*, sig. D2v; 'Nam qui dubium esse potest quin ei quicquid mali inferre poterit conaturus sit, praesertim vero in labefactanda militum fide qui sub eo merent, velut in causa praesenti se habet? Tametsi sine horror ne cogitari quidem potest quam insignis injuria fiat divinae Majestati & ipsi Religioni, cum tanquam Medusae caput pro spectro ad conscientias timidas perterrefaciendas adhibetur, atque (ut res tota uno verbo concludarur) religione ad fines prorsus mundanos, fortasse etiam injustos &tyrannicos, hoc est ad Dominia iis auferenda quibus a Deo concessa sunt, abutuntur', Sarpi, *Quaestio Quodlibetica*, pp. 8–9.

As with Sarpi's interdict pamphlets, this line of argument leads up to the claim that this papal meddling in matters of temporal sovereignty will eventually create a universal papal monarchy.

Relationships between sovereigns were governed by the law of nations, which was rooted in the law of nature, meaning one sovereign could not legitimately impose his will on the others. Herein lay the core of Sarpi's objection to Pope Clement VIII ordering Italians not to visit countries where they could not celebrate the mass according to the Roman rite. Sarpi emphasises that the Pope, like any other temporal sovereign, can only make laws which apply in his own lands (the Papal States). He notes that the papal constitution banning Italians from travel to non-Catholic states was an example of 'humane positive Lawe', which would not apply in other states unless confirmed by the prince of that realm. In fact, no princes had confirmed the law, or put it into practice, and thus this papal constitution had not become a law at all.[59] If princes accepted law from the Pope without confirming this law themselves, this would – on Sarpi's analysis – respresent an end to all sovereignty bar the Pope's. It would also constitute an offence against God's plan for earthly authority:

> And if Princes must in their interrests depend thus on others, and submit the ground-worke of good Governement, and the necessitie of their defence and preservation to other mens ends and arbitrements, they are no longer absolute Princes; and farewell Soveraignetie, if it be once brought to such a descent, as to render an account unto any but to God, and to receive Laws of what it ought to doe, or not to doe, from any power but Divine.[60]

[59] Sarpi, *Free Schoole of Warre*, sig. D3v-4r; 'lex humana positiva', Sarpi, *Quaestio Quodlibetica*, p. 10.
[60] Sarpi, *Free Schoole of Warre*, sig. F2r; 'Certe si Principibus hoc modo in suis negotiis ab aliis pendendum sit, rationesque rectae administrationis & propriae defensionis necessitas, aliorum utilitatibus & arbitriis submittendae; non sunt amplius Principes supremi: actumque est de Majestate, si alii quam Deo ratio reddenda sit, legesque accipiendae, quid facere oporteat, quid non facere, ab alio quoquam quam ab illa divina', Sarpi, *Quaestio Quodlibetica*, p. 15.

The Pope's efforts to use ambassadorial chaplains to advance 'the interests of the Courts of Rome and Spain … to the disadvantage of other Potentates' thus posed a threat to the whole state system.[61]

Thus, contrary to the claims of papal agents, Sarpi asserts that it is acceptable for a Catholic to fight for a Protestant monarch (a ban would be a decision for their own ruler, not the Pope). Relatedly, Sarpi defends the right of Protestant and Catholic states to ally with each other. Sarpi notes manifold examples of cross-confessional alliances and leagues, some of them biblical, and also wryly notes that Spain itself has been known to support Protestant forces: 'They know full well that the Kings of Spaine doe not hold it a sinne to contribute mony under-hand to those of the Reformation in France.'[62] This is an anti-Spanish text, which also justifies a possible Anglo-French alliance. Interestingly, Sarpi also offers a direct defence of the Dutch cause, arguing that it is a 'defensive warre', because 'they are those that are invaded by the armies of the King of Spaine'. He then cites the 'Law of Nature, which teacheth man to repell force with force'.[63] Sarpi's reasoning here is similar to that of William Bedell on the same question in his *Copies of Certaine Letters*, in which Bedell defended the Dutch against Wadsworth's charge of rebellion:

> You would know, *quo iure*, the Protestants warres in France and Holland are justified. First, the Law of Nature, which not onely alloweth, but inclineth and inforceth every living thing, to defend it selfe from violence. Secondly, that of Nations, which permitteth those that are in the protection of others, to whom they owe no more but an honourable acknowledgement, in case they goe about to make themselves absolute Souereignes, and usurpe their libertie, to resist and stand for the same. And if a lawful Prince (which is not yet Lord of his Subjects lives and goods) shall attempt to despoile them of the same, under colour of reducing them to his own religion after all humble remonstrances, they may stand upon their own guard, and being assailed, repel force with force, as did the Macchabees under Antiochus. In which case notwithstanding, the person of the Prince himselfe, ought alwaies to be sacred and inviolable, as was Sauls to David.

[61] Sarpi, *Free Schoole of Warre*, sig. F2v; 'promovendis rationibus & conatibus temporalibus Curiae Romanae & Hispanicae contra alios Principes', Sarpi, *Quaestio Quodlibetica*, p. 15.
[62] Sarpi, *Free Schoole of Warre*, sig. G1v; 'Sciunt Hispaniae Reges nullius se peccati reos existimare, si pecuniam Reformatis in Francia clanculum submininistrent', Sarpi, *Quaestio Quodlibetica*, p. 18.
[63] Sarpi, *Free Schoole of Warre*, sig. I2v; 'bellum defensivum', 'invadunt eos Regis Hispaniae exercitus', 'ius Naturale quod concedit vim vi repellere', Sarpi, *Quaestio Quodlibetica*, p. 26.

> Lastly, if the inraged Minister of a lawfull Prince, will abuse his authoritie against the fundamentall Lawes of the Countrie, it is no rebellion to defend themselves against force, reserving still their obedience to their Sovereigne inviolate.

For Bedell, therefore, resistance is allowed firstly in cases which involve a matter of life and death, and secondly, in cases in which the governor being resisted is not an absolute prince ('Lord of his subjects lives and goods'). Bedell describes these two scenarios as resistance to the Laws of Nature and Nations respectively. For Bedell, the right to resist according to the Law of Nature depends on the particular laws and customs of the country under discussion. As he points out to Wadsworth, this limits the extent to which he can judge the righteousness of the French and Dutch causes:

> These are the Rules of which the Protestants that have borne Armes in France and Flanders, and the Papists also both there and elsewhere, as in Naples,[64] that have stood for the defence of their liberties, have served themselves. How truly I esteem it hard for you and mee to determine, unlesse we were more thoroughly acquainted with the Lawes and Customes of those Countries, than I for my part am.[65]

However, he suggests that even a fairly cursory glance at the Dutch case gives reason to doubt that this was not a matter of resistance to an absolute sovereign:

> Once for the Low-Countries, the world knows that the Dukes of Burgundy were not Kings or absolute Lords of them, which are holden partly of the Crowne of France and partly of the Empire. And of Holland in particular they were but Earles.[66]

Finally, Bedell suggests that in agreeing to a truce, the Spanish themselves had accepted the Dutch's right to resist: 'It seems to some,' Bedell writes, 'that his Catholicke

---

[64] A reference to the unrest that followed an attempt by the Viceroy of Naples Pedro de Toledo to introduce the Spanish Inquisition to Naples in 1547, an incident Bedell had mentioned earlier in his discussion. See Bedell, *Copies of Certaine Letters*, p. 133.
[65] Ibid., p. 134.
[66] Ibid.

majesty did adsolve them in the treatie of the Truce, An. 1608. of all imputation of rebellion.'[67]

For Bedell, then, the question is how to establish whether one's ruler is a legitimate sovereign and who possesses only a lesser power to govern. He concludes that the answer to these questions involves detailed historical investigation, going far beyond the scope of his letters to Wadsworth. This line of argument could certainly open the way to questioning whether, given the history of Parliament and the Common Law, the kings of England possessed absolute power. However, this does not seem to be Bedell's intent: his argument focusses more on finding a loophole for the Dutch than giving any indication that English kings could be resisted, even if this was how some later readers would interpret it.[68] Bedell does, however, seem to have taken a serious interest in questions of resistance. Amongst a volume of Bedell's papers preserved at the Bodleian is an English translation of one chapter of Hugo Grotius's *De iure belli,* which was first published in 1625.[69] The chapter in question (Book I Ch 4) addresses the question of resistance to Princes. The translation does not match the text of any early English translation of Grotius's work, and thus seems to have been produced before one was available. I have not been able to identify the handwriting, which does not appear to be Bedell's, and it is therefore hard to say much about how or why this fragmentary piece was produced. Certainly Bedell himself would have understood the Latin text, but he may have wanted an English translation to show to others. It is a fairly neat copy and could possibly have been copied from some rougher notes written by Bedell himself. As Grotius's text was published only after the *Certaine Letters* were published (and even longer after the letters were written), it cannot be the source of Bedell's arguments, although it is likely that Bedell's interest in the text stemmed from the same questions which he discussed in his correspondence with Wadsworth.

Taking both Bedell and Sarpi's works together provides us with a sense of how an anti-papal foreign policy differed from a purely confessional approach. An anti-

[67] Ibid.
[68] Notably Gilbert Burnet, whose interpretation of Bedell's *Certaine Letters* is discussed below.
[69] 'Lib.1.c.4.', Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 922, No. 6, 3 fols.

papal foreign policy did not necessarily mean anti-Catholic, and it could be pursued as part of a cross-confessional alliance. This had been the hope that had underpinned Anglo-Venetian interactions in the 1610s and it is thus not surprising to find this case being made in the mid-1620s too. However, Sarpi and Bedell's writings of this period also reveal the underlying complexities which plagued advocates of an anti-papal foreign policy in this later period. The question of resistance, which is touched on delicately in both Bedell and Sarpi's writings, had been made more controversial following the acceptance of the Crown of Bohemia by James's son-in-law Frederick in 1619. By the mid-1620s, the ability to shift the focus of debate to the recovery of Frederick's Palatinate lands was one of the factors that enabled men like Bedell to advocate anti-Spanish and anti-papal war with fresh confidence. The careful delineation of cases in which resistance is legitimate (none of which, is seems, is meant to apply to England) by Bedell and Sarpi is perhaps indicative of fresh interest in this topic following events in Bohemia. It is striking that the comments in both Sarpi's *Free Schoole of Warre* and Bedell's *Copies of Certaine Letters* were published in England without any sign of controversy in 1624–5: indeed, Bedell was offered preferment first as Provost of Trinity College Dublin and then as Bishop of Kilmore in the years that followed. This suggests that these works were read with examples from abroad (the Dutch, the Huguenots, the Bohemians), rather than England, in mind.

IV

The year 1626 saw another text related to Venice printed by Bill's royal press: an English translation of Sarpi's *History of the Interdict*, translated by Christopher Potter (1590/91–1646). Potter is a somewhat enigmatic figure, who might be viewed as representative of a new departure in English interest in Sarpi. Potter received a Reformed education under Henry Airay at Queen's College, Oxford. His early publications were printed editions of Airay's works, starting with an edition of Airay's *Lectures upon the Whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians* (London, 1618), which

Potter dedicated to Archbishop George Abbot.[70] In 1623, however, he had travelled to France and the Low Countries, where he may have developed a sympathy for Dutch Remonstrant theology.[71] His travels may, therefore, have led to a shift towards Arminianism; however, the evidence is far from conclusive. Potter clashed with the influential Calvinist John Prideaux, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, over his disputation for the degree of DD (awarded on 17 February 1627), and he was much later accused by Anthony Wood of being a creature of William Laud.[72] The sermon he delivered at the episcopal consecration of his uncle, Barnaby, in March 1628 (printed the following year) was criticised for Arminianism. However, Potter forcefully asserted his innocence of this charge.[73] Nonetheless, he certainly played the role of a spokesman for noted Laudian policies in the 1630s.[74]

Potter took a strong interest in what might be called 'minimalist' theology. In 1631, he anonymously published a new edition of Jacopo Aconcio's *Satanae stratagemata*, a text often associated with Socianism, because its author blamed the disunity of the Church on competing religious dogmas.[75] Potter was also closely linked to the so-called 'Great Tew Circle'.[76] It is notable that Potter's *History of the quarrels* was dedicated to Sir Thomas Coventry, who had acted as Potter's patron. Coventry maintained a moderate Calvinist stance at Court into the 1630s, offering an alternative pole around which sceptics of the increasingly powerful William Laud could congregate.[77] Potter's preface to his *History* is firmly anti-papal and anti-Spanish.

---

[70] Henry Airay, *Lectures upon the Whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians* (London, 1618), ed. Christopher Potter; this was followed by Henry Airay, *The just and necessary apologie of Henrie Airay the late reverend provost of Queenes Colledge in Oxford touching his suite in law for the rectorie of Charleton* (London, 1621), ed. Christopher Potter.
[71] A.J. Hegarty, 'Potter, Christopher (1590/91–1646)', ODNB.
[72] Ibid.
[73] A letter which Potter wrote at the time to refute this claim was printed later as 'Dr. Potter to Mr. V.', 7 July [year omitted], in John Plaifere, *Appello evangelium for the true doctrine of the divine predestination concorded with the orthodox doctrine of Gods free-grace and mans free-will* (London,1651), pp. 411–419[434].
[74] Hegarty, 'Potter, Christopher', *ODNB*.
[75] Jacopo Aconcio, *Stratagematum satanae libri octo* (Oxford, 1631).
[76] See especially S. Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 71–6.
[77] Coventry's relations with Laud are discussed in his ODNB entry; his sons are also associated with the 'Great Tew Circle'.

Particularly interestingly, he begins by praising Sarpi for having 'revealed unto the World that piece of the Mystery of Iniquity, those Arcana Imperii Pontificii, in the History of the Councell of Trent'.[78] As we have seen, the 'mystery of iniquity' was a phrase strongly associated with the doctrine of the papal Antichrist.

In 1629, Potter reprinted sections of his *History* as an addendum to the printed edition of the sermon he had delivered at the consecration of his uncle. This interesting sermon gives a sense of Potter's careful positioning of himself within the Caroline Church. It is notable that even at this slightly later date, Potter deploys stark criticisms of the papacy:

> Hee had silenced the Scriptures, and hoodwinkt the world; then his work of darknesse went on apace, and the mystery of iniquity was quickly advanced to that formidable height, which at this day we see and lament. Then began his Vicar at Rome to Pope it in earnest … to appeare in his colours, in his triple Crowne, his two keyes in the one hand, his two swords in the other, and who but He? He must now be saluted Head and Spouse of the Church universall, a Vice-God upon earth, his judgement is infallible, his jurisdiction infinite, and his Monarchy boundlesse, inclosing all Churches and Kingdomes: all Bishops are but his Curates, and all Kings his vassals; and in few words, all Nations must worship this Idoll.[79]

In a marginal note next to the mention of the Pope claiming the title of 'Vice-God', he cites the passage in Bedell's *Copies of Certaine Letters* in which Bedell discusses Carafa's pamphlet.[80] In this sermon Potter also makes a brief comment on predestination, and while implying that he himself continued to hold to a Calvinist stance, he made a plea for these questions to 'bee debated with lesse edge and stomach' on all sides.[81]

The best known of Potter's published works was published a little later, in 1633, but it too provides evidence of the effect of the Venetian Interdict controversy on his thinking. This work, entitled *Want of charitie justly charged,* is well known because it

[78] Potter, *History of the Quarrels*, A?2r.
[79] Potter, *A Sermon preached*, pp. 12–13.
[80] Bedell, *Copies of Certaine Letters*, pp. 77-8
[81] Potter, *A Sermon preached*, p. 67.

formed part of a longer dispute between Potter, the Catholic convert (and son of the late Archbishop of York) Sir Tobie Matthew (who wrote the original text Potter was replying to), the Jesuit Edward Knott (who replied to Potter) and William Chillingworth (who defended Potter against Knott).[82] Chillingworth's contribution, *The religion of protestants* (1638), has long been seen as an important text in the development of 'latitudinarian' forms of Anglicanism. Potter's text attacked Matthew's claim that nobody can be saved outside the Church of Rome, which he ties into a broader critique of Catholicism for displaying a lack of charity. In making this argument, Potter makes a number of arguments that cite the third book of the *History* of the Interdict, which describes the expulsion of the Jesuits from Venice, emphasising that the reason behind it was the Jesuit tendency to interfere in matters of secular government:

> for this reason the whole Senate of *Venice,* (not one man of that great Body dissenting) did by decree chase these men out of their Dominions into perpetuall banishment, because, *the Iesuites haue beene the Authors and Instruments of all tumults, seditions, confusions, and miseries hapning in these times, in all Kingdomes and States of the world.*[83]

Later in the text, Potter brings up the example of Venice again, particularly citing the 'Divines of Venice' for their opposition to papal meddling in temporal matters:

> whereas his Flatterers tell him, that he hath either directly, (as some say) or indirectly, (as others, to the same purpose) a Temporall Monarchy over all the earth; that all Princes are his vassals, and may be deposed when he thinkes fitt; that he may dispense with subjects for their oath of Allegeance, and license them to take armes against their Soveraignes: Many good Catholiques detest these damnable doctrines, and have confuted them, as tending to bring ruine and confusion on all states

In the marginal note to this passage, Potter cites 'Barclay', 'Withrington', and 'The Divines of Venice.'

---

[82] Christophe Potter, *Want of charitie justly charged, on all such Romanists, as dare (without truth or modesty) affirme, that Protestancie destroyeth salvation* (London, 1633)

[83] Potter, *Want of Charitie*, p. 9. Italics Potter's own and indicate a quotation from his *History of the Quarrels*, p. 138.

Just like a number of earlier polemics we have seen, Potter emphasises that the Church of Rome is a true Church but has been corrupted by papal overlordship. He viewed papal claims to possess temporal power as a fundamental plank of this corrupt system. This critique underpins his broader claim that Protestants better reflect true charity, as Protestants believe some may be saved in the Roman Church, while Roman Catholics maintain (uncharitably) that it is impossible for anyone to be saved outside the Catholic Church. As the title of his work suggests, charity was a central concept in Potter's writings. But though this is most obvious in his *Want of Charitie*, it can also be seen in his other works: the frontispiece of his Oxford edition of Aconcio's *Stratagemata Satanae*, for instance, shows the figures of 'Charitas' and 'Veritas' looking up to and supporting the figure of 'Religio'.[84] Bedell had similarly emphasised charity as the feature which distinguished Protestantism from Catholicism in his letters to Wadsworth. Wadsworth had claimed that it is safer to be a member of the Church of Rome, in which Protestants say you *might* be saved, than a member of a Protestant Church, in which, according Catholics, you definitely won't be. For Bedell, however, this was proof of a failure on charity on the Roman side:

> it is possible we are both deceived in our opinions, each of other; wee through too much charitie, and you and others through ignorance or malice. Herein undoubtedly we have the advantage of you and the rest, and doe take that course which is more safe and sure to avoid sinne, that if we doe faile of the truth, yet we be deceived with the error of love, which as the Apostle saith, hopeth all things, and is not puffed up. Wee avoid at the least that gulfe of rash judgement.[85]

Given the similarities in their argument, it is not surprising, therefore, to find that Potter cites Bedell directly when making the case that the Church of Rome is a true Church, albeit a corrupt one, taking up the metaphor of a weed-covered field which Bedell had used in his letters:

---

[84] Jacopo Aconcio, *Stratagematum satanae libri octo* (Oxford, 1631), frontispiece.
[85] Bedell, *Copies of Certaine Letters*, pp. 86–7.

> These abuses and errors deface the beauty, and taint the purity of divine truth: they make up the *Popery* of Rome, not the *Church*... The state of the Church under the Roman obedience, and that part which is Reformed, is very fitly (q) [marginal note: (q) Mr Bedel ag. Wadsw. cap. 4.] resembled to a field overgrowne all with weeds, thistles, tares, cockle: Some part whereof is weeded and cleansed, some part remaines as it was before.[86]

Potter (surely consciously) does not bring up disputed doctrines such as that of the Antichrist (in contrast to his mention of the 'Mystery of Iniquity' in his Preface to his *History of the Quarrels*), but beyond this omission, his arguments are strikingly similar to those advocated by the Reformed conformists of the Jacobean Venetian Connection. The metaphor of weeds is also one which Chillingworth picks up at length in his *Religion of Protestants* (London, 1638). Where Potter made one reference to this image, Chillingworth develops it as an extended conceit.[87] Chillingworth does not cite Bedell, but his citations do indicate firm knowledge of Jacobean polemic. His epigraph is taken from Casaubon's *Letter* to Cardinal Perron (written on behalf of James VI & I), and he returns to this text elsewhere in the work, as well as discussing Edwin Sandys's *Relation*.[88]

Potter's *Want of Charitie* built on important elements of Anglo-Venetian polemic, which had been developed over the previous two decades, and his work in turn influences that of William Chillingworth. He seems here to be putting this polemic to work for the cause of creedal minimalism, moving beyond that of the earlier Venetian Connection's efforts. The break is not a dramatic one; is more a matter of emphasis than substance. It would be going too far to call Potter's arguments 'Laudian', or to apply that label to Chillingworth or, indeed, the Venetian Connection. But it gives some indication of areas of agreement about the problems of papal jurisdiction between conformists of overtly Reformed sympathies, and those whose views were more in tune with the Laudian reforms. Thus, anti-papal jurisdictional thinking may have helped

---

[86] Potter, *Want of Charitie*, p. 67.
[87] Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants*, pp. 242–3, 270, 280.
[88] For discussion of the epigraph, see R.W. Serjeantson, 'Elizabeth Cary and the Great Tew Circle', in *The Literary Career and Legacy of Elizabeth Cary, 1613–1680* (New York, 2007), ed. H. Wolfe, pp. 174–6.

promote some level of cooperation between Reformed conformist and Laudian-sympathising figures at the Court of Charles I, even as the Court became ever more religiously polarised on other religious questions.

V

Though increasingly sceptical of the doctrinal attitudes that Charles I and Laud were placing at the heart of the Church, most of the figures whom I have identified as part of the Venetian Connection died firm Royalists. The period 1605–19 had been one in which, for the most part, the Reformed conformists of the Anglo-Venetian network had viewed James VI & I's religious policies with approval. This was not to say that there were aspects of Church government they might have changed if they were monarch. But they were not, and the approach we saw Bedell advocate in the Subscription controversy of 1604 (and which I have suggested influences the approach Micanzio took to his 1609 sermons), of clearly explaining what was necessary and what was a matter indifferent, was deemed a sufficient remedy to any lingering concerns. Ultimately, however, any doubts about details of Church government were judged less important than the need to support the absolute jurisdictional independence of the King, against papal efforts to usurp temporal authority. However, in the 1620s, as the King's religious politics shifted, this became ever more of a challenge for men of strong Reformed sympathies.

Naturally, direct evidence of Reformed dissatisfaction with the King is difficult to establish, although it is clear that defending the doctrine of grace was a major concern of Samuel Ward's throughout the 1620s, with his stance set out most clearly in his *Gratia Discriminans* in 1625. Grace became a topic of discussion amongst the clergy of Ireland during Bedell's time as bishop of Kilmore (a dignity to which he was appointed in 1629). Bedell was, it seems, suspected of not holding a firm enough stance, and was asked by John Richardson, the dean of Derry to clarify his stance. The two men exchanged several nuanced letters, but though Bedell (as ever) took a subtle

position, he continued to hold a stance that was more Calvinist than Arminian.[89] It was also surely deliberate that his 1630 Latin translation of Sarpi's history of the Interdict particularly highlighted – by means of its appendix, with a cross-reference to Sarpi's text – the fact that the rules of the Jesuits deliberately encouraged members of the Order not to overemphasise divine grace while preaching.[90]

A final intriguing indication of how involvement with Venice shaped attitudes to the religious changes of the 1620s is found in the sermons of Isaac Bargrave, Wotton's chaplain in Venice during his second embassy.[91] In 1623 he preached a sermon before Parliament, which cited Sarpi:

> I had it from the mouth of that Reverend Father Paul of Venice, the worthy Author of (that excellent discovery) the History of the Councell of Trent, that hee esteemed the Hyerarchy of our Church, the most excellent peece of Discipline in the whole Christian World. But however they esteeme it abroad, wee here at home, if wee bee not unworthily-unthankfull must needes confesse, that for this sixty yeares and upwards, wee have felt such a blessed effect of it, as no other Church nor Nation in the Christian World can paralell. And therefore to your care, and love I commend it.[92]

However, despite this praise for the English system of Church government, a seventeenth-century memoir of his life states that Bargrave was the object of royal displeasure for his preaching: 'he suffered for his zeal in a sermon before Parliament 1623 … against Papery, Evil Counsellors, and Corruption.'[93] If we turn to the rest of the text of the sermon, we do indeed find such themes mentioned, with the sermon railing against papal equivocation and warning of,

---

[89] The letters that constitute these discussions are preserved in Bodl., Tanner MS 458, fols. 188r–247r. See also *Two Biographies*, pp. 371–96.
[90] Discussed in Chapter 5.
[91] S. Lee, revised by S. Bann, 'Bargrave, Isaac (bap. 1586, d. 1643)', OBNB; Isaac was the father of Robert Bargrave whose diary is printed as Robert Bargrave, *The Travel Diary of Robert Bargrave Levant Merchant (1647-1656)*, ed. M. Brennan (Abingdon, 1999); see also LPS II, pp. 461–2.
[92] Isaac Bargrave, *A sermon preached before the honorable assembly of knights, citizens, and burgesses of the lower house of Parliament, February the last, 1623* (London, 1624), pp. 29–30.
[93] The memoir is BL, Lansdowne MS 985/9, 'Dr. Isaac Bargrave, Dean of Canterbury', written c. 1641-60, fols. 36–7; quoted in S. p. 54. Bann suggests that the relevant sermon was unpublished (unlike others of the period) but the published sermon in which Sarpi is mentioned seems to match the description sufficiently closely.

> Such as sacrifice their King, their Country, their Parents, nay their Saviour to Mammon; such as winde into our Court, our Parliaments, our hearts; such as eate and take Councell together with us, but like the Traytors in the Troyan horse, fifty of them doe more hurt in one night, then five thousand open enemies in ten yeare.[94]

Here, praise delivered with reference to Sarpi's views of English ecclesiastical structures seems to be deployed by Bargrave in an attempt to assert his loyalty even as he criticises the Church. And for all his criticisms, Bargrave did indeed remain a loyal supporter of the King's divine right to rule. In another sermon of 27 March 1627, which he preached before King Charles on 1 Samuel 15.23 ('Rebellion is as the sinne of Witch-craft, and stubbornnesse as the wickednesse of Idolatry'), Bargrave asserted that 'No man hath learn'd to disobey his King, but he had learn'd before to disobey his God.'[95]

VI

The Gunpowder Plot and Venetian Interdict controversy had both generated a line of attack on the papacy which was jurisdictional; that is, which specifically emphasised that the main objection to the papacy was its claims of temporal jurisdiction. During the political shifts of the 1620s, this line of attack on the papacy still had considerable purchase. It offered men of Reformed conformist sympathies at the court of Charles I a means of maintaining hostility to the Papacy and supporting Charles's hostility to Spain, while still distinguishing themselves from more enthusiastic Calvinists who thought there was a religious duty to take a confessional stance in the Thirty Years War. A number of figures from the early Jacobean Venetian Connection adopted this stance, and it allowed many of them to take on prominent positions early in Charles's reign. For many of these figures, the early years of Charles's reign seemed to offer a return to

[94] Bargrave, *A sermon preached*, pp. 26–7.
[95] Isaac Bargrave, *A sermon preached before King Charles, March 27. 1627. Being the anniversary of his Maiesties inauguration* (London, 1627), p. 20.

the hopes they had cherished in the earlier years of James's reign, before the disappointments of the period of the Spanish match.

However, in the mid- to late 1620s, we also see how the example of Venice was put to use by writers who were willing to go along with the policies of Archbishop Laud (albeit often with some scepticism). It has been suggested that Sarpi was one of several 'Erasmian' thinkers, who had an important influence on the thinkers of the Great Tew Circle; in some accounts, this has been presented as the more important instance of the Servite's influence in England.[96] The nature of that influence has been explored here, but the story that emerges is less one of a 'Venetian' way of thinking which lent support to Laudianism. Instead, I suggest that Venetian arguments offered an alternative to Laud's ecclesiological vision, which circumvented some of the problems entailed by the Laudian emphasis on the clergy's *de iure divino* authority. This was a valuable alternative, and it was one to which later writers on English Church–State relations would return.

[96] See especially H.R. Trevor-Roper, 'The Great Tew Circle', in *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans* (London, 1987), pp. 166-230.

A Coda: The English legacy

The story of the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian network can all too easily be viewed through the prism of failure. First came the failure to institute a Venetian Reformation, then the failure to shape a stable religious and political settlement in England, as Reformed conformists lost out to Laudians, before the advent of civil warfare fundamentally reordered Britain's ecclesiastical structures. The lifespan of many of the core members of the Venetian Connection neatly coincided with the downfall of the early Stuart monarchy: Wotton died in 1639, well before England's descent into violence, while the deaths of both Bedell (d. 1642) and Ward (d. 1643) can be at least in part attributed to having suffered physically from the consequences of being imprisoned by anti-royalist forces, in Ireland and Cambridge. The death of Carleton a few years earlier (1632) had removed one of the few remaining figures with Calvinist sympathies from high office at Charles's Court.

By 1640 then, the number of those with personal experience of the post-Interdict Reforming efforts in Venice was dwindling and it no longer makes sense to talk about the Venetian Connection as a physical group of individuals at the Caroline Court. The Civil War period, however, does not mark the end of the story of the Venetian Connection's influence. Later in the seventeenth century, there was renewed interest in the writings of the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian network, which provided intellectual resources for post-Restoration Church–State relations. In the 1650s, as Britain's politically active classes looked towards a post-Cromwellian future, a wave of publications addressing the Venetian Connection's legacy were printed in London, including the *Reliquiae Wottonianae* (1651), *The State of Christendom* (1657) (a work here attributed, though almost certainly not written by, Henry Wotton), and Nicholas Bernard's publication of a short *Character* of Bedell (1659).[1] Such publications –

[1] Henry Wotton, *Reliquiae Wottonianae* (London, 1651) ed. Izaak Walton; Henry Wotton, *The State of Christendom* (1657); N. Bernard, *The judgement of the late Arch-bishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland. Of Babylon (Rev. 18. 4.)… With a sermon of Bishop Bedels upon the same words... Unto which is added a character of Bishop Bedel* (London, 1659). On the authorship of *The State of Christendom,*

alongside the enduring popularity of Sarpi's works – ensured that Jacobean Anglo-Venetian exchange were well known to the post-Restoration elite. As patriots loyal to their rulers, but forthright opponents of the papacy, men like Wotton, Bedell, Sarpi and Micanzio were well-suited to the role of authorities in later seventeenth-century debates. It is not possible to address the multifarious ways in which the works of the Venetian Connection were later revived and reinterpreted in the space remaining. But to give some indication of why this topic is worthy of further study, I will very briefly elucidate a few examples of the ways in which later writers drew on the intellectual resources of the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian connection in their own efforts to theorise English Church-State relations.

One distinctive account of English Church–State relations which seems to owe something to the discussion of the Venetian Interdict crisis is that of Thomas Hobbes. As we have seen, Hobbes probably met Sarpi and Micanzio while travelling in Venice as tutor to the Earl of Devonshire in 1614–15, and Hobbes later translated Micanzio and Cavendish's correspondence.[2] Hobbes did not (let us say) have a zeal for Reform comparable to Bedell or Ward, but he did share a Sarpian horror at papal incursions into sovereign jurisdiction, and it is worth noting that one of the only authors specifically named and refuted in Hobbes's *Leviathan* is Robert Bellarmine.[3] Hobbes's affinities with Reformed conformity have already proved a fruitful line of enquiry for scholarship, as has increased attention to Hobbes's use of sacred history, and it seems probable that there is more to say on Hobbes' use of specifically ecclesiastic history too.[4]

The writings of the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian network came to the fore once again following the Revolution of 1688. As English politics realigned along yet another

---

see A. Gajda, '*The State of Christendom*: history, political thought and the Essex circle', *Historical Research* 81 (2008), pp. 423–46.

[2] G. Baldin, 'Thomas Hobbes e la repubblica di Venetia', *Rivista di Storia della Filosofia* 4 (2015), p. 727; Fulgenzio Micanzio, *Lettere a William Cavendish (1615-28) nella versione inglese di Thomas Hobbes*, ed. Roberto Ferrini (Rome, 1987).

[3] See Hobbes's lengthy refutation in Chapter 42 of *Leviathan*. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (Cambridge, 1996), ed. R. Tuck, pp. 378–402.

[4] This flourishing of scholarship is usefully summarised in J. Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 2011), pp. 203–8. See also Rose's own account in the same chapter.

set of religious dividing lines, so too the writings of the Venetian Connection were again brought to bear on debate. Their legacy was hotly contested, and in the mid-1690s, the prominent Williamite bishop Gilbert Burnet and the non-juror George Hickes became embroiled in an extended pamphlet dispute over the historical accuracy of Burnet's *Life of William Bedell* (1685), clashing over both Bedell and Sarpi's legacies.[5] This fresh set of debates would require more space than is currently available to unpick in full. But what is clear is that Hickes and Burnet agreed that Bedell and Sarpi remained valuable authorities.

[5] [Gilbert Burnet], *The Life of William Bedell, D.D.: Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland* (London, 1685); Gilbert Burnet, *The life of William Bedell D.D., Lord Bishop of Killmore in Ireland* (London, 1692); George Hickes, *Some discourses upon Dr. Burnet and Dr. Tillotson occasioned by the late funeral sermon of the former upon the later* (London, 1695); Gilbert Burnet, *Reflections upon a pamphlet entituled, Some discourses upon Dr. Burnet and Dr. Tillotson* (London, 1696). This dispute spilled over into works by other authors, and was again revived when Burnet mentioned Bedell in Gilbert Burnet, *The Bishop of Salisbury His Speech in the House of Lords, on the First Article of the Impeachment of Dr. Henry Sacheverell* (London, 1710).

Conclusion

It has long been recognised that the early seventeenth century was an especially fertile moment for Anglo-Venetian intellectual exchange. Enrico de Mas thought it so significant that he proposed the label 'seicento anglo-veneto' (the Anglo-Venetian seventeenth century) to define the period 1605/6 to 1621/22. Hugh Trevor-Roper placed Anglo-Venetian connections at the heart of his account of the development of European religious toleration, while William Bouwsma viewed them as an important bridge which introduced Italian Renaissance Republicanism to the English-speaking world. This dissertation has reaffirmed the importance of this Anglo-Venetian moment for seventeenth-century intellectual history, while revising earlier judgements of its broader significance.

Characterisations of the members of the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian network as ecumenists (De Mas, Trevor-Roper) or republicans (Bouwsma) do not stand up to scrutiny. The group instead cohered around a deep concern about papal incursions into secular jurisdiction. This reappraisal of the significance of this period of Anglo-Venetian exchange also involves a substantial reassessment of Paolo Sarpi's role and intellectual significance. In contrast to the accounts offered by David Wootton and Vittorio Frajese, who emphasise Sarpi's heterodox religious views, I have suggested that Sarpi, Micanzio and their English interlocutors developed a shared project for religious reform, which emphasised conformity to a strong state Church. Sarpi's appeal for the English lay in not in the fact that his writings were anti-religious – or even anti-clerical – but rather the fact that they offered a firm defence of the powers of secular rulers against papal tyranny. Sarpi's analysis of the Church–State relations closely correlated with the Jacobean Reformed conformist stance on the Royal Supremacy. He, like Jacobean writers defending the Church of England from a Reformed conformist standpoint – endorsed a vision of princely headship of the Church which was non-sacerdotal, but allowed the secular ruler complete authority in matters of ecclesiastical government.

In the words of Jaqueline Rose, 'Supremacy was the juridical embodiment of that pervasive early modern English mentality: anti-popery.'[1] This is true, but we must also recognise that the English model of Royal Supremacy appealed to and grew out of a broader anti-papal mentality, with appeal far beyond the borders of England. Sarpi expounded a vision of 'Supremacy' which was neither specifically English nor specifically 'Royal': 'Princely' would be a more accurate term. But it is a vision which can plausibly be seen as generalising the intellectual foundations of the Church of England so that they could be applied to other 'particular' Churches. This vision might, without excessive exaggeration, be described as an 'international' version of secular Supremacy, and an important aim of this dissertation has been to demonstrate that the English model of Royal Supremacy had a broader international history. Indeed, the particular version of Supremacy promoted by the Venetian Connection was developed (and finessed) in direct response to the challenge of an unstable geopolitical order. Having diagnosed papal claims to temporal authority as the major destabilising force in European politics, the Connection could posit a system in which all secular jurisdiction flowed from a finite number of absolute, divinely ordained sovereigns. These sovereigns' spheres of authority were independent and did not overlap, and consequently (it was hoped) removed the risk of confusion and destabilisation caused by competing princely and papal claims

Thus, in the eyes of the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian network – including participants from both England and Venice – there was nothing parochial or exceptionalist about premising Church–State relations on the absolute jurisdictional authority of the secular prince. Rather, the Church of England offered the best example of the form of Church–State relations which needed to be applied in states across Europe if the disruptive and illegitimate jurisdictional claims of the papacy were to be excised from European politics. Much as papal authors tried to smear the Church of England as schismatic, and Presbyterians tried to smear it as a Church only partially

[1] J. Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 2011), p. 275.

Reformed, for the Anglo-Venetian network, the English Church continued to represent the 'cause of all princes in common'.[2]

A greater appreciation of the nature Sarpi's influence suggests new ways in which we can understand the English Royal Supremacy. But it is also important to recognise how far his ideas grew out of interactions with a broader Anglo-Venetian network. Too much scholarship on Sarpi has treated him as a unique and isolated figure, whose ideas were either before (Frajese, Wootton) or after (Kainulainen) his time. But the evidence here tells a different story, in which Sarpi was closely engaged with contemporary debates on canons of the Church councils, the Jesuit order and the identification of the Antichrist, and developed his stances in direct conversation with his English interlocutors. In particular, I have highlighted the roles of William Bedell, whose significance for Sarpi's intellectual development has been noted but never previously brought out in the detail it deserve, and Samuel Ward, whose Venetian interests have hitherto gone entirely unrecognised. Identifying a substantial number of manuscripts as Bedell's for the first time has especially enabled me to build up a fresh account of Bedell, Sarpi and Micanzio's rapport.

The picture that emerges is of close collaboration. The three men exchanged views on recent works of theology and history, developing a shared repertoire of anti-papal arguments. Bedell sent information given to him by Sarpi back to England, where his letters became a direct source for King James VI & I's refutation of Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, the Pope's leading polemicist. Sarpi, Bedell and Micanzio's interactions were also characterised by a particular interest in ecclesiastical history. They shared a conviction that the Pope's corruption of the Church could be traced as a historical phenomenon, and that highlighting this process was the best way to undermine papal power. This narrative of papal manipulation was given its most lucid form in Sarpi's *Historia del Concilio tridentino*, but the *Historia* was only the most visible fruit of an extended exchange of information and ideas about the political significance of ecclesiastical history.

[2] See above, p. 23 and p. 50.

This Anglo-Venetian exchange also took place within a broader web of early modern connections. Bedell had a truly transnational career, which took him from godly Cambridge to puritan Suffolk to Catholic but anti-papal Venice, and finally saw him appointed a bishop in colonial Ireland. His manuscripts also contain insights into his views on Judaism, Islam, and the contemporary Jesuit mission to China. Bedell and Wotton's appear to have defined their own evangelical efforts against those of their Catholic rivals, and it is clear that the English effort to 'convert' Venice merits a place within emerging histories of 'global Christianity'.

The English and the Venetian anti-papal party hoped that a distinctive, generalised version of the English Royal Supremacy would provide a more secure foundation for European peace than geopolitical division along confessional lines. These hopes would be dashed: the slow, careful path towards a Venetian Reformation was never followed through to its end, interrupted by the new conflicts and imperatives of the Thirty Years War. As a solution to the problem of balancing religious change and secular obedience, however, the ideas of the Jacobean Anglo-Venetian network continued to be an important point of reference in English and European debate.

Appendix I: Manuscript copies of Bedell's 'Defence'

At least six manuscript copies survive, including LPL, London, MS 772; BL, Add. MS 10055; Bodl., MS. Eng. th. C. 65; Bodl., MS Rawlinson C 922, fol. 39r–147r; and Emmanuel College Library MS 181; Corpus Christi Library, Oxford, MS 309, fols. 136r *et seq*.[1]

Bodl. MS. Eng. th. C. 65 – None of the manuscript copies are written in Bedell's own hand, but Bodl. MS. Eng. the. C. 65 contains marginal additions which appear to be Bedell's own. The title is also in Bedell's hand. The text as a whole is quite rough, and it seems that Bedell may have had it copied out quickly in order to send to friends (in a slightly ambiguous letter to Ward, Bedell appears to have sent Ward a copy of the first section of his 'Defence', but told him he could not keep it, because he had promised it to the copyist, Mr Bulwer).[2] Possibly Bodl. MS. Eng. the. C. 65 is that copy. This copy is certainly contemporary and appears to have formed the basis for the other copies.

LPL MS 772 – this is the neatest and most accurate fair copy, which may have been Bedell's presentation copy for Ambrose Jermyn. It later belonged to Thomas Tenison. It is also the most widely cited of the manuscripts by modern scholars (notably Anthony Milton); I too have used it for my citations.

Bodl., MS Rawlinson C 922 – this appears to have been the copy Bedell kept himself, preserved amongst various papers Bedell collected which later belonged to Archbishop Sancroft. The text is less accurate than LPL MS 772 and Sancroft made occasional corrections to the text, either through comparison to another manuscript or on his own initiative.

---

[1] Anthony Milton, who has written the most on this manuscript work, notes the existence of five of these copies in *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 456–7, note 25.
[2] See Bedell to Ward, Bury, 16 October 1604, Tanner MS 75 fol. 126; *Two Biographies*, p. 214.

Emmanuel College Library MS 181 – This copy belonged to William Halford, Curate of Great Chart, Kent (fl. 1707–16).[3] It contains a note from one William Warren (dated 30 July 1710, Ashford), who presents it to a 'Reverend Sir' (probably Dr John Balderston, the then Master of Emmanuel) as Halford's gift. It appeared to be a neater but still contemporary copy of Bodl. MS. Eng. the. C. 65.

BL, Add. MS 10055 – An eighteenth-century copy of Emmanuel College Library MS 181 (including Warren's note), made either by or on the instruction of late eighteenth-century Master of Emmanuel, Dr Richard Farmer. This copy was sold as part of the auction of Farmer's library in 1798 for 7s 6d to Richard Heber.[4] It was bought for the British Museum Library for 8s at the auction of Heber's books in February 1836.[5]

Corpus Christi Library, Oxford, MS 309 – A copy made by the Oxford antiquary William Fulman (1632-88) and held amongst a collection of Fulman's papers related to Alabaster.

[3] CCEd Person ID: 123771.
[4] Thomas King, *Bibliotheca Farmeriana: A Catalogue of the Curious, Valuable and Extensive Library, in Print and Manuscript, of the Late Revd Richard Farmer* (Cambridge, 2014), p. 366.
[5] R.H. Evans, *Auction catalogue, books of Richard Heber, 10 to 20 February 1836* (London, 1836), p. 7. Prices noted on the copy held at the Royal Library at The Hague (available on Google Books).

Bibliography for William Bedell

To aid future study of William Bedell, I include a new bibliography of his works and correspondence, significantly expanding that included in E.S. Shuckburgh's *Two Biographies*. It remains probable that substantial further material remains to be uncovered (for instance, Bedell's correspondence with Chaderton, Diodati and Biondi, referenced in surviving letters), especially in the archives of Ireland, where at least some of Bedell's papers were dispersed, rather than destroyed, following the Rebellion of 1641.

Notes for this bibliography

I have modified dates to treat 1 January as the start of the year. Dates given according to Roman calendar have also been converted to the Julian calendar. All dates Old Style unless otherwise specified. Square brackets [xxx] indicate information which is not recorded on the original manuscript or book, but which I consider certain. Square brackets which contain a question mark [xxx?] are suggestions which I think likely but not certain.

Manuscripts

[William Bedell], 'A weyghty deliberation… Touching Ceremonyes to be used in the publick service of God', [1604].

- Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 922, fols. 1r–5v, holograph.
- BL, Add MS 38492, fols. 18r-23v, transcript.

[William Bedell], 'An Answer to certaine Positions entituled Theses Against the erroneous conceit of those, which hold that the respect of offence in the use of thinges indifferent, ceaseth, when the Magistrates commandement interposeth it selfe', [1604?].

- Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 922, fols. 33r–8r, holograph.

William Bedell, 'A Defence of the Answer to Mr Alablasters fower demandes against a Treatise entituled The Catholikes Reply upon Bedells answer to Mr Alablasters fower demandes', 1604.

- Bodl. MS. Eng. th. C. 65, transcript with holograph annotations.
- LPS, MS 772, transcript.
- Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 922, fols. 39r–147r, transcript.
- Emmanuel, MS 181, transcript.
- BL, Add. MS 10055, transcript.

[William Bedell], '[Refutation of] Mr Alablasters declaration of Christs being 3 dayes & 3 nights in the bowells of the earth', [1604?].

- Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 922, fols. 148r–50r, holograph.

[William Bedell], Latin annotations on the Rules of the Jesuits, [1607]

- TCC, MS R.10.9, fols. 53r–8r, holograph.

[William Bedell], 'MS. Sermons of Bishop Bedell', [started in 1611]

- QUB, MS 128, holograph.

William Bedell, [View of religion], [1611]

- NLI, MS 471, transcript.

[William Bedell], 'De libris theologicis examinandis', 28 May 1624

- Bodl., Tanner MS 114, fol. 127r, transcript.
- Printed in Wilkins, *Concilia* (London, 1737), Vol. 4, p. 469.

[William Bedell], 'Memorials of the Government of the Colledge [i.e. Trinity College, Dublin] since the death of S[i]r W[illia]m Temple & of the calling of W[illiam] Bedell to the Provosts place there', 1626–9.

- TCD, MS 4976, holograph.

[William Bedell?], 'Bishop Bedle his groundes for the lawfullnesse of usury', [post 1629?].

- BL, Stowe MS 984, notes by a reader, probably John Keymer, on a work by Bedell.[6]

William Bedell, 'On the efficiency of grace', 1630.

- Bodl., Tanner MS 458, fols. 219r–47r, transcript by Partrick Coddan.
- printed in *Two Biographies*, pp. 371–96.

[William Bedell], [Response to Ward on the Sacraments, in Latin], [1630?].

- Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 922, fols. 10r–11v, transcript.
- Bodl., Tanner MS 65, fols. 48r–9v, holograph.

William Bedell, Sermon on Revelation 18.4, 1634

- Bodl., Tanner MS 458, fols. 161r–87v, holograph

[William Bedell], 'A censure of two popish treatises written at the desire of a friend', [copied by Clogie, 1639].

- Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 922, fols. 17r–21r, transcript by Alexander Clogie, but holograph title.

[6] The hand is a good match for Keymer's and the manuscript is labelled 'John Keymer's Booke' on the first page (in another hand). Keymer, known for his writings on commerce, is known to have flourished between 1584 and 1622 but the date of his death is unknown (see A. McConnell, ODNB). The fact that Keymer refers to Bedell as a bishop suggests that he lived until at least 1629.

[William Bedell], 'Concerning the article of justification, or how a man is justifyed before God', [unknown].

- Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 922, fols. 26r–31v, transcript by Alexander Clogie, but holograph note.

[William Bedell], 'The pointes in Controversie may be reduced to these 5 heades 1. Predestination 2 Redeption 3 Vocation 4 the obedience of the Faythfull 5 Perseverance', [unknown].

- Bodl., Tanner MS 65, fols. 46r–7v, holograph.

Early printed works

William Bedell and James Wadsworth, *Copies of certaine letters which have passed between Spaine and England in the matter of Religion* (London, 1624).

- Reprinted in Gilbert Burnet, *The Life of William Bedell D.D.* (London, 1685). Later editions: London, 1692; Dublin, 1736; Dublin, 1758.

William Bedell, *An Examination of certain motives to Recusancy* (Cambridge, 1626)

N. Bernard, *The judgement of the late Arch-bishop of Armagh, and Primate of Ireland. Of Babylon (Rev. 18. 4.)… With a sermon of Bishop Bedels upon the same words... Unto which is added a character of Bishop Bedel* (London, 1659).

- Manuscript copy in Bodl., Tanner MS 458, fols. 161r–87v.

William Bedell, 'Responsio ad praecedentia Problemata de pacis ecclesiasticae consiliis capessendis', in John Dury, *Irenicorum Tractatuum Prodromus* (Amsterdam, 1662), pp. 35–49.

William Bedell, *The Shepherd's Tale of the Powder Plot* (London, 1713)

Early printed books translated by Bedell

[Bedell (ed.), William], *A true copie of the sentence of the high Councell of tenne iudges in the state of Venice against Ridolfo Poma, Michael Viti priest, Alessandro Parrasio, Iohn of Florence the sonne of Paul and Pasquall of Bitonto, who of late most trayterously attempted a bloudy and horrible murder upon the person of the reverend Father Dr. Paolo Servite* (London, 1608).

Paolo Sarpi, *Historiae Concili Tridentini* (London, 1620), [first six books trans. Adam Newton and final two trans. William Bedell?]

Edwin Sandys, *Relatione dello stato della religione, e con quali dissegni et arti ella è stata fabricata e maneggiata in diversi stati di queste occidentali parti del mondo* ([Geneva], 1625), [trans. William Bedell, with additions by Paolo Sarpi].

Sarpi, Paolo, *Interdicti Veneti historia de motu Italiæ sub initia Pontificatus Pauli V commentarius* (London, 1626), trans. William Bedell.

[Paolo Sarpi], *Quaestio quodlibetica, an liceat stipendia sub principe religione discrepante mereri* (Cambridge, 1630), [trans. William Bedell].

Bedell, William, *Some Original Letters of Bishop Bedell Concerning the Steps Taken Toward a Reformation of Religion at Venice* (Dublin, 1742), ed. Edward Hudson.

Manuscript translations/corrections to which Bedell contributed

Transcription and correction of 'Dialogi hierarchiae subcoelestis de reformation ecclesiae militantis', [date unknown]

- TCD, MS 329 – note by James Ussher wrote on the first leaf: 'D Ward transcribed it. Mr Bedell and Mr Patr Yong corrected it'.

‘All the Canonical Bookes of the Old Testament, translated out of Hebrew into the Irish tongue, by the procurement of Doctor Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore’

- Marsh’s Library, Marsh Z4.2.3(a–b), 2 vols

Irish Old Testament: Prophets and Apocrypha

- CUL, MS Dd.9.7

Owned by Bedell

Biblia Hebraica, 3 vols

- Emmanuel, MS I.5, 6 and 7,

Ricemarch Psalter

- TCD, MS 50

Works relating to the Interdict controversy

- Emmanuel, 329.3.10-12 (containing 13 items: 9 Italian, 4 Latin). Full details of contents here:

329.3.10 (containing 13 items: 9 Italian, 4 Latin)

- The Latin inscription on this first volume, not in Bedell’s hand, reads ‘This book was given to Emmanuel College by William Beadle, member of the College’ and is dated 4 October 1621.

The works contained are:

Leonardo Donato, *Leonardo Donato, per gratia di Dio, Duce di Venetia… 6 maggio 1606* (Venice, 1606).

Jean Gerson [trans. Paolo Sarpi], *Trattato et resolutione sopra la validità delle scommuniche* ([Venice], 1606).

Marco Antonio Pellegrini, Marcus Antonius Othelius and Joachinus Scaynus, *Responsa… reddita pro decretis serenissimi Principis Veneti. De non alienandis bonis immobilibus in personas Ecclesiasticas* (Venice, 1606).

Paolo Sarpi, *Considerationi sopra le censure della santità di papa Paulo V. contra la serenissima republica di Venetia* (Venice, 1606).

Paolo Sarpi et al., *Trattato dell'interdetto della santità di papa Paulo V. Nel quale si dimostra che egli non è legitimamente publicato* (Venice, 1606), two copies.

Antonio Querini, *Aviso delle ragioni della Republica di Venetia. Intorno alle difficoltà che le sono promosse dalla Santità di Papa Paolo V* (Venice, 1606).

Giovanni Marsilio, *Difesa a favore della risposta dell'otto propositioni contro la quale ha scritto l'illustrissimo et reverendissimo signor cardinal Bellarmino* (Venice, 1606).

Nicolò Crasso, *Antiparaenesis ad Caesarem Baronium cardinalem pro seren. Veneta republica* (Padua, 1606).

Ventura Vincentino [Gaspare Lonigo], *Consilium super controversia vertente inter beatissimum Paulum papam V. ac serenissimam rempublicam Venetam* (Venice, 1606).

Paolo Sarpi, *Apologia per le oppositioni fatte dall'illustrissimo, & reverendissimo signor cardinale Bellarminio [sic] alli trattati, et risolutioni di Gio. Gersone sopra la validità delle scommuniche* (Venice, 1606).

[Antonio Possevino], *La città di Verona, ai lettori* (Verona, 1606).

Antonio Possevino, *Lettera al padre maestro Marc'Antonio Capello minor conventale, con la risposta di detto padre. Et il suo parere delle controversie trà il sommo pontefice Paolo quinto, et la serenissima Republica di Venetia* (Venice, 1606).

Gallofrancus [Louis Servin], *Pro libertate Status et Reipublicae Venetorum Gallofranci ad Philenetum epistola* (Paris, 1606).

329.3.11 (containing 12 items: 7 Italian, 5 Latin)

Marc' Antonio Capello, *Delle controversie tra il Sommo Pontifice Paulo Quinto, et… Venetia* (Venice, 1606).

Marc' Antonio Capello, *Risposta ... al discorso del P. M. Lelio ... sopra i fondamenti et le ragioni delle S. S. Venetiani intorno all'inter detto et censure di Papa Paolo V* (Venice, 1606).

[Alessandro Lisca], *Ad illustrissimum Caesarem Baronium Cardinalem epistola* ([Venice], 1606).

Girolamo Vendrameni, *Disquisitiones controversiarum inter Paulum V. Summum Pont. ac Venetam Rempubl. vergentium* (Venice, 1607).

Girolamo Vendramin, *Assertiones… contra Venetae Reipublicae detractores ac maledicos* (Venice, 1606).

Fulgenzio Tomaselli, *Le mentite filoteane o vero inuettiua di Giouanni Filoteo d'Asti contra la Republica Serenissima di Venetia confutata* (Padua, 1607).

Giovanni Marsilio, *Catholicae veritatis audiendae studiosis s.* (s.l., 1606).

Fulgenzio Manfredi, *A tutti li reverendissimi Padri in Christo. . . La gratia dello Spirito Santo, lo Spirito di Christo, et il zelo de gli Apostoli* (Venice, 1606).

Giovan Simone Sardi [Giovanni Battista Leoni], *Due discorsi sopra la libertà ecclesiastica* ([Venice], 1606).

Wolfgang Hoffman, *Avvertimento et ammonitione catolica al padre Antonio Posseuino giesuito. Contenuta in una lettera scrittagli da un gentilhuomo alemano alleuo del Collegio Germanico di Roma* (Venice, 1606).

[Antonio Possevino], *Due lettere una publicata sotto nome della Republica di Genova alla Republica di Venetia. L'altra che contiene il parere sopra la medesima lettera* (Milan, 1606).

[Ottavio Menini], *Ad Paulum V. pontificem maximum pro Republica Veneta. Oratio* (s.l., 1607).

329.3.12 (containing 12 items: 8 Italian, 4 Latin)

Annibal Crancius, *Sententia… super quaestione An iniurias a Paulo V. Summo Pont. Venetae Reipub. illatas bello & armis propulsare* (Padua, 1607).

Caesar Baronius, *Duo vota hoc est ex animo voto prolatae sententiae unum ... Caesaris Baronii ... contra serenissimam Rempublicam venetam. Alterum excellentissimi D. Joannis Marsilii ... pro eadem serenissima Republica* (s.l., 1606).

Giovanni Marsilio, *Esame sopra tutte quelle scritture*, (Venice, 1607).

Giovanni Marsilio, *Seconda parte dell'essame* (Venice, 1607).

Giovan Battista Palmerio, *Lettera del devotissimo padre fra Gio. Battista Palmerio romito. Alli fedeli sudditi del dominio venetiano* ([Venice], 1606).

Fulgenzio Micanzio, *Confirmatione delle considerationi del P.M. Paulo di Venetia contra le oppositioni. Del R.P.M. Gio. Antonio Bouio Carmelitano* (Venice, 1606).

St Peter and St Paul [pseud], *Missiva Principum Apostolorum Petri, Et Pauli, Plena Apostolicae Veritatis, Christianae Charitatis, amicae & sincerae adhortationis, ablegata Romam ad Sanctissimum Patarem Paulum Quintum Pontificem* (Monte Carpeio, 1607).

Jacques Leschassier, *Consulta di N. dottore parigino intorno la controversia tra la santità di Paolo quinto et la Serenissima Republica Veneta. Ad un gentilhuomo venetiano* (Padua, 1607).

Unnamed Jesuits, *Libero, et vero discorso al re, sopra il restabilimento, che li e' dimandato per li Giesuiti* (Hanau, 1606).

Sincero Severino [pseud?], *Sostegno De i Fondamenti, & delle ragioni delli Signori Venetiani; per le quali sono scusati dalla resistenza, che fanno alle Censure, & Interdetto della Santità del Sommo Pontefice Paolo Quinto* (Hanau, 1606).

Sincero Severino [pseud?], *Vanità de gl'avvertimenti di Nicomaco Filaliteo Romano dati alla Republica di Venetia e suoi sudditi* (Hanau, 1606).

Anon., *Consilium datum amico de recuperanda et in posterum stabilienda pace Regni Poloniae, in quo demonstratur, pacem nec constitui nec stabiliri posse quamdiu Jesuitae in Polonia maneant* (s.l., 1607).

Correspondence

On the subsequent pages I have included a table of all Bedell's extant letters of which I am aware. My system of dating remains that set out at the start of this bibliography.

Abbreviations

TB No. – *Two Biographies* Number

Ussher II –James Ussher, *The Correspondence of James Ussher: 1600-1656* Vol. 2 (Dublin, 2015), ed. E. Boran, trans. D. Money.

Parr – James Ussher, *The life of the Most Reverend Father in God, James Usher… with a Collection of three hundred letters* (London, 1686), ed. Richard Parr.

Date	Place	Sender and Recipient	Archive	Shelf Mark	Folio nos	TB No.	Language	Hand	Copies
11 July 1602	[Bury St Edmunds?]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 76	fol. 148r	N/A	Latin	Autograph	
25 August 1602	[Bury St Edmunds?]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 76	fol. 161r	N/A	Latin	Autograph	
21 April 1603	[Cambridge?]	Ward to Bedell	BL	Add. MS 70001	fols. 3r-5v	N/A	[not seen]	[not seen]	
16 October 1604	Bury St Edmunds	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 75	fols. 126r–27r	1	English	Autograph	
26 November 1604	Bury St Edmunds	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 75	fol. 129r	N/A	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., MS Add. A. 215, fols. 1–4
3 December [1604]	Bury St Edmunds	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 75	fol. 130r–v	N/A	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., MS Add. A. 215, fols. 5–17
11 March 1605	Bury St Edmunds	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 75	fol. 132r–v	2	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., MS Add. A. 215, fols. 25–32
25 July [1605]	Bury St Edmunds	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 75	fol. 137r	3	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl. MS. Add. A. 215, fols. 33–38
10 February 1606	Bury St Edmunds	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 75	fol. 227r	N/A	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., MS Add. A. 215, fols. 20–24
[1607?]	[Bury St Edmunds?]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 75	fol. 17r	N/A	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., MS Add. A. 215, fols. 39–41
[1607]	[s.l.]	Joseph Hall to Bedell	N/A	N/A	pp. 69–77	N/A	English	Printed	Printed in Jospeh Hall, *Epistles, the first volume: conteining two decads* (London, 1608), pp. 69–77.
26 December [1607]	Venice	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 75	fol. 3r-v	4	English	Autograph	Transcript in CUL, Add. MS 4848, fols. 212-14
1 January 1608	Venice	Bedell to Samuel Sotheby	Bodl.	Barlow MS 13	fols. 201r–02r	N/A	English	Transcript	
1 January 1608	Venice	Bedell to Newton	BL	Lansdowne MS 90	fols. 106r–10v	5	English	Autograph	Transcripts in Tanner MS 75, fols. 242–46; TCD, MS 580, fols. 64r–68r; printed in Edward Hudson (ed.), *Some Original Letters of Bishop Bedell* (Dublin, 1752)
16 May 1608	Greenwich	Newton to Bedell	TCD	MS 580	fol. 68v	N/A	English	Transcript	Printed in Edward Hudson (ed.), *Some Original Letters of Bishop Bedell* (Dublin, 1752)
[October? 1608]	[Cambridge?]	Ward to Bedell	Sidney Sussex	Ward MS I	fols. 51r–54r	N/A	Latin	Autograph (draft)	
26 December [1608]	[Venice]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 75	fol. 131r	7	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., MS Add. A. 215, fols. 17-19
[January 1609]	Venice	Bedell to Newton	BL	Lansdowne MS 90	fols. 133r–38v	6	English	Autograph	Tanner MS 75, fols. 18–23; transcript at TCD, MS 580, fols. 69r–74v; printed in Edward Hudson (ed.), *Some Original Letters of Bishop Bedell* (Dublin, 1752)
[January 1609]	Venice	Bedell to Newton	TCD	MS 580	fol. 68v	N/A	English	Transcript	Printed in Edward Hudson (ed.), *Some Original Letters of Bishop Bedell* (Dublin, 1752)
25 August 1609	Vienna	Sir John Harington to Bedell	ÖNB	Cod. 9737r	fol. 136r	N/A	English	Autograph (draft)	
23 July 1610	Venice	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 75	fol. 354r–v	N/A	English	Autograph	
3 August 1613	[Bury St Edmunds]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 74	fol. 29r–v	8	English and Latin	Autograph	
30 November 1613	Bury St Edmunds	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 74	fol. 31r–v	9	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 290 fol. 3
[c. 1616?]	[Horningerth?]	Bedell to Jasper Despotine	LPL	MS 595	no. 19	N/A	Latin	Transcript	
19 December 1618	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 74	fol. 173r	10	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 290,fol. 6

17 February [1619?]	Bury St Edmunds	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 74	fol. 164r–v	11	English	Autograph	
[1621?]	[Bury St Edmunds?]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 73	fol. 129r	13	English	Autograph	
5 April 1622	Bury St Edmunds	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 73	fol. 140r	12	English	Autograph	
[1623?]	Horningerth	Bedell to Lady Wray	CUL	Baker MS	p. 433	N/A	English	Transcript	
4 January 1625	Horningerth	Bedell to Lady Wray	CUL	Baker MS	p. 434	N/A	English	Transcript	
16 April 1624	London	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 73	fol. 425r–v	14	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 290, fol. 79r
1 June 1624	Lyme Street [London]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 73	fol. 443r	15	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 114, fol. 128r
19 March 1626	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fol. 178r	16	English	Autograph	Transcript in same volume at fol. 180
28 March 1626	[Horningerth]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fol. 178r–v	16	English	Autograph	Transcript in same volume at fol. 180
8 November 1626	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fol. 163r–v	17	English	Autograph	
6 March 1627	Bury St Edmunds	Bedell to [Ward]	Bodl.	Rawlinson MS Lett. 89	no. 52	N/A	English	Autograph	
15 March 1627	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fol. 176r–v	18	English	Autograph	
16 April 1627	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fol. 190r–v	19	English	Autograph	
[1627]	[Horningerth?]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 114	fol. 151r–v	20	English	Autograph	
8 May 1627	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fol. 194r	21	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 114, fol. 151
18 May 1627	Horningsheath	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fol. 198r	N/A	English	Autograph	
10 September 1627	[s.l.]	Bedell to Ussher	Bodl.	Rawlinson MS Lett. 89	no. 54	N/A		Autograph	Printed in Ussher II, pp. 400–1
9 October 1627	Horningerth	Bedell to Sir Nathaniel Rich	NLI	MS 18,666	N/A	22	English	Autograph	
10 December 1627	Horningerth	Bedell to Sir Robert Cotton	Bodl.	MS Smith 71	fols. 149r–51v	N/A	English	Transcript	
17 January 1628	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fols. 235r–36r	23	English	Autograph	
29 January 1628	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fols. 239r–40v	24	English	Autograph	
8 February 1628	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fols. 243r–44r	25	English	Autograph	
24 March 1628	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fols. 262r–63v	26	English	Autograph	
1 April 1628	London	Bedell to Ussher	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	English	Printed	Printed in Parr, pp. 387–90; Ussher II, pp. 415–18
15 April 1628	Horningerth	Bedell to Ussher	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	English	Printed	Printed in Parr, pp. 391–92; Ussher II, pp. 420–22.
Before 28 April 1628	[Horningerth?]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fols. 275r–76r	27	English	Autograph	
28 April 1628	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fol. 277r	28	English	Autograph	
28 April 1628	Horningerth	Bedell to Ussher	Bodl.	Rawlinson MS Lett. 89	no. 56	N/A	English	Autograph	Printed in Ussher II, pp. 425–26
6 May 1628	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fols. 279r–80v	29	English	Autograph	
7 May 1628	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fol. 281r	30	English	Autograph	
13 May 1628	Horningerth	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fol. 282r	31	English	Autograph	

9 June 1628	Drogheda	Ussher to Bedell	TCD	MS 3812	n. 107	N/A	English	Autograph	Printed in Ussher II, pp. 433–34
16 July 1628	Trinity College Dublin	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fols. 288r–89r	32	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 290, fol. 83
30 July 1628	Trinity College Dublin	Bedell to Ussher	Bodl.	Tanner MS 72	fol. 290r–v	33	English	Autograph	Printed in Ussher II, pp. 440–41
12 August 1628	Trinity College Dublin	Bedell to Ussher	Bodl.	Rawlinson MS Lett. 89	no. 59	N/A	English	Autograph	Printed in Ussher II, pp. 441–43
5 March 1629	Trinity College Dublin	Bedell to Ussher	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	English	Printed	Printed in Parr, pp. 402–3; Ussher II, pp. 446–47
12 May 1629	Dublin	Bedell to Ussher	Bodl.	Rawlinson MS Lett. 89	no. 63	N/A	English	Autograph	Printed in Ussher II, p. 458
24 May 1629	Trinity College Dublin	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 71	fol. 8r–v	34	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 290, fol. 85
2 June 1629	Trinity College Dublin	Bedell to Laud	TNA	State Papers Ireland	fol. 224r	35	English	Autograph	
20 August 1629	Trinity College Dublin	Bedell to Ussher	Bodl.	Rawlinson MS Lett. 89	no. 67	N/A	English	Autograph	Printed in Ussher II, p. 466
6 October 1629	Kilmore	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 71	fol. 16r	36	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 290, fol. 88
28 December 1629	Kilmore	Bedell to Ussher	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	English	Printed	Printed in Parr, pp. 416–17; Ussher II, pp. 483–84
15 February 1630	Kilmore	Bedell to Ussher	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	English	Printed	Printed in Parr, pp. 416–17; Ussher II, p. 488–94
23 February 1630	Drogheda	Ussher to Bedell	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	English	Printed	Printed in Parr, pp. 424–25; Ussher II, p. 496–98
29 March 1630	Kilmore	Bedell to Ussher	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	English	Printed	Printed in Parr, pp. 428–29; Ussher II, p. 502–3
2 April 1630	Kilmore	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 71	fols. 43r-4r	37	English	Autograph	Part autograph draft in Bodl., MS Rawlinson C. 922, fol. 12r; printed in Ussher II, pp. 518–19
28 May 1630	[Garvagh?]	John Richardson to Bedell	Bodl.	Tanner MS 458	fol. 200r and attachment fols. 201r-17v	N/A	English	Autograph	
28 May 1630	[Cambridge]	Ward to Bedell (part)	Bodl.	MS Rawlinson C. 922	fol. 12r–v	N/A	English	Transcript (by Bedell)	Printed in Ussher II, pp. 519–20.
24 June 1630	Dublin	Bedell to George Downame	Bodl.	Tanner MS 71	fols. 49r–50r	38	English	Transcript	
[illegible - maybe 2 September?] 1630	[illegible]	Bedell to Downame	Bodl.	Tanner MS 71	fol. 49	39	English	Transcript	
7 August 1630	Kilmore	Bedell to Laud	TNA	SP 63/251	fols. 91r–93r	41	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 278, fol. 50
11 September 1630	Fullham House	Laud to Bedell	TNA	SP 63/251	fols. 157r–60r	42	English	Transcript	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 278, fol. 50
16 September 1630 ('sent 11 October 1630')	Kilmore	Bedell to Richardson	Bodl.	Tanner MS 458	fol. 218r–v and attachment fols. 219r-47r	App'x I	English	Autograph	

18 September 1630	Kilmore	Bedell to Ussher	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	English	Printed	Printed in Parr, pp. 451–45; Ussher II, p. 533–38
11 October 1630	Kilmore	Bedell to Downame	Bodl.	Tanner MS 71	fol. 51r-v	40	English	Transcript	
22 October 1630	[Garvagh?]	Richardson to Bedell	Bodl.	Tanner MS 458	fol. 247v	N/A	English	Transcript?	
31 October 1630	Limavady	Richardson to Bedell	Bodl.	Tanner MS 458	fol. 191	N/A	English	Autograph	
14 November 1630	Dublin	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 71	fols. 57r-61r	43	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 290, fol. 89; part autograph draft in Bodl., MS Rawlinson C 922, fols. 12v–15v which is printed in Ussher II, pp. 520–25
December 1630	[s.l.]	Bedell to [Richardson?]	Bodl.	Tanner MS 458	fol. 194r-v	N/A	English	Autograph	With piece on grace attached
6 December 1630	Dublin	Bedell to Laud	TNA	SP 63/251	fol. 237r	44	English	Autograph	
10 May 1631	Dublin	Bedell to Laud	TNA	SP 63/252	fols. 93r–94r	45	English	Autograph	
17 February 1632	Dublin	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 71	fols. 111r-12r	46	English	Autograph	
5 November 1633	Kilmore	Bedell to Lord Viscount Wentworth	Bodl.	Rawlinson D. 376	fols. 226r-30v	N/A	English	Transcript	
25 November 1633	Kilmore	Bedell to Wentworth	Bodl.	Rawlinson D. 376	fols. 233r-v	N/A	English	Transcript	
2 February 1634	Kilmore	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 71	fols. 189r-92r	47	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 290, fol. 91r
10 May 1634	[s.l.]	Ussher, Bedell and Richardson to John Dury	BL	Sloane MS 402	fols. 195r–96v	N/A	Latin	[not seen]	Another copy in BL, Sloane, 1465; printed in Ussher II, pp. 630–31
13 May 1634	[s.l.]	Ussher, Bedell and Richardson to Dury	BL	Sloane MS 403	fols. 193r–94v	N/A	Latin	[not seen]	Printed in Ussher II, pp. 633–35
14 May 1635	Dublin	Ussher, Bedell and Richardson to Dury	BL	Sloane MS 1465	fol. 6r–v.	N/A	Latin	[not seen]	Printed in Ussher II, pp. 661–63.
20 June 1635	London	Dury to Ussher, Bedell and Richardson	BL	Sloane MS 654	fols. 183r–84v	N/A	Latin	[not seen]	Printed in Ussher II, pp. 665–69
11 October 1635	[place?]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 70	fol. 74r-v	48	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 290, fol. 94
26 July 1636	Kilmore	Bedell to Cornelius Shiriden	BL	Add MS 70002	fols. 114r–15v	N/A	Latin	Autograph	
18 August 1636	Kilmore	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 70	fol. 96r-v	49	English	Autograph	
24 February 1637	Kilmore	Bedell to Wentworth	Bodl.	Rawlinson D. 376	fol. 234r-35v	N/A	English	Transcript	
17 May 1637	Dublin	Ussher, Bedell and Richardson to Dury	BL	Sloane MS 1465	fols. 162r–63v	N/A	Latin	[not seen]	Printed in Ussher II, p. 721–24
2 September 1637	[s.l.]	Bedell to Laud	TNA	SP 63/256	fols. 137r–40v	50	English and Latin	Autograph	
[12 October 1637]	[s.l.]	Laud to Bedell	TNA	SP 63/256	fol. 149r	51	English	Transcript	
12 November 1638	Dublin	Bedell to Laud	TNA	SP 63/256	fols. 290r–92v	52	English	Autograph	
1 December 1638	[s.l.]	Bedell to Wentworth	TNA	SP 63/256	fols. 300r–1r	N/A	English	Autograph	
20 December 1638	Dublin	Bedell to Laud	TNA	SP 63/256	fols. 304r–5r	53	English	Autograph	
24 May 1639	Dublin	Bedell to Laud	TNA	SP 63/257/1	fols. 71r–72v	55	English	Autograph	

30 May 1639	Dublin	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 67	fols. 113r–14r	56	English	Autograph	Transcript in Bodl., Tanner MS 290, fol. 101
[28 June 1639]	[s.l.]	Laud to Bedell	TNA	SP 63/257/1	fol. 82r–v	57	English	Transcript	
29 June 1639	Hamburg	Dury to Ussher, Bedell and Richardson	BL	Sloane MS 654	fols. 185r–186v	N/A	Latin	Autograph	Printed in Ussher II, pp. 775–77
15 October 1639	Kilmore	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 67	fol. 138r–v	59	English	Autograph	
22 October 1639	[Kilmore]	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 67	fol. 139r	59	English	Autograph	
16 December 1639	Drogheda	Ussher, Bedell and Richardson to Dury	BL	Sloane MS 1465	fol. 5r–v	N/A	Latin	[not seen]	Printed in Ussher II, pp. 809–10
31 January 1640	Dublin	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 67	fol. 166r–v	60	English	Yes	
23 April 1640	Dublin	Bedell to Ward	Bodl.	Tanner MS 65	fols. 64r–65r	61	English	Yes	
13 July 1640	Dublin	Bedell to his sister	Bodl.	Tanner MS 65	fol. 96r–97r	62	English	Yes	
[August 1641?]	Dublin	Ward to Bedell	Sidney Sussex	Ward MS O/3	N/A	N/A	[not seen]	[not seen]	

Bibliography

Primary Manuscript Sources

Belfast, Queen's University Library

MS 128, 'MS. Sermons of Bishop Bedell'.

Bury St Edmunds, Cathedral Library

CLC T716, donation signed by Despotine

CLC G1235, donation signed by Despotine

Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk Record Office

IC/500/3/3/53, Probate Inventory of Jasper Despotine.

Cambridge, University Library

MS Dd.9.7, Irish Old Testament: Prophets and Apocrypha.

Cambridge, Emmanuel College Library

MS 9, 'Liber dialogorum hierarchiae subcoelestis'.

MS 181, Bedell's 'Defence'.

309.1.49, Philippe Duplessis-Mornay, *Mysterium iniquitatis* (Saumur, 1611), donated by Joseph Alliston.

329.3.10, works on the Interdict, donated by William Bedell.

Cambridge, Sidney Sussex Muniments Room

Ward MS B, I, Samuel Ward papers.

MS 65, 'Mattei Blastaris de sacris synodis synopsis Graece'.

Cambridge, Trinity College Library

MS R.3.42, MS R.3.44, MS R.3.44a, MS R.4.28, MS R.4.36, MS R.4.38–39, MS R.5.23, MS R.10.6–9, MS R.10.14, MS R.14.19, MS R.16.23, Castelvetro papers.

Chicago, University Library
Bacon MS 4178, Thomas Daynes to Lady Anne Drury.

Dublin, Marsh's Library
Marsh Z4.2.3(a–b), 'All the Canonical Bookes of the Old Testament, translated out of Hebrew into the Irish tongue, by the procurement of Doctor Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore', 2 vols.

Dublin, National Library of Ireland
MS 471, William Bedell, [View of religion].

Dublin, Trinity College Library
MS 50, Ricemarch Psalter.
MS 329, transcript of 'Dialogi hierarchiae subcoelestis de reformatione ecclesiae militantis'.
MS 580, letters transcribed by James Ussher.

London, British Library
Add. MS 10055, Bedell's 'Defence'; 38492, Lewkenor papers.
Burney MS 366, 367, Casaubon papers.
Harley MS 3344, 7000, 7004, 7007, relating to circles of Prince Henry.
Lansdowne MS 90, 91, relating to circles of Prince Henry; 97, notes on the Jesuits.

London, Lambeth Palace Library
MS 595, Bedell to Despotine.
MS 772, Bedell's 'Defence'.

London (Kew), The National Archives
SP 12, State Papers Domestic, Elizabeth I.

SP 14, State Papers Domestic, James VI & I.
SP 63, State Papers Irish.
SP 78/52, Cecil correspondence.
SP 85/3, Bedell to Castelvetro.
SP 99, State Papers Venetian.

Oxford, Bodleian Library
MS. Eng. tho C. 65, Bedell's 'Defence'.
MS Rawlinson C. 922, William Bedell's papers.
Tanner Manuscripts, 65, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 114, 278, 290, 458, Relating to Ward and Bedell.
MS. Smith 71, Letter from Bedell to Cotton.

Oxford, Corpus Christi Library
MS 309, Bedell's 'Defence'.

Venice, Archivio di Stato di Venezia
Collegio, Esposizioni Roma, reg. 12, f. 13, Papal nuncio in Collegio.
Collegio, Esposizioni Principi, f. 14, English ambassador in Collegio.
Consultore in iure 7, 451, Sarpi papers.
ASV, Senato, Dispacci, Dispacci degli ambasciatori e residenti, Inghilterra, f. 2, Relations of Venetian Ambassador to England.

Venice, Biblioteca del Museo Correr
Fondo Donà dalle Rose, MS 167, Donà's papers relating to England.

Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana
MS. It. XI, 174 [= 6517], Micanzio's notes.
MS. It. XI, 175 [= 6518], Micanzio's notes.
MS It. XI 176 [(=6519], Sarpi's papers.

MS It. XI, 28 [=6790], Antonio Possevino, 'Relazione sopra alcune cose passate in Venezia tra sui ed Arrigo Vottone Ambasciador d'Inghilterra'.

Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek
Cod. 9737r, correspondence of Sebastian Tengnagel.
Cod. 9737z, correspondence of Hugo Blotius.

Windsor, Eton College Library
Eton, Fa.2.05, Thucydides, *De bello peloponnesiaco libri VIII,* inscribed by Casaubon.

Primary Printed Sources

Abbot, Robert, *Antichristi demonstratio contra fabulas pontificias* (London, 1603).

Aconcio, Jacopo, *Stratagematum satanae libri octo* (Oxford, 1631).

Airay, Henry, *Lectures upon the Whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians* (London, 1618), ed. Christopher Potter.

Airay, Henry, *The just and necessary apologie of Henrie Airay the late reuerend provost of Queenes Colledge in Oxford touching his suite in law for the rectorie of Charleton* (London, 1621), ed. Christopher Potter.

Alabaster, William, *Unpublished works by William Alabaster (1568-1640)* (Salzburg, 1997), ed. D.S. Sutton.

Andrewes, Lancelot, *Tortura Torti sive ad Matthaei Torti librum responsio* (London, 1609).

Anon., *A True and Perfect Relation of the whole proceedings against the late ... Traitors, Garnet, a Jesuite, and his confederats* (London, 1606).

Anon., *Narratio fidelis et succincta de nupera illa proditione ... a Jesuitis et conjuratis in ... Magnæ Britanniæ regem intentata, ex commentariis Anglicis, publica authoritate editis, in unum historiæ corpus congesta* (Leiden, 1607).

Anon., *News from Venice. An extract of certaine poyntes of religion, maintained in Venice, against the doctrine of the church of Rome* (London, 1607).

Anon., *A record of some worthy proceedings in the honourable, wise, and faithfull Howse of Commons in the late Parliament* (London, 1611).

Anon., *M. Ant. de D[omi]nis Arch-bishop of Spalato, his shiftings in religion: A man for many masters* (London, 1624).

Anon., *A vindication of the Bishop of Salisbury and passive obedience, with some remarks upon a speech which goes under his Lordship's name* ([London], 1710).

Anon., *Remarks on the several paragraphs of the Bishop of Salisbury's speech in relation to the first article of Dr. Sacheverell's impeachment. In a letter to a friend. By a presbyter of the Church of England* (London, 1710).

Anon., *Resistance or non-resistance: or, an account of the debates in the h--- of l---s, on the first article of impeachment of Dr. Henry Sacheverell. With remarks on the Bishop of Salisbury's, and the Bishop of Oxford's speechs* ([London], 1710).

Anon., *A letter to the Bishop of Salisbury, occasion'd by his Lordship's speech on the first article of impeachment against Dr. Henry Sacheverell* ([London], 1710 [1711]).

Antoninus Florentinus, *Chronicorum in tres partes diuisum* (Leiden, 1586).

Atterbury, Lewis, *Some Letters Relating to the History of the Council of Trent* (London, 1705).

A[twood], W[illiam], *The fundamental constitution of the English government proving King William and Queen Mary our lawful and rightful king and queen* (London, 1690).

Augustine, *Contra Cresconium*, in CSEL 52 (Vienna, 1909).

Bacon, Francis, *Opuscula varia posthuma, philosophica, civilia, et theologica* (London, 1658), ed. William Rawley.

Bacon, Francis, *The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon, including all his Occasional Works* (London, 1861–74), 7 vols., ed. J. Spedding.

[Barclay, John], *Replique au sieur Coeffeteau, sur sa responce à l'aduertissement du roy aux princes & potentats de la Chrestienté* (London, 1610).

Barclay, William, *De potestate papae* (London, 1607).

Bardi, Girolamo, *Vittoria navale ottenuta dalla Republica Venetiana…* (Venice, 1584).

Bargrave, Isaac, *A sermon preached before the honorable assembly of knights, citizens, and burgesses of the lower house of Parliament, February the last, 1623* (London, 1624).

Bargrave, Isaac, *A sermon preached before King Charles, March 27. 1627. Being the anniversary of his Maiesties inauguration* (London, 1627).

Bargrave, Robert, *The Travel Diary of Robert Bargrave Levant Merchant (1647-1656)* (Abingdon, 1999), ed. M. Brennan.

Barlow, William, *The summe and substance of the conference* (London, 1604).

Baronius, Cesare, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Rome, 1588–1607; Mainz, 1601–8), 12 vols.

Bayle, Pierre, *Dictionnaire historique et critique* (Rotterdam, 1697), 3 vols.

Bayle, Pierre, *An historical and critical dictionary. Translated into English, with many additions and corrections, made by the author himself, that are not in the French editions* (London, 1710), 4 vols.

Bayly Howell (ed.), T., *A complete collection of state trials* (London, 1809–1826), 33 vols.

Baxter, Richard, *The successive visibility of the church of which the Protestants are the soundest members I. defended against the opposition of Mr. William Johnson, II. proved by many arguments* (London, 1660).

[Bedell, William], *A true copie of the sentence of the high Councell of tenne iudges in the state of Venice against Ridolfo Poma, Michael Viti priest, Alessandro Parrasio, Iohn of Florence the sonne of Paul and Pasquall of Bitonto, who of late most trayterously attempted a bloudy and horrible murder upon the person of the reverend Father Dr. Paolo Servite* (London, 1608).

Bedell, William, *The Copies of Certaine Letters which Have Passed Betweene Spaine and England* (London, 1624).

Bedell, William, *Some Original Letters of Bishop Bedell Concerning the Steps Taken Toward a Reformation of Religion at Venice* (Dublin, 1742), ed. Edward Hudson.

Bedell (son), William, *A true relation of the life and death of the Right Reverend father in God William Bedell… amplified with genealogical and historical chapters, compiled from original sources* (London, 1872), ed. T.W. Jones.

Bellarmine, Robert, *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae fidei* (Ingolstadt, 1586–93), 3 vols.

[Bellarmine, Robert], *Matthaei Torti presbyteri, & theologi Papiensis responsio ad librum inscriptum, triplici nodo, triplex cuneus, sive apologia pro iuramento fidelitatis* ([Saint Omer], 1608).

Bellarmine, Robert, *Tractatus de potestate summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus adversus Gulielmum Barclaium* (Rome, 1610).

Bellarmine, Robert, 'Hieratikon Doron', in *Auctarium Bellarminianum* (Paris, 1913), ed. X.M. Le Bachelet.

Benedetti, Benedetto, *Antithesis qua, tam falsum esse, quod Vicarius Dei sit Antichristus, quam falsum est, quod Christus sit Antichristus, demonstratur, Contra impii Guilielmi Vuitackeri haeretici Angli Thesin, qua Romanum Pontificem esse illum Antichristum, quem venturum Scriptura paedixit, demonstrare conatur* (Bologna, 1608).

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Trattato della Consideratione, nel quale considera l'autorità, carico, & ufficio del Sommo Pontefice* (Venice, 1606).

Birch, Thomas, *The Life of Henry, Prince of Wales, Eldest Son of King James I: Compiled Chiefly from His Own Papers, and Other Manuscripts, Never Before Published* (London, 1760).

Bodin, Jean, *The six bookes of a common-weale* (London, 1606), trans. Richard Knolles.

Bray (ed.), G., *Records of Convocation* Vol. 7: Canterbury 1603–1700 (Woodbridge, 2006).

Brown (ed.), R., *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice*, Vol. 1: 1202-1509 (London, 1864).

Brown (ed.), H.F., *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice* Vols. 10–17: 1603–23 (London, 1900–11).

Burnet, Gilbert, *The Life of William Bedell, D. D. Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland* (London, 1685; London, 1692; London, 1696; Dublin, 1736; Dublin, 1758).

Burnet, Gilbert, *Reflections upon a pamphlet* (London, 1696).

Burnet, Gilbert, *The Bishop of Salisbury His Speech in the House of Lords, on the First Article of the Impeachment of Dr. Henry Sacheverell* (London, 1710).

Calvin, Jean, *Institutio Christianae Religionis* (Geneva, 1559).

Camden, William, *Actio in Henricum Garnetem* (London, 1607).

Carafa, Tommaso*, Poetiche dicerie divise in vaghissime descrittioni, & discorsi accademici* (Naples, 1636, 4th edn).

[Casaubon, Isaac,] *De Libertate Ecclesiastica liber singularis. Ad viros politicos qui de controversia inter Paulum V. Pontificem Maximum et Rempublicam Venetam, edoceri cupiunt* ([Paris], 1607).

Casaubon, Isaac, *Polybii Lycortae F. Megalopolitani Historiarum libri qui supersunt. Isaacus Casaubonus ex antiquis libris emendavit, Latine vertit, et commentariis illustravit…* (Paris, 1609).

Casaubon, Isaac, *Ad Polybii Historiarum librum primum commentarii* (Paris, 1617).

Casaubon, Isaac, *Isaaci Casauboni epistolae* (Rotterdam, 1709), ed. Theodoor Jansson.

Castelvetro, Giacomo, *The fruit and Vegetables of Italy* (London, 1989) ed. J. Grigson.

Cecil, Robert, *An answere to certaine scandalous papers, scattered abroad under colour of a Catholicke admonition* (London, 1606).

Cecil, Robert, *Responsio ad libellum quendam famosum, Catholicæ admonitionis prætextu in vulgus sparsum* (London, 1606).

Chamberlain, John, *The Letters of John Chamberlain* (Philadelphia, 1939), 2 vols, ed. N. E. McClure.

Charron, Pierre, *Of Wisdome Three Bookes* ([London], [1608]), trans. Samson Lennard.

Chemnitz, Martin, *Examen Concilii Tridentini* ([Frankfurt],1566)*,* 2 vols.

Chillingworth, William, *The religion of protestants a safe way to salvation* (London, 1638).

Chrysostom, John, *Tou en hagiois patros hēmōn Iōannou Archiepiskopou Kōnstantinoupoleōs tou Chrysostomou tōn heuriskomenōn* (Eton, 1612; Eton, 1613), 8 vols, ed. Henry Savile.

[Church of England], *Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiasticall* (London, 1604).

Clarke, Samuel, 'The Life and Death of Thomas Gataker', in *A general martyrologie, containing a collection of all the greatest persecutions which have befallen the church of Christ, from the creation to our present times* (London, 1677).

Cochlaeus, Johannes [Johannes Wendelstein], *Canones apostolorum, veterum conciliorum constitutiones, decreta pontificum antiquiora, de primatu Romanae ecclesiae* (Mainz, 1525).

Coke, Sir Edward, *Fasciculus florum. Or A handfull of flowers gathered out of the severall bookes of the Right Honorable Sir Edward Coke* (London, 1618).

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, *Notes on English Divines* (London, 1853), 2 vols.

Contarini, Gasparo, *De Magistratibus et Republica Venetorum* (Paris, 1543).

Contarini, Gasparo, T*he Commonwealth and Government of Venice*, trans. Lewes Lewkenor (London, 1599).

Corpus juris canonici emendatum et notis illustratum. Gregorii XIII. pont. max. iussu editum (Rome, 1582), 2 vols.

Coryate, Thomas, *Coryats Crudities: Hastily gobled up in Five Moneths Travels* (London, 1611).

[Curll, Edmund], *Some considerations humbly offer'd to the Right Reverend the Ld. Bp. of Salisbury. Occasion'd by his Lordship's speech, upon the first article of Dr. Sacheverell's impeachment* (London, 1710).

De Dominis, Marc'Antonio, *Causae profectionis suae ex Italia* (s.l., 1616).

De Dominis, Marc'Antonio, *A Manifestation* (London, 1616).

De Dominis, Marc'Antonio, *A sermon preached in Italian* (London, 1617).

Diodati, Giovanni, *I sacri salmi messi in rime italiane* (Geneva, 1631; s.l., 1631).

Dionysius Exiguus, *Codex canonum ecclesiasticorum* (Paris, 1643), ed. C. Justel.

[Donato, Leonardo,] The Duke and State of Venice, *The Popes bull gelded or An edict published by the Duke and State of Venice, against the late bull of Pope Paulus Quintus, the sixth of May 1606. in the fourth indiction* (London, 1606).

Drusius, Johannes, *Responsio ad Serarium De Tribus Sectis Judaeorum* (Franeker, 1605).

Du Moulin, Pierre, *L'Antibarbare, ou du langage incogneu tant es prières des particuliers qu'au service public* (Geneva, 1629).

Duplessis-Mornay, Philippe, *De veritate religionis christianae liber singularis* (Antwerp, 1581).

Duplessis-Mornay, Philippe, *A Woorke concerning the trewnesse of the Christian Religion* (London, 1587), trans. Sir Philip Sidney and Arthur Golding.

Duplessis-Mornay, Philippe, *Mystère d'iniquité: c'est à dire l'histoire de la papauté, par quels progrez elle est montée à ce comble & quelles oppositions les gens de bien lui ont faict de temps en temps. Ou sont aussi defendus les Droicts des Empereurs Rois & Princes Chrestiens, contre les Assertions des Cardinaux Bellarmin & Baronius* (Saumur, [1611]; [Saumur], 1612)

Duplessis-Mornay, Philippe, *Mysterium iniquitatis seu, Historia papatus. Quibus gradibus ad id fastigii enisus sit, quamque acriter omni tempore ubique a piis contra intercessum. Asseruntur etiam jura Imperatorum, Regum, & Principium Christianorum adversus Bellarminum & Baronium Cardinales* (Saumur, 1611).

Duplessis-Mornay, Philippe, *The mysterie of iniquitie: that is to say, The historie of the papacie Declaring by what degrees it is now mounted to this height, and what oppositions the better sort from time to time have made against it. Where is also defended the right of emperours, kings, and Christian princes, against the assertions of the cardinals, Bellarmine and Baronius*, (London, 1612), trans. Samson Lennard.

Dyfnallt Owen (ed.), G., *Calendar of the manuscripts of the most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury* Vol. 21: 1609-1612 (London, 1970).

Erasmus, Desiderius, *Seven dialogues both pithie and profitable* (London, 1606), ed. William Burton.

Erastus, Thomas, *Explicatio Gravissimae Quaestionis utrum Exommunicatio . . . mandato nitatur Divino, an excogitata sit ab hominibus* ([London], 1589), [ed. Giacomo Castelvetro].

Faulkner, William, *Two treatises the first, Concerning reproaching & censure: the second, An answer to Mr. Serjeants's Sure-footing* (London, 1684).

Foresti da Bergamo, Giacomo Filippo, *Supplementum chronicarum* (Venice, 1483).

Foster (ed.), J., *Alumni Oxonienses 1500-1714* (Oxford, 1891), 4 vols.

Gentili, Alberico, *De legationibus, libri tres* (London, 1585).

Gentili, Scipione, *Solymeidos libri duo priores de Torquati Tassi Italicis expressi* (London, 1584).

Gentili, Scipione, *Annotationi di Scipio Gentili sopra La Gierusalemme liberata di Torquato Tasso* (Leiden [London], 1586).

Gerson, Jean, *De Excommunicationis valore Opuscula duo* ([Venice], [1606]), ed. [Paolo Sarpi].

Gerson, Jean, *Trattato e ressolutione sopra la validità delle scommuniche* ([Venice], [1606]), ed. [Paolo Sarpi].

Giustiniani, Pietro, *Rerum Venetarum ab urbe condita historia* (Venice, 1560).

Hall, Joseph, *Epistles, the first volume: conteining two decads* (London, 1608).

Harris, Paul, *A briefe confutation of certaine absurd, hereticall, and damnable doctrines, delivered by Mr. James Usher, in a sermon, preached before King James our late Soueraigne, at Wansted, June 20. anno Domini. 1624* (Saint-Omer, 1627).

[Herburt, Jan Szczęsny], *Consilium… de recuperanda et in posterum stabilienda pace Regni Poloniae* (s.l., 1607).

Hickes, George, *Jovian, or, An answer to Julian the Apostate by a minister of London* (London, 1683).

Hickes, George, *Some discourses upon Dr. Burnet and Dr. Tillotson occasioned by the late funeral sermon of the former upon the later* (London, 1695).

[Holywood, Christopher,] Christophorus a Sacrobosco, *De Investiganda Vera Ac Visibili Christi Ecclesia*, *Libellus* (London, 1604).

Hughes, P.L., and Larkin, J.F. (eds.), *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol. 1: Royal Proclamations of King James I 1603–1625* (Oxford, 1973).

James VI & I, *Basilicon Doron* (London, 1603).

James VI & I, *Basilikon Doron* (Paris , 1604), trans. Jean Hotman.

James VI & I, *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance* (London, 1609).

James VI & I, *King James VI and I: Political Writings* (Cambridge, 1994), ed. J.P. Sommerville.

James, Thomas, *A treatise of the corruption of Scripture, councels, and fathers, by the prelats, pastors, and pillars of the Church of Rome, for maintenance of popery and irreligion* (London, 1611).

Jerome *Epistola sancti Hieronymi ad evagrium de potestate papae. Cum praefatione D. Martini Lutheri* (Wittenberg, 1538), ed. Martin Luther.

Jerome, *Epistularum pars III: Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* Vol. 56 (Leipzig, 1910), ed. I. Hilberg.

Johnson, Samuel, *Julian the apostate being a short account of his life; the sense of the primitive Christians about his succession; and their behaviour towards him. Together with a comparison of popery and paganism* (London, 1682).

Leschassier, Jacques, *Consultatio Parisii cujusdam de controversia inter sanctitatem Pauli V et Sereniss. Rempublicam Venetam* (Paris, 1606).

Leschassier, Jacques, *De la Liberté ancienne et canonique de l'Eglise Gallicane* (Paris, 1606).

[Leslie, Charles], *The good old cause, Or, Lying in truth, being a second defence of the Lord Bishop of Sarum, from a second speech… By one Miso-Dolos* (London, 1710).

L'Estoile, Pierre de, *Mémoires-journaux: 1574-1611* (Paris, 1888–96), 12 vols, ed. G. Brunet et al.

Le Vassor, Michel, *The History of the reign of Lewis the XIIIth* Vol. I (London, 1701).

Lewis, John, *Two letters in defence of the English liturgy and Reformation; being Remarks on four sermons, lately preach'd by Dr. Thomas Bisse At the Rolls Chappel; and on his sermon before the sons of the clergy* (London, 1717).

Lewkenor (son), Sir Edward, et al., *Threnodia in obitum D. Edouardi Lewkenor Equitis, & D. Susannae coniugis charissimae* (London, 1606).

Machiavelli, Niccolò, *Il prencipe di Nicolo Machiauelli al Magnifico Lorenzo di Piero de Medici…* (Palermo [i.e. London], 1584).

Machiavelli, Niccolò, *I discorsi di Nicolo Machiavelli, sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio…* (Palermo [i.e. London], 1584).

[Manfredi, Fulgenzio?], *A declaration of the variance betweene the Pope, and the segniory of Venice* (London, 1606).

Merlin, Jacques, *Quatuor concilia generalia* (Paris, 1524; Cologne, 1530), 2 vols.

[Micanzio, Fulgenzio], *Intruzione ai prencipi della maniera con la quale governo li Padri Giesuiti* ([Venice], 1617).

[Micanzio, Fulgenzio], *An exact and sound discovery of the chiefe mysteries of jesuiticall iniquity* (London, 1619), trans. Isaac Bargrave.

Micanzio, Fulgenzio, *Vita del Padre Paolo* (Leiden, 1646).

Micanzio, Fulgenzio, *The life of the most learned Father Paul* (London, 1651).

Micanzio, Fulgenzio, 'Annotazioni and pensieri', ed. G. Benzoni, in *Storici e politici veneti del Cinquecento e del Seicento* (Milan, 1982), eds. G. Benzoni and T. Zanato.

Micanzio, Fulgenzio, *Lettere a William Cavendish* (Rome, 1987), ed. R. Ferrini, trans. Thomas Hobbes.

Middleton, Erasmus, *Biographia Evangelica Or, An Historical Account Of The Lives And Deaths Of the Most Eminent and Evangelical Authors, Or Preachers, Both British And Foreign, In The Several Denominations Of Protestants, From the Beginning of the Reformation, to the Present Time* Vol. 2 (London, 1780).

Milton (ed.), A., *The British delegation to the Synod of Dort (1618–19)* (Woodbridge, 2005).

Morton, Thomas, *A Catholike Appeale for Protestants* (London, 1609).

Paruta, Paulo, *Politick discourses*, trans. Henry Carey, Earl of Monmouth (London, 1657)

Paruta, Paulo, *The history of Venice…*, trans. Henry Carey, Earl of Monmouth (London, 1658).

Perkins, William, *A reformed Catholike* (Cambridge, 1598).

Perkins, William, *Problema de Romanae fidei ementito Catholicismo* (Cambridge, 1604), ed. Samuel Ward.

[Persons, Robert], *A treatise of three conversions of England from paganisme to Christian religion* ([Saint-Omer], 1603).

[Persons, Robert], *A treatise tending to mitigation towardes Catholike-subjectes in England* ([Saint-Omer], 1607).

Persons, Robert, *Judgement of a Catholicke English-Man* (St Omer, 1608).

Plaifere, John, *Appello evangelium for the true doctrine of the divine predestination concorded with the orthodox doctrine of Gods free-grace and mans free-will* (London,1651).

Possevino, Antonio, *Moscovia* (Vilnius, 1586).

Potter, Christopher, *A sermon preached at the consecration of the right Reverend Father in God Barnaby Potter DD. and L. Bishop of Carlisle. An advertisement touching the history of the quarrels of Pope Paul 5 with the Venetians….* (London, 1629).

Potter, Christopher, *Want of charitie justly charged, on all such Romanists, as dare (without truth or modesty) affirme, that Protestancie destroyeth salvation* (London, 1633).

Powell, Gabriel, *Disputationum Theologicarum et Scholasticarum de Antichristo et eius ecclesia Libri duo* (London, 1605)

Rainolds, John, *De Romanae Ecclesiae idolatria* (Oxford, 1596).

Ridolfi, Carlo, *Maraviglie dell'arte, overo le vite gl'illustri pittori veneti…* (Venice, 1648).

Sandys, Sir Edwin, *A relation of the state of religion and with what hopes and policies it hath beene framed, and is maintained in the severall states of these westerne parts of the world* (first published in London, 1605).

Sandys, Edwin, *Relatione dello stato della religione, e con quali dissegni et arti ella è stata fabricata e maneggiata in diversi stati di queste occidentali parti del mondo* ([Geneva], 1625), [trans. William Bedell, with additions by Paolo Sarpi].

Sarpi, Paolo, *Considerationi sopra le censure della Santità di Papa Paolo V. contra la serenissima republica di Venetia* (Venice, 1606).

Sarpi, Paolo, *A full and satisfactorie ansvver to the late vnaduised bull, thundred by Pope Paul the Fift, against the renowmed state of Venice: being modestly entitled by the learned author, Considerations vpon the censure of Pope Paul the Fift, against the common-wealth of Venice* (London, 1606).

Sarpi, Paolo, *Apologia per le oppositioni fatte dall'Illustrissimo, et Reverendiss.mo Signor Cardinale Bellarmino all trattati et resolutioni di Gio. Gersone sopra la validità delle Scommuninche* (Venice, 1606).

Sarpi, Paolo, *An Apology, or Apologeticall answere, made by Father Paule a Venetian, of the order of Serui unto the Exceptions and Objections of Cardinall Bellarmine, against certaine Treatises and Resolutions of Iohn Gerson, concerning the force and validitie of Excommunication* (London, 1607).

[Sarpi, Paolo], *Historia del Concilio Tridentino* (London, 1619).

[Sarpi, Paolo], *The historie of the Councel of Trent* (London, 1620).

[Sarpi, Paolo], *Petri Suauis Polani Historiae Concilii Tridentini libri octo* (London, 1620).

Sarpi, Paolo, *Historia particolare delle cose passate tra 'l sommo pontefice Paolo V e la serenissima republica di Venetia* ([Venice], 1624).

[Sarpi, Paolo], *Trattato se sia lecito di maneggiar l'armi in servicio di principe di diversa religione* ([Venice?], [1625?]).

Sarpi, Paolo, *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, 1625), trans. W.B. [Nathaniel Brent?].

[Sarpi, Paolo], *The history of the quarrels of Pope Paul. V. with the state of Venice. In seven books* (London, 1626), trans. C[hristopher] P[otter].

Sarpi, Paolo, *Interdicti Veneti historia de motu Italiæ sub initia Pontificatus Pauli V commentarius* (London, 1626), trans. William Bedell.

Sarpi, Paolo, *A discourse upon the reasons of the resolution taken in the Valteline against the tyranny of the Grisons and heretiques. To the most mighty Catholique King of Spaine, D. Phillip the Third. Written in Italian by the author of the Councell of Trent. And faithfully translated into English. With the translators epistle to the Commons House of Parliament* (London, 1628).

[Sarpi, Paolo,] *Quæstio quodlibetica· An liceat stipendia sub principe religione discrepante merer*e (London, 1630), [trans. William Bedell].

Sarpi, Paolo, *History of the Inquisition* (London, 1639).

Sarpi, Paolo, *The papacy of Paul the Fourth. Or, The restitution of abby lands and impropriations, an indispensable condition of reconciliation to the infallible see, &c.* (London, 1673).

Sarpi, Paolo, *A treatise of matters beneficiary* (London, 1680).

Attr. Sarpi, Paolo, [Anon.,] *The opinion of Padre Paolo, of the Order of the Servites, consultor of state, given to the Lords the inquisitors of state. In what manner the republick of Venice ought to govern themselves both at home and abroad, to have perpetual dominion. Deliver'd by publick order, in the year 1615* (London, 1689).

Sarpi, Paolo, *The letters of the renowned Father Paul, counsellor of state to the most serene republick of Venice; and author of the excellent History of the Council of Trent. Written to Monsieur Del Isle Groslot, a noble Protestant of France: the learned Monsieur Gillot, and others; in a correspondence of divers years. Translated out of Italian by Edward Brown, rector of Sundridge in Kent* (London, 1693).

Sarpi, Paolo, *A treatise of ecclesiastical benefices and revenues… To which is prefixed, (never before printed) the life of Father Paul, by Mr. Lockman. And a Preface, giving an Account of the Work* (London, 1736).

Sarpi, Paolo, *Lettere ai Protestanti* (Bari, 1931), 2 vols, ed. M.D. Busnelli.

Sarpi, Paolo, *Lettere ai Gallicani* (Wiesbaden, 1961) ed. B. Ulianich.

Sarpi, Paolo, *Opere* (Milan, 1969) eds. Gaetano Cozzi and Luisa Cozzi.

Sarpi, Paolo, *Pensieri naturali, matematici e metafisici* (Milan, 1996), eds. L. Cozzi and L. Sosio.

Sarpi, Paolo, *Consulti (1606–1609)* (Pisa, 2001), 1 vol 2 parts, ed. C. Pin.

Sarpi, Paolo, *Della potestà de' prencipi* (Venice, 2006), ed. N. Cannizzaro, with an essay by C. Pin.

Sarpi, Paolo, *Lettres Italiennes* (Paris, 2017), ed. M. Viallon.

Scaliger, Joseph Justus, *Elenchus Trihaeresii Nicolai Serarii* (Franeker, 1605).

Scaliger, Joseph Justus, *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger* (Geneva, 2012), eds. P. Botley and D. van Miert.

Selden, John, *Mare clausum, seu, De dominio maris libri duo…* (London, 1636).

Selden, John, *Of the dominion or ownership of the sea two books… translated into English and set forth with some additional evidences and discourses* (London, 1652), trans. Marchamont Nedham.

Shuckburgh (ed.), E.S., *Two Biographies of William Bedell, bishop of Kilmore: with a selection of his letters and an unpublished treatise* (Cambridge, 1902).

Signaroli, S., *Domenico Molino e Isaac Casaubon: Con l'edizione di sette lettere da Venezia a Parigi (1609–1610)* (Milan, 2017).

Smith (ed.), L.P., *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton* (Oxford, 1907), 2 vols.

Smith, Sir Thomas, *Sir Thomas Smithes voiage and entertainment in Rushia* (London, 1605).

[Sotheby, Samuel], *The reporte of a bloudie and terrible massacre in the citty of Mosco with the fearefull and tragicall end of Demetrius the last Duke, before him raigning at this present* (London, 1607).

Stock, Richard, *The churches lamentation for the losse of the godly deliuered in a sermon, at the funerals of that truly noble, and most hopefull young gentleman, John Lord Harington, Baron of Exton* (London, 1614).

Turner (ed.), C.H., *Ecclesiae Occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima: canonum et conciliorum graecorum interpretationes latinae* (Oxford, 1899).

Ussher, James, *The Correspondence of James Ussher: 1600-1656* (Dublin, 2015), 3 vols, ed. E. Boran, trans. D. Money.

Valentini, Tiberio, *Nascimento di antichristo, sua stirpe, progenie, patria, habitatione, podesta, maraviglie, vita, & morte* (Fano, 1592; Venice, 1592).

Valentini, Tiberio, *Nascimento di antichristo, sua stirpe, progenie, patria, habitatione, podesta, maraviglie, vita, & morte* (Venice, 1609).

Venn (eds.), J.A. and J., *Alumni Cantabrigienses ... from the Earliest Times to 1751* (Cambridge, 1922-27), 4 vols.

Vignier, Nicolas, *Concerning the excommunication of the Venetians a discourse against Caesar Baronius Cardinall of the Church of Rome In which the true nature and use of excommunication is briefly and cleerly demonstrated, both by testimonies of Holy Scripture, and from the old records of Christs Church* (London, 1607).

Ward, Samuel, 'The Diary of Samuel Ward', in *Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries* (Chicago, 1933), ed. M.M. Knappen.

Warren, Erasmus, *Geologia: or, A discourse concerning the earth before the deluge* (London, 1690).

Whitaker, William, *Ad Nicolai Sanderi demonstrationes quadraginta, in octauo libro visibilis Monarchiæ positas, quibus Romanum Pontificem non esse Antichristum docere instituit, responsio Guilielmi Whitakeri ... Accessit eiusdem Thesis de Antichristo, defensa in comitijs Cantabrigiensibus* (London, 1583).

Whitaker, William, *Disputatio de sacra scriptura contra hujus temporis Papistas: inprimis Robertum Bellarminum... et Thomam Stapletonum* (Cambridge, 1588).

Wilkins, David, *Concilia magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae a Synodo Verolamensi anno 446 ad Londinensem 1717* (London, 1737), 4 vols.

Willet, Andrew, *Synopsis Papismi* (London, 1600).

Wotton, Sir Henry, *Reliquiae Wottonianae or, a collection of lives, letters, poems; with characters of sundry personages: and other incomparable pieces of language and art…,* ed. Izaak Walton (London, 1651).

Attr. Wotton, Sir Henry, [Anthony Bacon, Wotton and others?], *The state of Christendom…* (London, 1657).

Wotton, Sir Henry, *Letters of Sir Henry Wotton to Sir Edmund Bacon* (London, 1661).

Venice, Council of Ten, *A true copie of the sentence of the high Councell of tenne judges in the state of Venice, against Ridolfo Poma, Michael Viti priest, Alessandro Parrasio, John of Florence the sonne of Paul and Pasquall of Bitonto; who of late most trayterously attempted a bloudy and horrible murder vpon the person of the reuerend Father Dr. Paolo Seruite, theologue of the common wealth of Venice* (London, 1608).

Secondary Sources

Adams, S., 'Spain or the Netherlands? The Dilemmas of Early Stuart Foreign Policy', in *Before the English Civil War* (London, 1983), ed. H. Tomlinson, pp. 79–101.

Amalou, T., 'Jacques Leschassier, Senlis et les libertés de l'Eglise gallicane (1607)', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 3 (2009), pp. 445-66.

Archbold, W.A.J., revised by Bakewell, S., 'Lorkin, Thomas (c. 1528–1591), ODNB.

Baine Campbell, M., 'Speedy Messengers: Fiction, Cryptography, Space Travel, and Francis Godwin's *The Man in the Moone*', *The Yearbook of English Studies* 41 (2011), pp. 190-204.

Bajetta, C.M., *Elizabeth I's Italian Letters* (New York, 2017).

Bald, R.C., *Donne and the Drurys* (Cambridge, 1959).

Baldin, G., 'Hobbes and Sarpi: Method, Matter and Natural Philosophy', *Galilaeana* 10 (2013), pp. 85–118.

Baldin, G., ‘Thomas Hobbes e la repubblica di Venetia’, *Rivista di Storia della Filosofia* 4 (2015), pp. 718–41.

Baldin, G., ‘Irenista, calvinista, scettico, o ateo nascosto? Il dibattito’, *Etica & Politica* 20 (2018), pp. 121-61.

Ballor (eds.), J., Gaetano, M., and Sytsma, D., *Beyond Dordt and De Auxiliis: The Dynamics of Protestant and Catholic Soteriology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 2019).

Bann, S., *Under the Sign: John Bargrave as Collector, Traveler, and Witness* (Ann Arbor MI, 1994).

Bann, ‘Bargrave, Isaac (bap. 1586, d. 1643)’, OBNB.

Barrington Bates, J., ‘Stephen Gardiner's Explication and the Identity of the Church’, *Anglican and Episcopal History* 10 (2003), pp. 22-54.

Bayly, C.A., et. al., ‘AHR Conversation: On Transnational History’, *The American Historical Review* 111 (2006), pp. 1441-64.

Bendall (eds.), S., Brooke C. and Collinson P., *A History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (Woodbridge, 1999).

Benzoni, G., ‘Giovanni Francesco Biondi: un avventuroso dalmata del ’600’, *Archivio Veneto* 80 (1967).

Benzoni, G., ‘I teologi minori dell’interdetto’, *Archivio Veneto* 5 (1970), pp. 31–108.

Benzoni (eds.), G., and Zanato, T., *Storici e politici veneti del Cinquecento e del Seicento* (Milan, 1982).

Birley, R., *The History of Eton College Library* (Eton, 1970).

Blank, A., ‘Protestant Natural Philosophy and the Question of Emergence, 1540–1615’, *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle* 61 (2017), pp. 7–22.

Botley, P., ’Three Very Different Translators: Joseph Scaliger, Isaac Casaubon and Richard Thomson’, *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 41 (2014), pp. 477-91.

Botley, P., *Richard ‘Dutch’ Thomson, c. 1569-1613: The Life and Letters of a Renaissance Scholar* (Leiden, 2016).

Bottigheimer, K.S., 'The Hagiography of William Bedell', in *'A miracle of learning': studies in manuscripts and Irish learning* (Aldershot, 1998), eds. T.C. Barnard, D.Ó Cróinín, K. Simms, pp. 201-20.

Bottigheimer, K.S., and Larminie, V., 'Bedell, William (bap. 1572, d. 1642)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online edition last updated 7 January 2010.

Bouwsma, W.J., 'The Venetian Interdict and the Problem of Order', *Archiwum Historii Filozofii i myzli spoleszney* 12 (1966), pp. 127–40.

Bouwsma. W.J., *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty: Renaissance Values in the Age of the Counter Reformation* (Los Angeles, 1968).

Bouwsma, W.J., 'Venice and the political education of Europe', in Renaissance Venice, ed. J.R. Hale (London, 1973) pp. 445-66.

Bremer, F.J., 'Alabaster, William (1568–1640)', ODNB.

Brett, A., *Changes of State: Nature and the Limits of the City in Early Modern Natural Law* (Princeton, 2014).

Broadway, J., 'Harington, John, first Baron Harington of Exton (1539/40–1613)', ODNB.

Brodrick, G.C., *Memorials of Merton College: With Biographical Notices of the Wardens and Fellows* (Oxford, 1885).

Brown, P.R.L., 'St. Augustine's Attitude to Religious Coercion', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 54 (1964), pp. 107-116.

Bush, S., and Rasmussen, C.J., *The Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, 1584-1637* (Cambridge, 1986).

Butler, K.T., 'An Italian's message to England in 1614: "Eat more fruit and vegetables"', *Italian Studies* 2 (1938), pp. 1–18.

Butler, K.T., 'Giacomo Castelvetro 1546–1616', *Italian Studies* 5 (1950), pp. 1–42.

Caball, M., '"Solid divine and worthy scholar": William Bedell, Venice and Gaelic culture' in *Irish and English: essays on the Irish linguistic and cultural frontier, 1600–1900*, eds. James Kelly and Ciarán Mac Murchaidh (Dublin, 2012), pp. 43–57.

Campbell, G., 'Nathaniel Tovey: Milton's Second Tutor', *Milton Quarterly* 21 (October 1987), pp. 81-90.

Chaney, E., and Wilks, T., *The Jacobean Grand Tour: Early Stuart Travellers in Europe* (London, 2014).

Christianson, P., 'Selden, John (1584–1654)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004), online edition last updated 3 January 2008.

Clarke, A., 'Bishop William Bedell (1571–1642) and the Irish Reformation', in *Worsted in the game: losers in Irish history*, ed. C. Brady (Dublin, 1989), pp. 61-72.

Clegg, C.S., *Press Censorship in Caroline England* (Cambridge, 2008).

Coffey, J., '"The Jesuits Have Shed Much Blood for Christ": Early Modern Protestants and the Problem of Catholic Overseas Missions', in *British Protestant Missions and the Conversion of Europe, 1600–1900* (London, 2020), eds. S. Maghenzani and S. Villani, pp. 38–43.

Colley, L., *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837* (New Haven, CT, 1992).

Colley, L., 'Britishness and Otherness: An Argument', *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992), pp. 309-329.

Collinson, P., *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London, 1967).

Collinson, P., 'Lectures by Combination: Structures and Characteristics of Church Life in Seventeenth-Century England', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 48 (1975), pp. 182–213.

Collinson, P., 'Magistracy and ministry: a Suffolk Miniature', in *Reformation, Conformity and Dissent: essays in honour of Geoffrey Nuttall* (London, 1977), ed. R.B. Knox, pp. 70-91.

Collinson, P., 'The Jacobean Religious Settlement: The Hampton Court Conference', in *Before the English Civil War*, ed. H. Tomlinson (London, 1983), pp. 27–51.

Collinson, P., et al., *A History of Emmanuel College, Cambridge* (Woodbridge, 1999).

Costello, W.T., *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge* (Cambridge MA, 1958).

Costil, P., *Andre Dudith: humaniste hongrois 1533-1589, sa vie, son oeuvre et ses manuscrits grecs* (Paris, 1935).

Cozzi, G., 'Fra Paolo Sarpi, l'anglicanesimo e la *Historia del Concilio Tridentino*', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 68 (1956), pp. 559-619.

Cozzi, G., *Il doge Nicolò Contarini: Ricerche sul patriziato veneziano agli inizi del Seicento* (Venice, 1958).

Cozzi, G., 'Paolo Sarpi e Jan van Meurs', *Bollettino dell'istituto di storia delta società e dello stato veneziano* 1 (1959), pp. 179-186.

Cozzi, G., 'Edwin Sandys e la *Relazione dello stato della religione*', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 79 (1967), pp. 1096–1121.

Cozzi, G., *Religione, moralità e giustizia a Venezia: vicende della magistratura degli Esecutori contro la bestemmia* (Padua, 1967).

Cozzi, G., 'Authority and the Law in Renaissance Venice', in *Renaissance Venice* (London, 1973), ed. J. R. Hale, pp. 293-345.

Cozzi, G., *Paolo Sarpi tra Venezia e l'Europa* (Torino, 1979).

Cozzi, G., *Stato, società e giustizia nella Repubblica veneta,* (Roma 1980), 2 vols.

Cozzi, G., 'Considerazioni sull'amministrazione della giustizia nella repubblica di Venezia (secc. XV–XVI)', in *Florence and Venice: Comparisons and Relations; Acts of two Conferences at Villa I Tatti in 1976–1977*, Vol. 2 (Florence, 1980), eds. C. Smith and S. I. Camporeale, pp. 101-133.

Cozzi, G., *Repubblica di Venezia e Stati italiani: Politica e giustizia dal secolo XVI al secolo XVIII* (Turin, 1982).

Cozzi, G., *Giustizia 'contaminata': Vicende giudiziare di nobili ed ebrei nella Venezia del Seicento* (Venice, 1996).

Cozzi, L., 'La tradizione settecentesca dei *Pensieri* Sarpiana', *Studi Veneziani* 13 (1971), pp. 393–448.

Croft, P., 'Rex Pacificus, Robert Cecil, and the 1604 Peace with Spain' in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences* (Basingstoke, 2006), eds. G. Burgess, J. Lawrence and R. Wymer, pp. 140-54.

Cromartie, A., ‘King James and the Hampton Court Conference’, in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority, and Government* (Aldershot, 2006), ed. R.A. Houlbrooke, pp. 61–80.

Curtis, M., ‘Hampton Court Conference and its Aftermath’, *History* 46 (1961), pp. 1–16.

Curzon, G., *Wotton and his Worlds: Spying, Science and Venetian Intrigues* (Bloomington, IN, 2003).

Da Pozzo, G., ‘Il problema filologico del testo sarpiano dell’Istoria del Concilio tridentino’, in *Ripensando Sarpi*, pp. 111–36.

Dalton, J., ‘The Politics of Conversion: Antonio Possevino SJ, Rome and the Conversion of the Family of the French Ambassador to Venice (1601–1607)’, *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* 88 (2019), pp. 3–48.

Daly, J.W., ‘The idea of absolute monarchy in seventeenth-century England’, *Historical Journal* 21 (1978), pp. 227–51.

De Jong, J.L., *The Power and the Glorification: Papal Pretensions and the Art of Propaganda in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (University Park, PA, 2013).

De Mas, E., *Sovranità Politica e Unità Cristiana nel Seicento Anglo-Veneto* (Ravenna, 1975).

De Rinaldis, M.L., *Giacomo Castelvetro, Renaissance Translator: An Interface Between English and Italian Culture* (Lecce, 2003).

De Rinaldis, M.L., ‘Giacomo Castelvetro's political translations: narrative strategies and literary style’, *Lingue Linguaggi* 14 (2015), pp. 181-96.

De Rycker, K., ‘The Italian Job: John Wolfe, Giacomo Castelvetro and Printing Pietro Aretino’, in *Specialist Markets in the Early Modern Book World* (Leiden, 2015), ed. R. Kirwan and S. Mullins, pp. 241–57.

De Vivo, F., ‘Historical Justifications of Venetian Power in the Adriatic’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 64 (2003), pp. 159–76.

De Vivo, F., ‘Paolo Sarpi and the Uses of Information in Seventeenth-Century Venice’, *Media History* 11 (2005), pp. 37-51.

De Vivo, F., *Information and Communication in Venice: Rethinking Early Modern Politics* (Oxford, 2007).

De Vivo, F., 'Francia e Inghilterra di fronte all'Interdetto di Venezia', in *Paolo Sarpi: Politique et religion en Europe*, ed. M. Viallon (Paris, 2010), pp. 163-88

De Vivo, F., 'Making Sense of the News: Micanzio's letters, Cavendish, Bacon, and the Thirty Years' War', in *The Renaissance of Letters: Knowledge and Community in Italy, 1300–1650* (London, 2019), eds. P. Findlen and S. Sutherland.

Dompnier, B., and Viallon, M., *L'Habit religieux du penseur politique: Une biographie de Paolo Sarpi* (Paris, 2019).

Donnelly, J.P., 'Italian Influences on the Development of Calvinist Scholasticism', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 7 (April 1976), pp. 81-101.

Dunning, C., 'Who Was Tsar Dmitrii?', *Slavic Review* 60 (2001), pp. 705-29.

Ellison, J., 'The Order of Editions of Sir Edwin Sandys's Relation of the State of Religion (1605)', *The Library* (1980), pp. 208–211.

Feingold, M., 'Joseph Scaliger in England', in *For the Sake of Learning: Essays in honor of Anthony Grafton* (Leiden. 2016), eds. A. Blair and A.-S. Goeing.

Ferente, S., 'Guelphs! Factions, Liberty and Sovereignty: Inquiries about the Quattrocento', *History of Political Thought* 28 (2007), pp. 571–98.

Figgis, J.N., 'Eratus and Erastianism', *Journal of Theological Studies* 2 (1901), pp. 66-101.

Fincham. K., and Lake, P., 'The Ecclesiastical Policy of James I', *Journal of British Studies* 24 (1985), pp. 169-207.

Fincham (ed.), K., *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (London, 1993).

Fink, Z.S., 'Venice and English Political Thought in the Seventeenth Century', *Modern Philology* 38 (1940), pp. 155-172.

Fink, Z.S., *The Classical Republicans: An Essay in the Recovery of a Pattern of Thought in Seventeenth-Century England* (Evanston, 1945).

Frajese, V., 'Sarpi e la tradizione scettica', *Studi Storici* 29 (1988), pp. 1029-50.

Frajese, V., *Sarpi Scettico: Stato e Chiesa a Venezia tra Cinque e Seicento* (Bologna, 1994).

Frajese, V., 'Visti da Roma. Paolo Sarpi e Fulgenzio Micanzio nel triennio protestant (1606–1609)', *Nuova rivista storica* 103 (2019), pp. 178–187.

Freeman, J., 'The Parish Ministry in the Diocese of Durham, c. 1570-1640' (Unpublished PhD thesis, Durham, 1979).

Fusaro, M., *Political Economies of Empire in the Early Modern Mediterranean: The Decline of Venice and the Rise of England*, 1450-1700 (Cambridge, 2015)

Gabrieli, V., 'Bacone, la Riforma e Roma nella versione hobbesiana di un carteggio di Fulgenzio Micanzio', *English Miscellany* 8 (1957), pp. 195–250.

Gajda, A., '*The State of Christendom*: history, political thought and the Essex circle', *Historical Research* 81 (2008), pp. 423–446.

Gajda, A., *The Earl of Essex and Late Elizabethan Political Culture* (Oxford, 2012).

Gamble, W., *William Bedell: His Life and Times* (London, 1951).

Goldie, M., 'The civil religion of James Harrington', in *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1987), ed. A. Pagden.

Grant, D., 'Francisco de Vitoria and Alberico Gentili on the Juridical Status of Native American Polities', *Renaissance Quarterly* 72 (2019), pp. 910 - 952.

Greenslade, S.L., 'The printer's copy for the Eton Chrysostom, 1610–13', *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966), pp. 60–64.

Grell, O.P., *Brethren in Christ: A Calvinist Network in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, 2011).

Grendler, M., 'A Greek Collection in Padua: The Library of Gian Vincenzo Pinelli (1535-1601)', *Renaissance Quarterly* 33 (1980), pp. 386–416.

Grendler, P.F., 'Books for Sarpi: The Smuggling of Prohibited Books into Venice during the Interdict of 1606–6', in *Essays Presented to Myron P. Gilmore* (Florence, 1976), eds. S. Bertelli and G. Ramakus.

Grendler, P.F., *The Roman Inquisition and the Venetian Press, 1540–1605* (Princeton, 1977).

Grubb, J.S., 'When Myths Lose Power: Four Decades of Venetian Historiography', *The Journal of Modern History* 58 (1986), pp. 43-94.

Gunnoe, C.D., *Thomas Erastus and the Palatinate: A Renaissance Physician in the Second Reformation* (Leiden, 2011).

Haivry, O., *John Selden and the Western Political Tradition* (Cambridge, 2017).

Hamilton, T., *Pierre de L'Estoile and his World in the Wars of Religion* (Oxford, 2017).

Hammer, P.E.J., 'The Use of Scholarship: The Secretariat of Robert Devereux, Second Earl of Essex, c. 1585–1601', *English Historical Review* 109 (1994), pp. 26-51.

Hampton, S., *Anti-Arminians: The Anglican Reformed Tradition from Charles II to George I* (Oxford, 2008).

Hampton, S., 'Samuel Ward and the Defense of Dort in England', in *Beyond Dordt and De Auxiliis: The Dynamics of Protestant and Catholic Soteriology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Leiden, 2019), eds. J. Ballor, M. Gaetano and D. Sytsma, pp. 200–18.

Hampton, S., *Grace and Conformity: The Reformed Conformist Tradition and the Early Stuart Church of England* (Oxford, 2021).

Hardy, N., 'Religion and Politics in the Composition and Reception of Baronius's *Annales Ecclesiastici*: A New Letter from Paolo Sarpi to Isaac Casaubon', in *For the Sake of Learning: Essays in Honor of Anthony Grafton* Vol. 1 (Leiden, 2016), eds. A. Blair and A. Goeing, pp. 21-38.

Hardy, N., *Criticism and Confession: The Bible in the Seventeenth Century Republic of Letters* (Oxford, 2017).

Haupt, H.-G., 'A New Sensitivity: The "Transnational" Perspective - A Critical Review', *Cahiers Jaurès* 200 (2011), pp. 173–80.

Hayton, D.W., 'The "Country" Interest and the party system', in *Party and Management in Parliament, 1660-1784* (Leicester, 1984), ed. C. Jones, pp. 37-85.

Heal, F., 'What Can King Lucius Do for You? The Reformation and the Early British Church', *English Historical Review* 120 (2005), pp. 593–614.

Healy, S., 'Harington, Sir John', in in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629* (Cambridge, 2010), ed. A. Thrush and J.P. Ferris.

Helmholz, R., *The Profession of Ecclesiastical Lawyers: An Historical Introduction* (Cambridge, 2019).

Henley, M.E., 'Sir Edwin Sandy's Europae Speculum: a critical edition' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of British Columbia, 2001).

Highfield, J.R.L., 'An autograph manuscript commonplace book of Sir Henry Savile', *Bodleian Library Record* 7 (1963), pp. 73-83.

Hill, R., 'Art and Patronage: Sir Henry Wotton and the Venetian Embassy 1604–1624', in *Double Agents: Cultural and Political Brokerage in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, 2011), eds. M. Keblusek and B.V. Noldus, pp. 27–58.

Hoekstra, K., 'Hobbes's Thucydides', in *The Oxford Handbook of Hobbes* (Oxford, 2016), eds. A.P. Martinich and K. Hoekstra.

Höpfl, H., *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c.1540–1630* (Cambridge, 2004).

Howard, D., and McBurney, H., (eds.), *The Image of Venice: Fialetti's View and Sir Henry Wotton* (London, 2014).

Hunt, A., 'Laurence Chaderton and the Hampton Court Conference', in C. Litzenberger and S. Wabuda, eds. ,*Belief and Practice in sixteenth-century England* (Ashgate, 1998), pp. 207–28.

Infelise, M., *I padroni dei libri: Il controllo sulla stampa nella prima età moderna* (Rome, 2014).

Innes, J., '"Networks" in British History', *East Asian Journal of British History* 5 (2016), pp. 51–72.

James, M.R., *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1895).

Jemolo, A.C., *Stato e chiesa, negli scrittori politici italiani del seicento e del settecento* (Milan, 1914).

Jones (ed.), T.W., *A True Relation of the Life and Death of the Right Reverend Father in God William Bedell, Lord Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland* (London, 1872).

Kainulainen, J., *Paolo Sarpi: A Servant of God and State* (Leiden, 2014).

Keenan, C., 'Paolo Sarpi, Caesar Baronius, and the Political Possibilities of Ecclesiastical History', *Church History* 84 (2015), pp. 746-767.

Kerrigan, J., 'Thomas Carew', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 74 (1988), pp. 311-350.

King, M., 'The Essex Myth in Jacobean England', in *The Accession of James I: Historical and Cultural Consequences* (Basingstoke, 2006), eds. G. Burgess, J. Lawrence and R. Wymer, pp. 140-54.

Kyle, C.R., 'Prince Charles in the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624', *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998), pp. 603-24.

Lake, P., *Moderate puritans and the Elizabethan church* (Cambridge, 1982).

Lawlor, H.J., *The Psalter and Martyrology of Ricemarch* (London, 1914), 2 vols.

Levi, E., 'King James I and Fra Paolo Sarpi in 1612', *The Athenaeum* 3869 (July 1898), pp. 66–7.

Levitin, D., *Ancient Wisdom in the Age of the New Science: Histories of Philosophy in England, c. 1640-1700* (Cambridge, 2015).

Leyser, C., 'Law, memory, and priestly office in Rome, c.500', *Early Medieval Europe* 27 (2019), pp. 61–84.

Lievsay, J.L., 'Paolo Sarpi's Appraisal of James I', in *Essays in History and Literature Presented by Fellows of the Newberry Library to Stanley Pargellis* (Chicago, 1965), ed. H. Bluhm, pp. 109–117.

Lievsay, J.L., *Venetian Phoenix: Paolo Sarpi and Some of His English Friends (1606-1700)* (Lawrence, KS, 1973).

Ljubić, S., 'O Markantunu Dominisu Rabljaninu', *Rad Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti* 10 (1870), pp. 1–159.

Louthan, H. *The quest for compromise: Peacemakers in Counter-Reformation Vienna* (Cambridge, 1997).

Lugt, F., *Les Marques de Collections de Dessins & d'Estampes* (Amsterdam, 1921).

Mackenney, R., '"A Plot Discover'd?" Myth, Legend and the "Spanish" Conspiracy against Venice in 1618', in *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilisation*

of an Italian City-State 1297-1797 (Baltimore, MD, 2000), eds. J. Martin and D. Romano, pp. 185-216.

Maghenzani, S., 'The Protestant Reformation in Counter-Reformation Italy, c. 1550-1660: An Overview of New Evidence', *Church History* 83 (2014), pp. 571-589.

Maghenzani, S., 'Giochi di specchi: La Chiesa d'Inghilterra e Venezia tra Cinquecento e Seicento', in *Ateneo Veneto* 25, (2018), pp. 67-76.

Maladorno-Hargraves, A.W., 'George Rooke, allievo inglese di Galileo', *Quaderni per la storia dell'università di Padova 19* (1986), pp. 157-61.

Malcolm, N., 'Hobbes, Sandys, and the Virginia Company', *Historical Journal* 24 (1981), pp. 297-321.

Malcolm, N., *De Dominis, 1560-1624: Venetian, Anglican, Ecumenist, and Relapsed Heretic* (London, 1984).

Malcolm, N., *Aspects of Hobbes* (Oxford, 2002).

Malcolm, N., *Useful Enemies: Islam and The Ottoman Empire in Western Political Thought, 1450-1750* (Oxford, 2019).

Marshall, A.H., 'Sir Dudley Carleton and English diplomacy in the United Provinces, 1616-1628' (unpublished thesis, Rutgers University, 1978).

Mayer, T.F., 'Thomas Starkey's Aristocratic Reform Programme', *History of Political Thought* 7 (1986), pp. 439-461.

Mayer, T.F., *Thomas Starkey and the Commonwealth: Humanist Politics and Religion in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Cambridge, 2009).

Mayer, T.F., *The Roman Inquisition on the Stage of Italy, c. 1590-1640* (Philadelphia, 2014).

McCafferty, J., 'Venice in Cavan: the career of William Bedell, 1572-1642', in *Culture and Society in Early Modern Breifne/Cavan* (Dublin, 2009), ed. B. Scott, pp. 173–87.

McCaughey, T., *Dr Bedell and Mr King: the making of the Irish Bible* (Dublin, 2001).

McCormish, W.A., *The Epigones: A study of the theology of the Genevan Academy at the Time of the Synod of Dort, with special reference to Giovanni Diodati* (Eugene OR, 1989).

McCullough, P., *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean preaching* (Cambridge, 1998).

Meakin, H.L., *The Painted Closet of Lady Anne Bacon Drury* (Ashgate, 2013).

Médina, J., 'Penser la religion: Thomas Hobbes dans le cercle de Paolo Sarpi', in *Hobbes et la religion* (Bordeaux, 2012), eds. J. Terrel et B. Graciannette, pp. 123-145.

Mendle, M., 'The Ship Money Case, The Case of Shipmony, and the Development of Henry Parker's Parliamentary Absolutism', *The Historical Journal* 32 (1989), pp. 513–36.

Menozzi, D., Cristianesimo nella storia', *Cristianesimo nella Storia* 1 (1980), pp. 123-54.

Meyjes, P., *Jean Hotman's English Connection* (Amsterdam, 1990).

Miller, J. A., 'The Earliest Known Draft of the King James Bible: Samuel Ward's Draft of 1 Esdras and Wisdom 3–4', in *Labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord: Erudition and the Making of the King James Version of the Bible* (Leiden, 2018), ed. M. Feingold.

Millet, H., 'Le «Liber dialogorum hierarchiae subcoelestis» (1388)', in *Vaticana et medievalia Etudes en l'honneur de Louis Duval-Arnould* (Florence, 2008), eds. J.-M. Martin, B. Martin-Hisard and A. Paravicini Bagliani, pp. 367-94.

Millstone, N., 'Seeing like a Statesman in early Stuart England', *Past & Present* 223 (2014), pp. 77–127.

Milton, '"The Unchanged Peacemaker?" John Dury and the politics of irenicism in England, 1628–43', in *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication* (Cambridge, 1994), eds. M. Greengrass, M. Leslie and T. Raylor, pp. 95–117.

Milton, A., *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge, 1995).

Milton, A., 'A Qualified Intolerance: The Limits and Ambiguities of Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism', in *Catholicism and Anti- Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (Basingstoke, 1999).

Milton (ed.), A., *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618-1619)* (Woodbridge, 2005).

Milton, A., 'Arminians, Laudians, Anglicans, and Revisionists: Back to Which Drawing Board?', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 78 (2015), pp. 723-743.

Milton, A., 'Introduction', in *The Oxford History of Anglicanism* Vol. 1 (Oxford, 2017), ed. A. Milton.

Mortimer, S., *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution: The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, 2010).

Murphy, G.M., 'Green [alias Harris]', ODNB.

Oakley, F., 'Complexities of Context: Gerson, Bellarmine, Sarpi, Richer, and the Venetian Interdict of 1606-1607', *The Catholic Historical Review* 82 (1996), pp. 369-96.

O'Connor, D., 'Florio, John (1553–1625)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004), online edition last updated 3 January 2008.

Ottolenghi, P., *Giacopo Castelvetro esule Modenese nell'Inghilterra di Shakespeare* (Pisa, 1982.

Panzarin, F., 'Il collezionismo inglese a Venezia nel Seicento: Henry Wotton letterato, agente, collezionista, mecenate e il suo rapporto con Odoardo Fialetti' in *Arte in Friuli, arte a Trieste* (2000), pp. 37–60.

Pavone, S., *Le astuzie dei gesuiti: Le false 'Instruzioni segrete' della Compagnia di Gesú e la polemica antigesuita nei secoli XVII e XVIII* (Rome, 2000).

Patterson, W.B., *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 2000).

Pattison, M., *Isaac Casaubon: 1559–1614* (Oxford, 1892).

Paul, J., *Counsel and Command in Early Modern English Thought* (Cambridge, 2020).

Payne, H., 'Russell [née Harington], Lucy, countess of Bedford (bap. 1581, d. 1627)', ODNB.

Petrolini, C., ‘Per un regesto delle carte diplomatiche di Giovan Francesco Biondi (1609-1619 ca.)’, in *Storie inglesi: L’Inghilterra vista dall’Italia tra storia e romanzo (XVII sec.) con l’edizione del Cappuccino scozzese di Giovan Battista Rinuccini (1644) e del Cromuele di Girolamo Graziani (1671)* (Pisa, 2003), eds. C. Carminati and S. Villani, pp. 35–42.

Petrolini, C., ‘Paolo Sarpi e l’Inghilterra di Giacomo I: Tra aspettative e disincanto’ (unpublished PhD thesis, Florence/Pisa, 2007).

Petrolini, C., ‘Un salvacondotto e un incendio: la morte di Fulgenzio Manfredi in una relazione del 1610’, *Bruniana & Campanelliana* 18 (2012), pp. 161–85.

Petrolini, C., and Pirillo, D., ‘Anglo-Venetian networks: Paolo Sarpi in early modern England’ in *The Routledge Research Companion to Anglo-Italian Renaissance Literature and Culture* (London, 2019), ed. M. Marrapodi, pp. 434–49.

Pin, C., 'Le scritture pubbliche trovate alla morte di fra Paolo Sarpi nel convento dei Servi', *Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 2 (1978), pp. 311–69.

Pin, C., ‘“Natum ad encyclopaediam”: osservazioni sul Sarpi scienziato e filosofo dopo l'edizione integrale dei “Pensieri”’, *Rivista Storica Italiana* (1999), pp. 582–612.

Pin (ed.), C., *Consulti (1606–1609)* (Pisa, 2001), 1 vol 2 parts.

Pin (ed.), C., *Ripensando Paolo Sarpi: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi nel 450° anniversario della nascita di Paolo Sarpi* (Venice, 2006).

Pin, C., ‘“Qui si vive con esempi, non con ragione”: Paolo Sarpi e la committenza di stato nel dopo-Interdetto’, in *Ripensando Sarpi*, pp. 343–94.

Pirillo, D., *The Refugee-Diplomat: Venice, England, and the Reformation* (Ithaca NY, 2018)

Pitts, J., *Boundaries of the International: Law and Empire* (Cambridge MA, 2018).

Pocock, J.G.A., *The Ancient Constitution and the Feudal Law: A Study of English Historical Thought in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 1957).

Pocock, J.G.A., *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, 1975).

Pocock, J.G.A., 'Clergy and Commerce: the Conservative Enlightenment in England', in *L'Età dei Lumi: studi storici sul settecento europeo in onore di Franco Venturi* Vol. 1 (Naples, 1985), eds. R. Ajello, E. Cortese and V. Piano Mortari.

Pollnitz, A., *Princely Education in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2015).

Pursell, B.C., 'The End of the Spanish Match', *The Historical Journal* 45 (2002), pp. 699–726.

Quantin, J.-L., 'Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec: Une histoire européenne (1588-1613)', in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters* (Berlin, 2008), eds. M. Wallraff and R. Brändle.

Rabb, T.K., 'The Editions of Sir Edwin Sandys's "Relation of the State of Religion"', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 26 (1963).

Rabb, T.K., *Jacobean Gentleman: Sir Edwin Sandys, 1561-1629* (Princeton, 1998).

Raimondi, F.P., *Giulio Cesare Vanini nell'Europa del Seicento: con una appendice documentaria* (Pisa, 2008).

Reeds, J., 'Solved: The Ciphers in Book III of Trithemius's *Steganographia*', *Cryptologia* 22 (1998), pp. 291-317.

Rees, G., and Wakely, M., *Publishing, Politics and Culture: The King's Printers in the Reign of James I and VI* (Oxford, 2009).

Rein, G., *Paolo Sarpi und die Protestanten: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Reformationsbewegung in Venedig im Anfang des Siebzehnten* (Helsinki, 1904).

Rhodes, D.E., *Giovanni Battista Ciotti (1562–1627?): Publisher Extraordinary at Venice* (Venice, 2013).

Riverso, N., 'Paolo Sarpi: a Baroque Chameleon', *Modern Language Notes* 129 (2014), pp. 62–78.

Riverso, N., 'Paolo Sarpi: The Hunted Friar and his Popularity in England', *Annali d'italianistica* 34 (2016), pp. 297-318.

Rosa, G., 'Politica e religione nella vita e nel pensiero di fra Fulgenzio Micanzio' (Tesi di Laurea, Università Ca'Foscari, Venezia, 1993).

Rose, J., *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660–1688* (Cambridge, 2011).

Rose, J., 'Roman Imperium and the Restoration Church', *Studies in Church History* 54 (2018), pp. 159–75.

Rupp, G., *William Bedell 1571–1642: A Commemorative Lecture given in the Old Library, Emmanuel College on 1 December 1971* (Cambridge, 1972).

Rypins, S., 'The Printing of "Basilikòn Dôron", 1603', *The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 64 (1970), pp. 393–417.

Salazar, G., 'Polemicist as Pastor: Daniel Featley's Anti-Catholic Polemic and Countering Lay Doubt in England during the early 1620s', *Studies in Church History* 52 (2016), pp. 315–30.

Salmon, J.H.M., 'Catholic resistance theory, Ultramontanism, and the royalist response, 1580–1620', in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450–1700* (Cambridge, 1991), eds. J.H. Burns and M. Goldie, pp. 219-53.

Secchi, S, *Antonio Foscarini: un patrizio veneziano del '600* (Firenze, 1969).

Senning, C.F., 'Vanini and the Diplomats, 1612-1614: Religion, Politics, and Defection in the Counter-Reformation Era', *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 54 (1985), pp. 219-39.

Serjeantson, R.W., 'Elizabeth Cary and the Great Tew Circle', in *The Literary Career and Legacy of Elizabeth Cary, 1613-1680* (New York, 2007), ed. H. Wolfe.

Shagan, E.H., *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2012).

Sharpe, K., 'Crown, Parliament and Locality: Government and Communication in Early Stuart England', *The English Historical Review* 101 (1986), pp. 321–50.

Sharpe, K., *Image Wars: Kings and Commonwealths in England, 1603-1660* (New Haven CT, 2010).

Shriver, F., 'Orthodoxy and Diplomacy: James I and the Vorstius Affair', *The English Historical Review* 85 (1970), pp. 449–74.

Shriver, F., 'Hampton Court Re-visited: James I and the Puritans', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 33 (1982), pp. 48-71.

Signaroli, S., 'Il trattato De Archivis di Baldassarre Bonifacio e Domenico Molino: politica, storia e archivi nel primo Seicento Veneto', *Archivi* 10 (2015), pp. 76–90.

Signaroli, S., *Domenico Molino e Isaac Casaubon: Con l'edizione di sette lettere da Venezia a Parigi (1609–1610)* (Milan, 2017).

Silano, G., 'Of sleep and sleeplessness: the Papacy and the Law, 1150-1300', in *The Religious Roles of the Papacy: Ideals and Realities, 1150-1300* (Toronto, 1989), ed. C. Ryan, pp. 343–61.

Skinner, Q., *From Humanism to Hobbes: Studies in Rhetoric and Politics* (Cambridge, 2018).

Slingo, B., 'Civil Power and the Deconstruction of Scholasticism in the Thought of Marc'Antonio de Dominis', *History of European Ideas* 41 (2015), pp. 507-526.

Smith, A.G.R., 'Hickes, Sir Michael (1543–1612)', ODNB.

Smith, L.P., *The life and letters of Sir Henry Wotton* (Oxford, 1907), 2 vols.

Smuts, R.M., 'International Politics and Jacobean Statecraft', in *The Oxford Handbook of John Donne* (Oxford, 2011), eds. D. Flynn, M.T. Hester, and J. Shami.

Sommar, M.E., *The Correctores Romani* (Zurich, 2009).

Sommerville, J.P., *Jacobean political thought and the controversy over the Oath of Allegiance* (unpublished thesis, University of Cambridge, 1981).

Sommerville, J. P., 'James I and the Divine Right of Kings: English Politics and Continental Theory', in *The Mental World of Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991), ed. L. Levy Peck, pp. 55–70.

Sommerville, J.P., 'English and European Political Ideas in the Early Seventeenth Century: Revisionism and the Case of Absolutism', *Journal of British Studies* 35 (1996), pp. 168-94.

Sommerville, J.P., 'Papalist political thought and the controversy over the Jacobean oath of allegiance,' in *Catholics and the 'Protestant Nation': Religious politics and identity in early modern England*, ed. E.H. Shagan (Manchester, 2005), pp. 162–84.

Stewart, Alan, *The Oxford History of Life-writing* Vol. 2 (Oxford, 2018).

Stoye, J., *English Travellers Abroad, 1604-1667: Their Influence in English Society and Politics (Revised Edition)* (New Haven CT, 1989).

Strong, R., *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (New York, 1986).

Sutton, D.S., 'Introduction', in William Alabaster, *Unpublished works by William Alabaster (1568-1640)* (Salzburg, 1997), ed. D.S. Sutton.

Terzi, M.P., 'Una vicenda della Venezia seicentesca: l'amicizia e la corrispondenza tra Fulgenzio Micanzio e Sir Dudley Carleton' (unpublished thesis, Ca' Foscari University of Venice, 1979).

Thrush, A., 'Puckering, Sir Thomas, 1st Bt. (1591-1637)', in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629* (Cambridge, 2010), ed. A. Thrush and J.P. Ferris.

Todd, M., 'The Samuel Ward Papers at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 8 (1985), pp. 582-92.

Todd, M., '"An Act of Discretion": Evangelical Conformity and the Puritan Dons', *Albion* 18 (1986), pp. 581-99.

Todd, M., 'Puritan Self-Fashioning: The Diary of Samuel Ward', *Journal of British Studies* 31 (1992), pp. 236-264.

Todd, R.B., 'Henry and Thomas Savile in Italy', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 58 (1996), pp. 439-44.

Tomita, S., and Tomita, M., *A Bibliographical Catalog of Italian Books Printed in England, 1603-1642* (Farnham, 2014).

Trebbi, G., '"Studi veneziani". La prima serie (1959-1976)', in *Introduzione all'uso delle riviste storiche. Un corso di lezioni*, eds. N. Recupero e G. Todeschini, (Trieste, 1994), pp. 91–107.

Trebbi, G., 'Gaetano Cozzi e la Controriforma', *Studi Veneziani* 43 (2002), pp. 26-42.

Trebbi, G., 'Il processo stracciato. Interventi veneziani di metà Seicento in materia di confessione e Sant'Ufficio', *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 161 (2002–2003), pp. 115–23.

Trevor-Roper, H.R., *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (Indianapolis IN, 1967).

Trevor-Roper, H.R., *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays* (London, 1987).

Trevor-Roper, H.R., *Europe's Physician: The Various Life of Sir Theodore de Mayerne* (New Haven, 2006).

Thrush, A., 'V. The Composition of the House of Commons', in *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1604-1629* (Cambridge, 2010), ed. A. Thrush and J.P. Ferris.

Tuck, R., *Philosophy and Government 1572–1651* (Cambridge, 1993).

Tutino, S., *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth* (Oxford, 2010).

Tyacke, Nicholas, *Aspects of English Protestantism c. 1530-1700* (Manchester, 2001).

Ulianich, B., 'La lettera di Sarpi allo Heinsius', *Rivista Storica Italiana* 68 (1956), pp. 425-456.

Ulianich, B., 'Considerazioni e documenti per una ecclesiologia di Paolo Sarpi', in *Festgabe Joseph Lortz* II (Baden-Baden, 1958), pp. 363–444.

Ulianich, B., 'Il principe Christian von Anhalte e Paolo Sarpi: dalla missione veneziana del Dohna alla relazione Diodati (1608)', *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 8 (1976), pp. 429-506.

Ulianich, B., 'Paolo Sarpi "Riformatore", "irenico"? Note sulla sua ecclesiologia, sulla sua theologia, sulla sua religione', in *Fra Paolo Sarpi dei Servi di Maria: atti convegno di studio, Venezia, 28-29-30 ottobre 1983* (Venice, 1986), eds. P. Branchesi and C. Pin, pp. 49–100.

Usher, R.G., *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, (London, 1969), 2 vols.

Van Dam, H.–J., 'Italian Friends: Grotius, De Dominis, Sarpi and the Church of England', *Dutch Review of Church History* 75 (1995), pp. 198-215.

Van Eerde, K.S., 'The Spanish Match through an English Protestant's Eyes', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 32 (1968), pp. 59–75.

Van Gelderen, M., '"So meerly humane": Theories of Resistance in Early Modern Europe', in *Rethinking the Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, eds. H. Hamilton Bleakley and A. Brett (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 149–70.

Van Heck, P., ‘La fortuna di Paolo Sarpi in Olanda [suivi de] Appendice groziana’, in *Paolo Sarpi: Politique et religion en Europe* (Paris, 2010), ed. M. Viallon, pp. 369–405.

Vester, M., ‘Paolo Sarpi and Early Stuart Debates over the Papal Antichrist’, in *Catholic Millenarianism: From Savonarola to the Abbé Grégoire* (Dordrecht, 2001), ed. K.A. Kottman, pp. 53-69.

Viallon, M. (ed.), *Paolo Sarpi: Politique et religion en Europe* (Paris, 2010).

Villani, S., ‘La prima edizione italiana del Book of Common Prayer (1685) tra propaganda protestante e memoria sarpiana’, *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 44 (2008), pp. 24–45.

Villani, S., ‘Italian Translations of the Book of Common Prayer’. in *Travels and Translations* (Amsterdam, 2013), eds. A, Yarrington, S. Villani, and J. Kelly, pp. 303–319.

Villani, S., ‘Uno scisma mancato: Paolo Sarpi, William Bedell e la prima traduzione in italiano del Book of Common Prayer’, *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* 53 (2017), pp. 63-112.

Vincze, O., *The Politics of Translation and Transmission: Basilikon Doron in Hungarian Political Thought* (Newcastle, 2012).

Vivanti, C., *Lotta Politica e pace religiosa in Francia fra Cinque e Seicento* (Turin, 1961).

Walsh, A., *Civil Religion and the Enlightenment in England, 1707-1800* (Woodbridge, 2020).

Walters, L.M., ‘Odoardo Fialetti (1573–c. 1638): The Interrelation of Venetian Art and Anatomy, and his Importance in England’ (unpublished PhD thesis, St Andrews, 2009).

Waszink, J., ‘Henry Savile's Tacitus and the English role on the Continent: Leicester, Hotman, Lipsius’, *History of European Ideas* 42 (2014), pp. 151-68.

Weinreich, S.J., ‘Thinking with Crocodiles: An Iconic Animal at the Intersection of Early-Modern Religion and Natural Philosophy’, *Early Science and Medicine* 20 (2015), pp. 209–40.

Westphal, S., *Handbuch kultureller Zentren der Frühen Neuzeit: Städte und Residenzen im alten deutschen Sprachraum* (Berlin, 2012).

Wijffels, A.A., 'Alberico Gentili e il rinnovamento del diritto pubblico nella tradizione dello ius commune', in *Alberico Gentili (San Ginesio 1552 – Londra 1608): Atti dei Convegi nel Quarto Centenario della morte* (Milan, 2010), pp. 519-56.

Wilcher, R., 'Moseley, Humphrey (b. in or before 1603, d. 1661)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online edition last updated 23 September 2004.

Wilson, D.H., 'James I and His Literary Assistants', *Huntington Library Quarterly* 8 (1944), pp. 35–57.

Wilson, P.H., 'The Stuarts, the Palatinate and the Thirty Years' War', in *Stuart Marriage Diplomacy: Dynastic Politics in their European Context, 1604-1630* (Woodbridge, 2018), eds. V. Caldari and S.J. Wolfson.

Winship, M.P., 'Freeborn (Puritan) Englishmen and Slavish Subjection: Popish Tyranny and Puritan Constitutionalism, c.1570-1606', *The English Historical Review* 124 (2009), pp. 1050–74.

Wootton, D., *Paolo Sarpi: Between Renaissance and Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1983).

Yates, F.A., 'Paolo Sarpi's "History of the Council of Trent"', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 7 (1944), pp. 123-143.