

“The Bulwark of the Republic?”
The Scots-Dutch Brigade in the Second Half of the
Eighty Years’ War (1609-1648)



University of
St Andrews

John Abernethy

Matriculation Number: 160022373

*Dissertation submitted in fulfillment of the degree of
Master of Studies by Research, 2019-2020*

Submission of MSt(Res) Thesis

Declarations

1. Candidate's declarations:

I, John Abernethy, hereby certify that this thesis, which is approximately 30,000 words in length, has been written by me, and that it is the record of work carried out by me, or principally by myself in collaboration with others as acknowledged, and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree.

I was admitted as a research student at the University of St Andrews as a candidate for the degree of MSt(Res) in January 2019.

Date signature of candidate

2. Supervisor's declaration:

I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate for the degree of MSt(Res) in the University of St Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree.

Date signature of supervisor

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	4
Acknowledgements.....	5
Abbreviations.....	6
Conventions.....	8
Introduction.....	9
<i>The Historiography of the Scots-Dutch Brigade</i>	11
<i>Source Material</i>	16
<i>Scope and Structure of the Study</i>	18
Chapter One: The Scots-Dutch Brigade Beyond the Battlefield.....	20
<i>Recruitment and Motivation</i>	21
<i>The Scots-Dutch Brigade and the “Calvinist Revolution” (1618-1621)</i>	38
<i>Scotland and the Scots-Dutch Brigade</i>	50
<i>Conclusion</i>	63
Chapter Two: The Scots-Dutch Brigade at War.....	66
<i>The Scots-Dutch Brigade and the Twelve Years’ Truce (1609-1621)</i>	68
<i>The Siege of Bergen-op-Zoom (1622)</i>	78
<i>The Siege of ’s-Hertogenbosch (1629)</i>	86
<i>Breda to Münster (1637-1648)</i>	94
<i>Conclusion</i>	102
Conclusion.....	104
Bibliography.....	106

Abstract

This thesis examines the role of the Scots-Dutch Brigade in Dutch and Scottish political, military, and social affairs in the second half of the Eighty Years' War (1609-1648), by utilizing hitherto untapped primary archival material related to its service. The thesis establishes the relationship the Scots-Dutch Brigade had with Scotland, by examining methods of recruitment, motivations to enlist, veterans who returned to Scotland, and the interaction of Scots with other Scots both at home and abroad. The thesis also analyzes the relationship the Scots-Dutch Brigade had with the Dutch Republic by examining the impact the Brigade had on Dutch internal politics during the "Calvinist Revolution" and the Orange Coup (1617-1621), as well as on international politics during the Jülich-Cleves Crises (1610/1614) and the Uskok War (1615-1618). Finally, this thesis analyzes the contributions the Scots-Dutch Brigade made to crucial moments during the Eighty Years' War, such as the siege of Bergen-op-Zoom (1622), the siege of 's-Hertogenbosch (1629), and the battle of Kallo (1638). By using previously unused printed sources and archival material from England, Scotland, and the Netherlands, the thesis provides an original contribution to existing historiography of the Eighty Years' War, Scotland and the era of the Thirty Years' War, and offers a correction to extant work on the Scots-Dutch Brigade.

Acknowledgments

This dissertation would not have been possible without the knowledge, guidance, and unwavering support of my two supervisors, Steve Murdoch and Jacqueline Rose, to whom I am deeply indebted. It is safe to say that without Steve, I would never have studied Scottish history, and that without Jacqueline I would never have reached the Masters level or known how to write a dissertation.

There are of course many other mentors who have been kind enough to lend me a hand along the way and to whom I will be forever grateful. For those of my friends who have had to put up with me while I detailed (perhaps, at times, too much detail) to them the lives of seventeenth century Scottish soldiers at all hours of the day and night—thank you for both your kindness, friendship and, most of all, your patience.

And of course, to my parents, who have given me nothing but unconditional love and support both at home and abroad, this dissertation is especially dedicated.

Abbreviations

<i>APC</i>	England, Privy Council, <i>Acts of the Privy Council of England</i> (45 Vols., London, 1890-1964)
<i>Bohemia</i>	Nadine Akkerman (ed.), <i>The Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia</i> (2 Vols, Oxford, 2011-2015).
<i>BSG</i>	<i>Besluiten Staten Generaal, 1626-1630</i> , ed. I.J.A. Nijenhuis, P.L.R. De Cauwer, W.M. Gijssbers, et al. (The Hague: Instituut Nederlandse Geschiedenis, 2007).
<i>Carleton</i>	Sir Dudley Carleton, <i>The Letters from and to Sir Dudley Carleton, Knt. During His Embassy in Holland, from January 1615/16, to December 1620</i> , (3 rd Edition, London, 1780).
<i>CSPD</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, First and Second Series</i> (36 vols., London, 1856-1897).
<i>CSPS</i>	<i>Calendar of the State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots: preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum and elsewhere in England</i> (13 Vols., Edinburgh, 1898-1969).
<i>CSPV</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers relating to English affairs, existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in other Libraries of Northern Italy</i> , ed. A.B. Hinds (38 Vols., London 1864-1947).
<i>D/S</i>	The Doge and Senate of Venice.
<i>Ferguson</i>	James Ferguson (ed.), <i>Papers Illustrating the History of the Scots Brigade in the Service of the United Netherlands, 1572-1782</i> (3 Vols., Edinburgh, 1899-1901). (All references to Ferguson are to Volume One, unless otherwise noted).
<i>HSL</i>	F.J.G. Ten Raa, and F. De Bas, <i>Het Staatsche Leger, 1568-1795</i> (11 Vols., Breda/The Hague, 1911-1950).
<i>Leslie</i>	Alexia Grosjean and Steve Murdoch, <i>Alexander Leslie and the Scottish Generals of the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648</i> (London, 2014).
<i>NL-AmrRAA</i>	Regionaal Archief, Alkmaar.
<i>NL-HaNa</i>	Nationaal Archief, The Hague.
<i>NRS</i>	National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh.

RMA	Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam.
RPCS	Scotland, Privy Council, <i>Register of the Privy Council of Scotland</i> : First Series, 1545-1625 (14 Vols., Edinburgh, 1877-1898). Second Series, 1625-1660 (8 Vols., Edinburgh, 1899-1908).
RPS	<i>Records of the Parliaments of Scotland</i> —Published online by the University of St Andrews at: www.rps.ac.uk .
RSG	<i>Resolutiën der Staten-Generaal: Nieuwe Reeks, 1610-1670</i> , ed. J.G. Smit, A.T. van Deursen, and J. Roelevink (7 Vols., The Hague, 1971-1994).
RvS	Raad van State (Council of State).
SAR	Stadsarchief Rotterdam.
SSNE	A. Grosjean and S. Murdoch, “Scotland, Scandinavia, and Northern Europe, 1580-1707” (<i>SSNE</i>)—Published online by the University of St Andrews at: https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/history/ssne/index.php . Published by the University of St Andrews, November, 2004.
TNA	The National Archives, Kew.

Stylistic Conventions

Because this dissertation focuses on a Scottish military unit, when discussing the British monarchy, the Scottish convention is used (i.e. James VI, rather than James I) unless in a specifically British or English context, in which case the British or English titles are used (i.e. James VI and I or James I). The spelling of names for people and places have been standardized as well, unless used in direct quotes or if it is unclear what the standard or modern equivalent of the name might be. The terms “Dutch Republic,” “Republic,” or occasionally, “United Provinces,” have been used when referring specifically to the united northern provinces. “Low Countries” is used when referring to either its use in primary sources or to generally describe areas in the north or south which were contested by Spain and the Dutch Republic, or in which the Brigade may have fought but were not within the borders of the Dutch Republic. Individual provinces (i.e. Holland, Zeeland) are named when relevant. Although it overlaps in countless ways with the Thirty Years’ War, this dissertation utilizes “Eighty Years’ War” when describing the conflict between Spain and the Dutch Republic between 1568-1648. Despite the use of the Julian calendar at home, many of the Scottish soldiers adhered to the Gregorian style while in the Dutch Republic, and dates within the text are in Gregorian form where both forms have been provided, unless otherwise specified.¹

N.B.: In the footnotes, where Ferguson himself is quoted, either in his own footnotes or his introductory material, it is referenced with the abbreviated title and page number (i.e. Ferguson, p.5n). When individual documents are cited, the abbreviated title is used, followed by the date/title of the document and the page number (i.e. Ferguson: 1610—States of War, p.226). If multiple documents are referenced, the following is used: Ferguson: 1610—States of War, p.226, 1613—States of War, p.227.

¹ See Steve Murdoch, *Terror of the Seas? Scottish Maritime Warfare, 1513-1713* (Leiden, 2010), sigs.xiii-xiv for an excellent explanation of the different calendars used throughout Europe in the seventeenth century.

Introduction

In the summer of 1618, Colonel Sir William Brog wrote to the States-General of the United Provinces, describing his regiment within the Scots-Dutch Brigade as “the first and oldest regiment of foreign nationality in these Netherlands, [which has] rendered so many notable and excellent services... and will continue certainly until death.”² Brog was speaking from experience. By 1618 he had been in the Brigade for at least thirty years, and would go on to serve for nearly twenty more, until his death in 1636.³ Brog had arrived within sixteen years of the Brigade’s establishment, after the first Scottish contingent fought alongside the Dutch at Haarlem in 1572. These troops had themselves arrived only four years after the Dutch revolt against Spanish hegemony and the outbreak of the Eighty Years’ War.⁴ However, the Brigade far outlived Brog. Not only did it serve in the Republic until 1782, its officers returned and were reorganized in Britain as the 94th Regiment of Foot, serving until 1881, when it finally was amalgamated with the Connaught Rangers until their dissolution in 1922.⁵

The origin of the Brigade is more pertinent to this dissertation than its end, coinciding with the end of the Marian Civil War in 1572, when those who fought for Mary, Queen of Scots were punished with “remote service” in Sweden while those who fought against her were rewarded with service under the Prince of Orange in the Netherlands.⁶ It

² Ferguson: [Undated] 1618—Representation by Colonel Brog, p.285. Though not dated by Ferguson, the letter was probably written between 21 and 26 July 1618. See *RSG, 1617-1618*: 21 July 1618, 26 July 1618, pp.448, 452.

³ Ferguson, p.54n, 12 July 1588—Commission of William Brog, pp.87-89.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p.3.

⁵ Ferguson, II, sig.xxv-xxxviii, xxxii-xxxv; Joachim Miggelbrink, “The End of the Scots-Dutch Brigade,” in S. Murdoch, A. Mackillop (eds.), *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, c. 1550-1900* (Leiden, 2002), p.99; John Morrissey, “A Lost Heritage: The Connaught Rangers and multivocal Irishness,” in M. McCarthy (ed.), *Ireland’s Heritages: Critical Perspectives on Memory and Identity* (Aldershot, 2005), p.73.

⁶ Leslie, p.26; *CSPS, 1571-1574*: 20 June 1573, p.590.

is therefore somewhat ironic that when the Brigade evolved from these first levies, it became an instrument of the House of Stuart. Although on a Dutch payroll and in Dutch service on the Continent the soldiers of the Brigade during this period were, first and foremost, loyal to the Stuarts and the monarch of Scotland.⁷

It takes, of course, a large stretch of the imagination to think of Colonel Brog's regiment having a continuous and unbroken 350-year history; that the 600 Scots who died at Nieuwpoort in 1600 are somehow directly connected to the 400 Irishmen who fell at the Somme in 1916.⁸ Nonetheless, the Brigade—in whole or part—was involved in practically every major engagement of the Eighty Years' War and its companies were deployed in over fifty garrison-towns.⁹ Its steadfastness and loyalty was lauded by contemporaries, like Sir Thomas Urquhart, who wrote that “the gold and treasure of the Indias [were not able] to purchase all the affections of Scotland to the furtherance of Castilian designs.”¹⁰ Even Frederick Henry, Prince of Orange, regarded the Scots as the “bulwark of the Republic.”¹¹ The Brigade became an integral part of Dutch national, local and military affairs. It was a durable and long-lasting unit, and yet, its early years have remained almost completely ignored by modern scholars.

This dissertation offers an original contribution, and in many ways a correction, to modern knowledge of the Scots-Dutch Brigade. It identifies those in the Brigade, where they served, and what they achieved, using new primary archival research. Among other

⁷ Leslie, p.31.

⁸ Ferguson, pp.30-31; Morrissey, “Lost Heritage,” p.83.

⁹ Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*.

¹⁰ Sir Thomas Urquhart, *The Jewel*, ed. R.D.S. Jack and R.J. Lyall, (Edinburgh, 1983), pp.98-99.

¹¹ Frederick Henry, Prince of Orange, as quoted in Ferguson, p.311.

things, the dissertation examines the motivations for service in the Brigade, and the relationships it had with and within both Scotland and the Dutch Republic.

The Historiography of the Scots-Dutch Brigade

The dearth of research on the Scots-Dutch Brigade during the early seventeenth century is surprising, given the renaissance that Scottish military history has undergone in recent decades. Numerous angles have been taken on the Scottish military diaspora. Steve Murdoch and Alexia Grosjean, for example, have published extensively on Scots in the Swedish and Danish armies.¹² Dmitri Fedosov and Paul Dukes have published on Scottish soldiers in Russia, while Peter Paul Bajer and Robert Frost have addressed those who served in Poland.¹³ Likewise, David Worthington has provided ample coverage of those who fought for the Habsburg powers in the seventeenth century.¹⁴ But even this list is by no means exhaustive, and it does not come close to covering those who work on Scottish maritime, mercantile, and other civilian diasporas, or those who have published in languages other than English.

Of course, the work of recent scholars is very much indebted to that of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century antiquarians and historians. Those like T.A. Fischer

¹² Steve Murdoch, *Britain, Denmark-Norway, and the House of Stuart, 1603-1660* (East Lothian, 2003); Alexia Grosjean, *An Unofficial Alliance: Scotland and Sweden, 1569-1654* (Leiden, 2003), pp.11-111; Leslie.

¹³ Paul Dukes, "The First Scottish Soldiers in Russia," in G.G. Simpson (ed.), *The Scottish Soldier Abroad, 1247-1967* (Edinburgh, 1992), pp.47-54; D. Fedosov, *The Caledonian Connection: Scotland-Russia ties, Middle Ages to early Twentieth Century. A Concise Biographical List* (Aberdeen, 1996); Peter Paul Bajer, *Scots in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, 16th-18th Centuries: The Formation and Disappearance of an Ethnic Group* (Leiden, 2012); Robert Frost, "Scottish Soldiers, Poland-Lithuania and the Thirty Years' War." in S. Murdoch, (ed.), *Scotland and the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648*, (Leiden, 2001), pp.191-213.

¹⁴ David Worthington, *Scots in Habsburg Service, 1618-1648* (Leiden, 2004) and "Alternative Diplomacy? Scottish Exiles at the Courts of the Habsburgs and their Allies, 1618-1648," *Scotland and the Thirty Years' War*, pp.51-76.

and A.F. Steuart laid the groundwork for much recent research.¹⁵ Scots-Dutch military studies are not without their own seminal historian: James Ferguson, whose three-volume set has informed much of the current knowledge of the Brigade.¹⁶ The lack of new research on the Scots-Dutch Brigade is perhaps due to a faulty notion that Ferguson has already covered everything. In fact, Ferguson's work is quite limited in its scope. Some of his transcriptions are inaccurate and his analyses can be faulty. Many of his footnotes and introductory sections are not fully referenced, and he often conflates or misconstrues names and dates.¹⁷ Nevertheless, consulting Ferguson is still vital for any historian considering any facet of the Brigade.

Despite several attempts at filling in this gap in historiography, each one falls into the trap of not consulting enough, or sometimes any, Dutch-language sources or being over-reliant on Ferguson, either by repeating his introductory material or failing to consult any primary sources other than those he published. Joachim Miggelbrink, for example, has done an excellent job of analyzing much of what Ferguson offers.¹⁸ However, besides some references to printed primary source material, Miggelbrink largely does not corroborate Ferguson with Dutch, Scottish, or English archival material. Furthermore, much of the information is quite general, as the dissertation cover a very lengthy time-span. Nonetheless, it provides a good introduction to many of the themes pursued in-depth in this dissertation.

¹⁵ T.A. Fischer, *The Scots in Germany* (Edinburgh, 1902); A.F. Steuart, *Papers Relating to the Scots in Poland: 1576-1793* (Edinburgh, 1915).

¹⁶ Ferguson, see abbreviations.

¹⁷ For example, Ferguson identifies a Captain Livingston in 1622 as both Thomas and James Livingston, although it probably is Henry, who served as captain from 1607-1626, see Ferguson: 1607, 1621, 1622—States of War, p.69n, 319n, 322, Index, p.322.

¹⁸ Joachim Miggelbrink, "Serving the Republic: Scottish soldiers in the Republic of the United Provinces, 1572-1782," (PhD Thesis, European University Institute, 2005).

Hugh Dunthorne has authored a book that focuses generally on Britain and the Low Countries, in which the Brigade is mentioned, and an introductory article on the Brigade.¹⁹ The book is an important contribution, but is mostly focused on Anglo-Dutch military ties, diplomacy, and pamphleteering. Only brief references to the Brigade appear, drawn mostly from Ferguson's books, thus providing little in the way of original research.²⁰ Dunthorne's article has some interesting illustrations, and references the *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland* and other primary sources—including Dutch ones—not in Ferguson.²¹ However, numerous flaws detract from Dunthorne's article and book. First, despite the titular dates, 1572-1648, the article is mostly weighted towards the late sixteenth century and the early days of the Dutch Revolt. Second, his most-cited source is Ferguson, making much of the information he presents derivative.²² Third, some serious factual errors appear, chief of which is his assertion that soldiers of the Scots- and Anglo-Dutch Brigades had to be kept "as separate and as far away from each other as possible."²³ Paul Sellin's work falls very much into the same category: very reliant on Ferguson, but includes some references to both Scottish and English state papers, Dutch *Staten van Oorlog* (States of War) and papers of the States-General.²⁴ Again, it is a good introduction to the Brigade, but it mostly focuses on John Donne's service in the Netherlands and on the Anglo-Dutch Brigade.

¹⁹ Hugh Dunthorne, "Scots in the Wars of the Low Countries, 1572-1648," in G.G. Simpson (ed.), *Scotland and the Low Countries, 1124-1994* (East Lothian, 1996), pp.104-121 and *Britain and the Dutch Revolt, 1560-1700* (Cambridge, 2013).

²⁰ Dunthorne, *Revolt*, *passim*.

²¹ Dunthorne, "Wars," pp.111-112n, 118-121.

²² For example, compare Dunthorne's information on the payment of companies, "Wars," p.112, to Ferguson, sig.xiv-xv.

²³ Dunthorne, "Wars," p.111.

²⁴ Paul Sellin, "'Soldiers of one Army': John Donne and the Army of the States General as an International Protestant Crossroads," in Mary Arshagouni Papazian (ed.), *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation: New Perspectives* (Detroit, 2003), pp.143-192.

Matthew Glozier has authored a more unsatisfactory article, which contains many flaws and inconsistencies.²⁵ For example, Glozier does not satisfactorily define the Brigade. While he acknowledges that it is often erroneously conflated with the Anglo-Dutch Brigade, he then refers solely to the Anglo-Dutch Brigade in his article, regardless of which unit is under focus.²⁶ He also provides a statistical table of marriage patterns of Scottish soldiers in Dutch service and provides some basic analysis thereof, based on the work of Ir. J. Maclean.²⁷ But, when cross-referenced with Maclean, most of what he has written is simply wrong, or his conclusions are based only on assumptions. For example, Glozier writes that for soldiers mostly confined to garrison duty, “the opportunity to meet and court local girls must have been high.”²⁸ And yet, out of 175 women recorded in Alkmaar by Maclean, only twelve were actually “local girls.”²⁹ This dissertation, in large part, tries to correct some of the mistakes in the existing historiography of the Brigade.

Currently, the best place to find accurate secondary information on the Scots-Dutch Brigade comes from studies that ostensibly have nothing to do with it. The work of Steve Murdoch and Alexia Grosjean provides some well-contextualized information on the Brigade.³⁰ Kathrin Zickermann and Steve Murdoch’s article on Scottish widows during the Thirty Years’ War also offers excellent case studies of widows in the Brigade and their requests to the Dutch government.³¹ Though much of it is drawn from Ferguson, that

²⁵ Matthew Glozier, “Scots in the French and Dutch Armies during the Thirty Years’ War,” *Scotland and the Thirty Years’ War*, pp.117-141.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.117, 124-137.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p.135; Ir. J. Maclean, *De Huwelijksintekeningen Van Schotse Militairen in Nederland: 1574-1665* (Zutphen, 1976).

²⁸ Glozier, “French and Dutch,” p.133.

²⁹ Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*, pp.16-25.

³⁰ Leslie, *passim*.

³¹ Steve Murdoch, Kathrin Zickermann, “‘Bereft of all Human Help?’: Scottish Widows during the Thirty Years’ War (1619-1648),” *Northern Studies*, 50 (2019), pp.114-134.

material is corroborated with other primary sources, thus achieving originality. Alexander Dow provides a short, but excellent introduction to the religious aspects of the Brigade and Nadine Akkerman, in her edition of Elizabeth of Bohemia's correspondence, offers a wealth of information on the Brigade and its officers, whether within the letters themselves or in her notes.³²

This gap also exists within Dutch historiography. Olaf van Nimwegen's impressive study on the Dutch army only has a few brief references to Scottish soldiers within the army of the Republic.³³ Peter de Cauwer's recent work provides some references to the Brigade but makes it unclear how many regiments were actually there by referring to them solely as the "Schotse Regiment."³⁴ This book is also not a general history of the Eighty Years' War, as it only deals with the years 1628 and 1629 and the siege of 's-Hertogenbosch. Nonetheless, studies of the Eighty Years' War like these provide an essential context to the Brigade within Dutch history.

None of this is intended to suggest that Scots-Dutch studies are completely neglected. Andrew Little has done rigorous work on Scottish mariners in the Dutch marine in the late seventeenth century.³⁵ Douglas Catterall has done similar work on the Scots Kirk in Rotterdam as well as on the city itself.³⁶ Esther Mijers has also published extensively on

³² Alexander Dow, *Ministers to the Soldiers of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1962), pp.62-74; *Bohemia*, I, II.

³³ Olaf van Nimwegen, *The Dutch Army and the Military Revolutions, 1588-1688*, translated by Andrew May, (English Ed., Woodbridge, 2010), pp.36, 302, 311.

³⁴ Peter de Cauwer, *Tranen van bloed, Het Beleg van 's-Hertogenbosch en de oorlog in de Nederlanden, 1629* (Amsterdam, 2008), *passim*.

³⁵ Andrew Little, "British Seamen in the United Provinces during the seventeenth century Anglo-Dutch Wars: the Dutch navy—a preliminary survey," in Hanno Brand (ed.), *Trade, Diplomacy and Cultural Exchange* (Hilversum, 2005), pp.75-92.

³⁶ Douglas Catterall, *Community Without Borders, Scots Migrants and the Changing Face of Power in the Dutch Republic, c. 1600-1700* (Leiden, 2002); "Scots Along the Maas, c. 1570-1750," in A. Grosjean, S. Murdoch, (eds.), *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period* (Leiden, 2005), pp.169-189; "The Rituals of Reformed Discipline: Managing Honor and Conflict in the Scottish Church of Rotterdam, 1643-1665," *Archive for Reformation History*, 94 (2003), pp.194-222.

Scottish students in the Netherlands as well as on Scots in the West Indies.³⁷ Thus, this dissertation fits not just into Scottish military studies, but also Eighty Years' War historiography, and contemporary Scots-Dutch studies as well.

Source Material

The lack of attention given to the Scots-Dutch Brigade is certainly not for want of primary sources. State papers, personal letters, and early modern books are easily available in both English and Scots. This dissertation not only draws on hitherto untapped English and Scottish sources for the history of the Brigade but also uses Dutch language sources, allowing for a new, original, and comprehensive analysis.

The main Scottish print sources, other than Ferguson, originate from a royal or government perspective including, for example, the *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*.³⁸ Other sources include published family papers, such as those of William Kerr of Ancram, and seventeenth-century publications like William Lithgow's account of the siege of Breda in 1637.³⁹ General British sources are the *Calendars of State Papers, Domestic and Venetian*, which reveal contemporary attitudes towards Stuart-Dutch, Anglo-Dutch and Scots-Dutch military and diplomatic affairs, as well as the usual news on levies and recruitment.⁴⁰ Archival sources are drawn from many of those accessible through the

³⁷ Esther Mijers, "A Natural Partnership? Scotland and Zeeland in the Early Seventeenth Century," in A.I. Macinnes, A.H. Williamson (eds.), *Shaping the Stuart World, 1603-1714: The Atlantic Connection* (Leiden, 2006), pp.232-260.

³⁸ *RPCS*.

³⁹ David Laing (ed.), *Correspondence of Sir Robert Kerr, First Earl of Ancram and his son William, Third Earl of Lothian*, Vol. I: 1616-1649 (2 Vols., Edinburgh, 1875); William Lithgow, *A true and experimentall discourse...* (London, 1637).

⁴⁰ *CSPD*; *CSPV*.

National Records of Scotland in Edinburgh as well as those located in The National Archives in Kew.

The main Dutch print material used here is the *Resolutiën der Staten-Generaal, 1576-1625* and *Besluiten Staten Generaal, 1626-1630*.⁴¹ Although the printed records omit the final eighteen years of the Eighty Years' War, the *Resolutiën* remains an incredibly helpful source, as it not only provides government information but it also includes the petitions, requests, and statements of any manner of person, from widow to general. Further print sources include several volumes of *Het Staatsche Leger*, which, like Ferguson, includes primary documents coupled with some analyses.⁴² The aforementioned work of Maclean will also be used to a great extent. This nearly encyclopedic list of Scottish marriages drawn from local Dutch marriage-registers presents data in an entirely raw form, providing almost no analysis.⁴³ Invaluable information can be drawn from this work: from where companies were garrisoned, to where soldiers and their wives came from specifically in Scotland or the Netherlands, to the rate at which widows and widowers remarried. Dutch material from archives or museums of the Netherlands, including the Nationaal Archief, the archives of Alkmaar and Rotterdam, as well as the Rijksmuseum also help to cover the gap left by the *Resolutiën* from 1630 to 1648.

⁴¹ *RSG; BSG*.

⁴² *HSL*; David Trim, "Army, Society and Military Professionalism in the Netherlands during the Eighty Years' War," in Trim (ed.), *The Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism* (Leiden, 2003), pp.276-277.

⁴³ Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*.

Scope and Structure of the Study

This dissertation provides an original account of the Scots-Dutch Brigade between 1609 and 1648, coinciding with the start of the Twelve Years' Truce and the Peace of Münster. By focusing on the latter half of the Eighty Years' War, the dissertation runs concurrently with other recent studies of Scottish participation during the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648). This not only fills in the biggest gap in modern knowledge of the military dimensions of the Brigade, but it also contextualizes it with the internal and international politics of the Dutch Republic.

The first chapter sets the Brigade within two different spheres: its relationship to Scotland and its relationship with the Dutch Republic. First, it examines the mechanisms for recruitment into the Brigade and tries to answer several questions: what kind of person was in the Brigade? Where did they come from? And, what was their motivation to join? Secondly, it examines how the Brigade interacted with Dutch people and the Dutch government by examining a key moment in Dutch history: the "Calvinist Revolution" and the Orange Coup of 1617 to 1621. Lastly, the chapter explores the ways in which soldiers and veterans of the Brigade interacted with Scotland and their fellow countrymen. The reasons a soldier might decide to return home from the Republic are analyzed, followed by an examination of the ways in which Scots in the Brigade interacted with one another at home and abroad.

The second chapter, using a variety of case studies, assesses the military contribution that the Brigade made to the Dutch army during the second half of the Eighty Years' War. First, an analysis of the Brigade's role during Dutch expeditions abroad during the Twelve Years' Truce is made. By examining the Brigade's use during the Jülich-Cleves

crises of 1610/1614 and Bohemia in 1619, the combined interests of the Stuart Crown and the Dutch Republic in international affairs are examined, providing a completely original overview of Scots in the Dutch expedition to the Adriatic in 1617 during the Uskok War. The chapter then focuses on the Brigade's defensive and offensive roles after the resumption of hostilities with Spain, using the sieges of Bergen-op-Zoom (1622) and 's-Hertogenbosch (1629) as case studies. Finally, the chapter examines the contributions of the Brigade to the campaigns of the late-1630s and 1640s. Did, as some have argued, the outbreak of the Bishops' Wars in 1639 put a stop to any Scottish influence in Continental military affairs?⁴⁴ The two chapters, together, clarify the significance of the Brigade in military, local, and national life, in both Scotland and the Dutch Republic.

⁴⁴ Peter Wilson, *Europe's Tragedy* (London, 2009), p.594; David Parrott, *The Business of War: Military Enterprise and Military Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2012), p.133; W.P. Guthrie, *The Later Thirty Years' War: From the Battle of Wittstock to the Treaty of Westphalia* (Westport, 2003), p.257.

Chapter One: The Scots-Dutch Brigade Beyond the Battlefield

Although the most important aspect of the Scots-Dutch Brigade was its military dimension, several other characteristics also help to define it. Before an analysis of the Brigade's use in war can be made, these must be clearly explained. Firstly, it was Scottish and was a Scottish military community. Aside from its loyalty to the House of Stuart, this meant several different things. Eventually, the Brigade was able to replenish itself with second- or third-generation soldiers, but during the period covered here the Brigade largely drew fresh recruits from Scotland.¹ Thus many recruits were drawn to Brigade service for particularly Scottish or, at the very least, British reasons. Even while abroad, Scots maintained both tangible and intangible links with home, and some eventually returned there.

Secondly, the Brigade existed within Dutch society, not just within the Dutch army. Given the Brigade's spread throughout towns and cities across the Dutch Republic during an eighty-year conflict, the soldiers of the Brigade necessarily interacted with both the people and the government of the Republic to a very great extent, sometimes very positively. Ferguson wrote that relations between Scottish soldiers and Dutch people were "consistently friendly and cordial" and that during the Twelve Years' Truce, many Scots went to work on local Dutch farms.² However, interactions could also be negative. The Brigade also could be, and was, used against groups within the Dutch Republic, like Arminians, and this had consequences on Dutch society.

This chapter explores these themes to examine what made the Scots-Dutch Brigade exactly that: Scottish and Dutch. Firstly, both the mechanisms for recruitment and the

¹ There were, for example, no fewer than eleven related Halketts who served in the Brigade between 1582 and 1782. See Ferguson, pp.67-68n.

² Ferguson, sig.xxviii.

motivation for soldiers to leave Scotland and join the Brigade are examined. Secondly, the interaction of the Brigade with the Dutch people and within Dutch politics is examined during a specific moment, the “Calvinist Revolution” and Orange Coup of the late 1610s. Thirdly, an analysis is made of the relationship Scottish veteran soldiers had with their homeland when choosing to return, and with their compatriots at home and abroad.

Recruitment and Motivation

To fully understand the Scots-Dutch Brigade, the diversity of origin and motivation of its soldiers must be taken fully into account, starting with a prospective soldier in Scotland taking his first steps towards joining the Brigade. This section explores these two topics by examining recruitment, analyzing the origins of many soldiers, and exploring the various reasons why a man may have left Scotland to fight in the Low Countries. This, in turn, establishes the relationship between Scotland and the Brigade and, where possible, establishes a general character for the Scots-Dutch Brigade.

Very little has been written about recruitment into the Brigade. Ferguson’s selection of documents on the topic only deals with the years 1632-1638.³ Miggelbrink and Dunthorne provide some information on recruitment, giving similar explanations of how it occurred on a regular basis. First, a colonel received a commission, and then contracted captains who, in turn, were responsible for “maintaining the numerical strength of [their companies],” and would “[return] home to Scotland at intervals in order to take on fresh manpower.”⁴ This manpower came from the Lowlands, in particular, Miggelbrink argues,

³ Ferguson, pp.406-437.

⁴ Dunthorne, “Wars,” p.108; Dunthorne, *Revolt*, pp.69-70; Miggelbrink, “Serving,” p.52.

“Fife had the closest connection with the Brigade.”⁵ Finally, after being recruited, soldiers were shipped from Leith to ports in either Zeeland or Holland, where they would await deployment into an army or garrison.⁶

Despite the lack of specific examples or primary source material, the above explanations appear to be generally correct, with a few caveats. Firstly, lieutenants and colonels, as well as captains, could recruit soldiers. On 20 March 1621, Lieutenant Hamilton recruited William Cuming, who was sent to Leith to embark with a levy of men for the “wearis in the Low Countreyes.”⁷ In 1623, Colonel Brog interceded on behalf of three millers condemned to death and recruited them for the Brigade.⁸ Hamilton was clearly on recruitment duties, but it remains unclear whether Brog’s intercession was coincidental or planned.

Colonels could recruit men in much higher numbers, or whole regiments could be recruited at once. For instance, a regiment of around 2,000 men under Sir George Hay of Kinfauns was recruited for service at ’s-Hertogenbosch in 1629, although it had originally been levied in 1627 for the La Rochelle campaign.⁹ On 9 March 1636, Colonel James Livingston, Lord Almond, was commissioned by the Privy Council to levy three hundred men—presumably for his own regiment.¹⁰ That a colonel, lieutenant-colonel or sergeant-major would undertake recruitment personally should be unsurprising. Aside from executing the duties of their highest rank—in the case of a colonel, commanding the entire regiment—these officers would also have to perform the duties of a captain, including

⁵ Dunthorne, “Wars,” p.109; Miggelbrink, “Serving,” p.53.

⁶ Dunthorne, “Wars,” p.109; Miggelbrink, “Serving,” p.53.

⁷ *RPCS*, 1619-1622: 20 March 1621, p.453.

⁸ *RPCS*, 1622-1625: 10 Dec. 1622, 7 Jan. 1623, 21 Jan. 1623, pp.137, 146, 769.

⁹ Charles Rogers (ed.), *The Earl of Stirling’s Register of Royal Letters, Relative to the Affairs of Scotland and Nova Scotia from 1615-1635*, (2 Vols., Edinburgh, 1885), I, pp.193, 195, 338, 341.

¹⁰ *RPCS*, 1635-1637: 9 March 1636, p.225.

keeping up company strength, as each officer was also in command of their own unit. For example, Sir John Halkett, in a resolution of the States-General dated 20 March 1618, was referred to as “captain and sergeant-major,” highlighting his role as company commander.¹¹

Miggelbrink observed a glaring problem with Scottish records for recruitment.¹² Scottish Privy Council records, especially during the era of the Thirty Years’ War—when frequent levies were made for use in the Palatinate, Denmark-Norway, Sweden, and France—record barely any instances of recruitment for the Republic.¹³ Miggelbrink thus concludes that “a large number of Scotsmen went to Flanders without the proper official consent and on an individual basis.”¹⁴ This is based on the assumption that most Scottish recruits departed to the Dutch Republic from Scottish ports and therefore only Scottish records would have information on recruitment. Dunthorne echoes this, claiming that little governmental control existed in Scotland over recruitment, and most recruits left without proper authorization.¹⁵

This last claim seems to be almost entirely unfounded, for it is in fact within English records that the key to the recruitment problem may be found. Many, if not most, Scottish recruits actually travelled to the Dutch Republic via England, probably departing from Dover, Southampton, or London.¹⁶ Shortly before departure, each soldier was required to

¹¹ *RSG*, 1617-1618: 20 March 1618, p.356.

¹² Miggelbrink, “Serving,” p.53.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p.48.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.48.

¹⁵ Dunthorne, *Revolt*, p.70.

¹⁶ For details of other levies leaving Dover or Southampton, see Elizabeth Thomson (ed.), *The Chamberlain Letters* (London, 1965): 8 Jan. 1625, p.298 and Steve Murdoch, “James VI and the Formation of a Scottish-British Military Identity,” in S. Murdoch, A. Mackillop (eds.), *Fighting for Identity*, p.21; *CSPD*, 1627-1628: 14 Nov. 1627, p.435. Between April and December 1617, no fewer than sixteen soldiers left London for the Brigade. TNA, E157/3.

take an oath of allegiance, and this is listed within the records of the Exchequer under “Licenses to pass beyond the seas.”¹⁷ These records confirm that the oath was taken, and lists the name, age, destination and officer of each recruit. Both English and Scottish soldiers appear in these records and, in total, the names of at least 317 recruits for the Scots-Dutch Brigade appear between the years 1613 and 1633.¹⁸

This may seem like a relatively small number for two decades of recruitment, especially given the vast numbers of English recruits appearing in the records. However, the simple answer is that the records are very unevenly weighted: for example, the Exchequer records for 1628-1629, 1630-1631, and 1631-1632 each have 180, 160, and 128 pages, respectively, while those for 1611, 1623, and 1625, only have four, eight and twelve pages each.¹⁹ Likewise, there are no records for 1622, or for the years 1626-1627. This precludes any definitive calculation of the total number of soldiers recruited for the Brigade in these years. Similarly, until further evidence appears to the contrary, whether all recruits travelled through England and took the oath or some travelled directly from Scotland remains uncertain. Lack of evidence indicates, however, that most were diverted via England and fully authorized by the English Privy Council.²⁰

These records appear to confirm at least one of Miggelbrink’s points: captains by and large were the lynchpins of the recruiting process, accounting for the vast majority of specified officers in the records. In some cases, lieutenants did represent their captains while recruiting. For example, on 15 February 1620, 25 recruits destined for the company

¹⁷ TNA, E157.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ TNA, E157/14; TNA, E157/15; TNA, E157/16; TNA, E157/32; TNA, E157/9; TNA, E157/29.

²⁰ There are many examples of Brigade officers that obtained passes to travel from the English Privy Council. See *APC*, 1628-1629, pp.2, 408 for the passes of captains Archibald Douglas and Alexander Erskine.

of Sir Henry Livingston at Nijmegen took the oath, had been recruited by Sir Henry's brother, Lieutenant James Livingston.²¹ Again, colonels and lieutenant-colonels undertook recruiting: Colonel Robert Henderson recruited four men in September 1614, while Lieutenant-Colonel Francis Henderson recruited fifteen soldiers on 30 April 1621.²²

Miggelbrink's assertion that most soldiers were recruited alone is incorrect. Groups of two, three, or four men frequently took the oath of allegiance together, but it was certainly not uncommon for groups exceeding 20 men to do so. This occurred especially during the early months of 1621, as the termination of the Twelve Years' Truce approached. On 22 February 1621, 20 men were recruited for the company of Captain Andrew Donaldson, another 20 were recruited for Captain Philip Mowbray on 19 March 1621, in addition to the 25 recruited in mid-February for Captain Livingston.²³ In total, out of the 317 recruits appearing between 1613 and 1633, no fewer than 235 men took the oath in a group of two or more, accounting for nearly 75% of the total recruits recorded. The largest group was made up of 30 men, joining on 12 March 1621 and bound for Nijmegen to fight under Captain Livingston.²⁴ Further, Lieutenant David Pitcairn raised an entire company of 120 men in Scotland in 1621 at his own expense.²⁵ After some deliberation, the company was accepted and Pitcairn was commissioned as captain on 22 September.²⁶

What type of person was recruited for the Scots-Dutch Brigade? The mean age of those whose ages are noted in the Exchequer records—121 of the men—was around 26 to

²¹ TNA, E157/7, p.25.

²² TNA, E157/2, p.56; TNA, E157/7, p.94.

²³ TNA, E157/7, pp.19, 25, 53.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p.42.

²⁵ RSG, 1621-1622: 17 Sept. 1621, p.286.

²⁶ *Ibid.*: 24 Sept. 1621, 25 Sept. 1621, pp.291, 293; Ferguson: 1622—States of War, p.321.

27 years old. The oldest was one George Marshall, aged 48, who joined the company of Colonel Henderson in Alkmaar.²⁷ The youngest, at 17 years old, was Thomas Musgrave, who joined the company of Sir Henry Livingston on 30 June 1621.²⁸ Unfortunately, very few of the locations of origin are listed in the Exchequer records, and those that are extant are surprising. On 23 May 1614, one John Davis—from Llanhardre, Wales—joined the company of Captain Mowbray, and in September of that year, Francis Halfheid—of Whaddon, Cambridgeshire—joined the company of Colonel Henderson along with three Scots.²⁹ How, or why, a man from Cambridgeshire would fall in with three Scots and join the Scots-Dutch Brigade is a fascinating mystery and is proof that Scotsmen, Englishmen, and even Welshmen in Dutch service were certainly not averse to serving together.

Although Dunthorne and Miggelbrink argue that Fife and Lothian had the strongest links to the Brigade, neither scholar provides any evidence to support this.³⁰ Their claims can, in part, be tested by using Dutch marriage registers, where origin is listed more frequently than in the Exchequer records. Of the nearly 6,000 marriages listed by Maclean, the vast majority of soldiers are simply “from” Scotland, with no specific place named.³¹ 182 Scottish soldiers are identified in Maclean’s book as having a discernible place of origin, and of those, 77 soldiers married between 1609 and 1648. Whereas the dates in the Exchequer records indicate the beginning of service, date of marriage neither indicates the beginning nor end of service in the Brigade. Sir John Halkett, for example, married in 1608, but had served from 1604 to 1629.³² Therefore, the following analysis necessarily includes

²⁷ TNA, E157/7, p.92.

²⁸ TNA, E157/7, p.110.

²⁹ TNA, E157/2, p.33, 56.

³⁰ Dunthorne, “Wars,” p.109; Dunthorne, *Revolt*, p.69; Miggelbrink, “Serving,” p.53.

³¹ Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*, *passim*.

³² *Ibid.*, p.140; Ferguson, p.67n.

soldiers who married outside of the dissertation time-span. However, three marriages will be excluded in the analysis. Two of them occurred on the far earlier end of the spectrum: Alexander Hay, from Stirling, married in 1575 and Jan Peters, from Haddington, married in 1576.³³ The latest marriage will also be excluded: Martijn Hudde, from Burntisland, whose marriage took place in 1681.³⁴ Given the time-spans involved it is unlikely that Hay, Peters, or Hudde served in the Brigade between 1609 and 1648. This narrows down the list to 179 soldiers who appeared between 1583 and 1664.

Another parameter must be set before any analysis can be undertaken: geography. There are 42 specific locations mentioned in the records relating to these 179 soldiers, and they generally seem to fall into six distinct regions in Scotland: 1) the Northeast, including everywhere north of the River Tay and south of the Moray Firth, 2) the Borders, including the areas around the River Tweed, 3) the Southwest and West, including Glasgow, Ayr, Arran, Dumfries and locations in Galloway, 4) the Highlands, also encompassing Caithness and Orkney, 5) Fife and Lothian, around the mouth of the Forth, and 6) Central Scotland, including Stirling, Perth, Carron, and Falkirk.

When analyzed, Miggelbrink's claim that the geographic region with the highest representation was indeed Fife and Lothian is confirmed, with 73 (41%) of the men.³⁵ The second largest region, the Northeast, has a total of 41 soldiers (23%) in the sample, with the Southwest and West in a close third with 36 soldiers (20%) followed by Central Scotland with 17 men (9.5%). The apparent paucity of Highlanders, six (3.5%), in the Brigade is not particularly surprising, given that the majority of colonels seem to be

³³ Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*, pp.67, 114.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.114.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

Lowland nobles. Colonels Sir Robert Henderson, Sir Francis Henderson, Sir John Halkett, and Sir William Balfour were all from Fife.³⁶ Sir James Livingston, Lord Almond, was the son of the Earl of Linlithgow, near Edinburgh, while Walter Scott, Lord Scott of Buccleuch, and his son, the Earl of Buccleuch, were both from the Borders.³⁷ However, the numbers probably do not represent the Borders, (five men, 3%) accurately: Buccleuch, one of the major landholders in Scotland, had raised his own regiment for the Brigade in 1603, rendering it likely that a large cohort of Borderers accompanied him.³⁸

Additionally, of the 179 men sampled from Maclean, 105 (c. 59%) came from one of six major urban areas. These six—Edinburgh (excluding Leith), Aberdeen, Glasgow, Dundee, Stirling, and Perth—are also, individually, the top six locations from Maclean, regarding numbers of soldiers. Edinburgh by itself accounts for over a quarter (51 men, 28%) of the 179 men sampled, followed by Aberdeen (21 men, 12%), Glasgow (ten men, 5.5%), Dundee (nine men, 5%), Stirling (eight men, 4.5%), and Perth (six men, 3.5%). Other urban areas worthy of note are Leith, which was the origin of five men (3%), as well as Ayr and St Andrews, which account for four men each.³⁹

Using all of the above information, a typical recruit for the Brigade can be constructed. He would be around 26 years old and a Lowlander. He would most likely hail from Fife or Lothian, quite possibly from Edinburgh. However, there is one aspect of this “average” recruit that cannot be extrapolated by these numbers, and that is the question of

³⁶ Sir Robert Douglas, *The Baronage of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1798), pp.287, 518.

³⁷ David Stevenson. "Livingston [Livingstone], James, first earl of Callendar (d. 1674), army officer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Published 23 September 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-16808>. [Accessed 26 Feb. 2019]; *Burke's Peerage, Baronetage & Knightage* (107th Edition, 2003), Vol. I, pp.560-561.

³⁸ TNA, SP84/64, f.43, Cecil to Winwood, 12 Aug. 1603.

³⁹ Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen, passim*.

motivation. Why join the Scots-Dutch Brigade at all, rather than stay in Scotland? Why not join the armies of Sweden, Denmark-Norway or France?

“My affection to my lord of mortone entered me a souldier,” wrote Sir George Hay of Kinfauns to the Earl of Carlisle, British ambassador extraordinary in The Hague, in December 1628.⁴⁰ Hay had just served at the siege of La Rochelle in the regiment of his father-in-law, the Earl of Morton, but on assuming its colonelcy was petitioning Carlisle for its use in the Republic.⁴¹ “Now,” he wrote further, “my love to the trade moves me to continew, if your lo.’s favour to me and power with the States will procure them to take on this regiment.”⁴² This is perhaps the clearest explanation of personal motivation to be a soldier of any Scot during the period concerned, but, unfortunately, there are very few examples as clear-cut as this. It also does not provide an answer as to why Hay chose *Dutch* service.

As Murdoch has written, “there is no single answer” to the “question of motives:” the draw towards Swedish service could be very different from that of Poland-Lithuania, Spain, or France.⁴³ But there is also no “single answer” for those who chose service in the same place. Several different motivations, for example, have been ascribed to those who decided to fight in the Brigade.⁴⁴ Perhaps the most important theory is David Trim’s “Calvinist International,” which states that those who left for service for the Dutch Republic did so, not out of any particular love for it, but to fight against the powers of the anti-Christ led by

⁴⁰ TNA, SP16/549, f.88, Hay to Carlisle, [Dec.] 1628.

⁴¹ Laurence Spring, *The First British Army, 1624-1628: The Army of the Duke of Buckingham* (Solihull, 2016), *passim*.

⁴² *Ibid*.

⁴³ Murdoch, “Introduction,” p.15.

⁴⁴ Dunthorne, “Wars,” pp.109-110.

the Catholic Habsburgs.⁴⁵ This theory is very appealing, especially given the multi-national dimensions of the Dutch Army, which was manned by Calvinist Swiss, English, Scottish, and Huguenot soldiers, and the desire of the Princes of Orange to project themselves as defenders of European Calvinism.⁴⁶ While Trim makes a very convincing case for it regarding English officers, only passing references relate “Calvinist Internationalism” to the Scots-Dutch Brigade.⁴⁷

Another major theory on motivation for Scots to seek service in the Dutch Republic is that of the “International School of War,” where sons of noblemen—especially younger sons with little to no inheritance—went abroad, often to the Low Countries, to seek a military education.⁴⁸ This is also a very appealing notion. The Dutch Republic, from 1568 to 1648, was a scene of nearly constant warfare and was a highly militarized state, and before the outbreak of the Thirty Years’ War in 1618 the Republic had few rivals for soldiers. Thus, before 1618 the most obvious place to seek a military education was the Republic. Again, this theory has mostly been tested for the Anglo-Dutch Brigade, so how true this is for the Scots-Dutch Brigade remains debatable. Other motivations ascribed to early modern Scottish soldiers include the unhelpful label “mercenary,” or that most were criminals expelled from Scotland.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ David Trim, “Calvinist Internationalism and the English Officer Corps, 1562-1642,” *History Compass*, 4, 6 (2006), pp.1024-1048.

⁴⁶ Helmer Helmers, “Foreign News in Times of Domestic Crisis: the Truce Conflicts, the Thirty Years’ War, and the Rise of the Dutch Newspaper,” in A. Wilkinson, G. Kemp (eds.), *Negotiating Conflict and Controversy in the Early Modern Book World* (Leiden, 2019), pp.259-260, 265.

⁴⁷ Leslie, pp.30-33, 40, 122.

⁴⁸ Dunthorne, *Revolt*, pp.61-63, 99-102; Dunthorne, “Wars,” p.110; Keith Brown, *Noble Power in Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution* (Edinburgh, 2011), p.123. Glozier, “French and Dutch,” p.117.

⁴⁹ For example, James Miller, *Swords for Hire: the Scottish Mercenary* (Edinburgh, 2007); James A. Fallon, “Scottish Mercenaries in the Service of Denmark and Sweden, 1626-1632,” (PhD Thesis, University of Glasgow, 1973), p.91; Guthrie, *Later*, p.47.

It is true that younger sons often sought foreign military service. The genealogy of the Halketts recorded in Douglas's *Baronage of Scotland* notes that Colonel Sir John Halkett was either the second or third son of George Halkett of Pitfiranne.⁵⁰ Indeed, wrote Douglas, "Sir John... being born a younger brother, betook himself to a military life, went into the service of the states of Holland, where, by his bravery and merit, he rose to the rank of colonel."⁵¹ Sir Robert Henderson was the second son of Sir John Henderson of Fordell, and his brother, Sir Francis, was the third, and both sought military service in the Republic.⁵² Both Sergeant-Major Sir William Drummond of Midhope and Colonel Sir James Livingston, Lord Almond were third sons, and it is probable that Alexander Erskine, the fourth son of the Earl of Mar, was a captain of cavalry.⁵³

It was not always the case that only younger sons sought service in the Republic. Indeed, Walter Scott, Earl of Buccleuch, the first and only son of Sir Walter Scott, Lord Scott of Buccleuch, commanded the third regiment of the Brigade from 1629 to 1633.⁵⁴ However, this example opens up another avenue to explore: patrilineage and familial ties as a cause for service. George Home of Wedderburn, only son of Sir David Home of Wedderburn, initially joined a French regiment in Dutch service in order to learn French.⁵⁵ However, he appears to have departed the French regiment when the fourth Scottish regiment entered Dutch service, captaining the company that was raised by his father.⁵⁶

⁵⁰ Douglas, *Baronage*, pp.285, 287.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p.287.

⁵² *Burke's Peerage*, II, p.1864.

⁵³ Stevenson, "Livingston, James," *ODNB*. Another William Drummond in Dutch service was the fourth son of the Earl of Perth. William Drummond, *The Genealogy of the Most Noble and Ancient House of Drummond* (Glasgow, 1831), pp.73, 209. Erskine was certainly a courtier of Elizabeth of Bohemia. *Bohemia*, I: 4 Oct. 1623—Elizabeth to Mar, pp.435-436n, and *passim*.

⁵⁴ *Burke's Peerage*, I, p.560.

⁵⁵ NI-HaNa, RvS, 1.01.19, inv.nr. 46, Resoluties 1629.

⁵⁶ Ferguson: Annexa II—Roll of names, p.400; *RPCS*, 1629-1630: 31 March 1629, p.124.

Ferguson has written on the “recurrence of [the] same names” among Scottish officers in the Brigade, and the high degree to which fathers, sons, and brothers would serve in the same companies and regiments.⁵⁷ This was increasingly reflected over time as the Brigade became more established. Thomas Edmond, the son of Colonel Sir William Edmond, commanded a company of infantry as well as a company of cavalry between 1617 and 1625.⁵⁸ Sir William and Sir Henry Balfour were the sons of one of the original colonels of the Brigade, and both served as officers in the Brigade.⁵⁹ At least four of Sir John Halkett’s six sons—George, Robert, Maurits, and Johan—went on to receive captain’s commissions within it.⁶⁰ There may have been two motivations behind their enlistments: to follow in the same service as their father, or to provide income for their widowed mother.⁶¹ There are certainly more examples of sons following in their father’s footsteps, and this type of “motivation” is one that makes the Brigade particularly unique.

The recurrence of names also featured among ordinary soldiers. James Spens, formerly a drummer in Colonel Brog’s regiment, for instance, joined the regiment of Sir James Spens of Wormiston for Swedish service.⁶² That regiment alone contained—besides the colonel—two other men named James Spens, along with an Alexander Spens.⁶³ The propensity of Scots to join the regiment of their kinsmen was certainly present in the Brigade. Between 1611 and 1647, no fewer than 38 ordinary soldiers bore a derivation of

⁵⁷ Ferguson, sigs.xxiv-xxvi.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*: 1613—States of War, p.229n.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*: 1579—States of War, p.43n, 1607—States of War, p.69n

⁶⁰ *Bohemia*, I: 19 Aug. 1629—Frederick to Elizabeth, p.778n; Ferguson, pp.67-68n.

⁶¹ Maria van Loon, Halkett’s widow, petitioned the State-General for a pension in 1640. See Ferguson: 3 February 1640—Resolution of the States General, pp.458-459; Zickermann, Murdoch, “Scottish Widows,” p.121.

⁶² Alexia Grosjean, Steve Murdoch, and Siobhan Talbott, “Drummer Major James Spens: Letters from a Common Soldier Abroad, 1617-1632,” *Northern Studies*, 47 (2015), pp.77-78

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p.78.

the surname “Henderson,” in addition to Michael Henderson, the provost of the regiment from 1609 to 1618.⁶⁴ At that same time, four officers with the surname Henderson all had command in the same regiment: colonels Robert (from 1603-1622) and Francis (1603-1628) as well as lieutenant-colonels James (the son of Robert, killed at Breda in 1637) and John (lieutenant-colonel in the second regiment until 1655, colonel of the third regiment to 1660).⁶⁵ Of the 38 “ordinary” Hendersons serving in the Brigade in this period, twelve served directly in the company of one of the Henderson officers, while seven served under a different captain but in the same regiment as a commanding Henderson. An additional two Hendersons were living in The Hague and Tiel in 1622 and 1627, where both Sir Robert and Sir Francis Henderson had recently had companies garrisoned.⁶⁶ Thus, in the period concerned, nearly 54% of ordinary soldiers with the name Henderson had a direct connection with their commanding kinsmen—lending weight to the theory of kith and kin networks as motivation for service.⁶⁷

Contemporaries certainly saw the Low Countries as a “school of war,” but whether or not Scots actually joined the Brigade for this reason is somewhat difficult to determine.⁶⁸ However, many officers used their service in the Dutch Republic to further their careers. Henry Bruce, former captain of the Brigade, most likely used his experience of siege warfare to obtain command in the defense of Gradisca, when it was besieged by the Venetians during the Uskok War.⁶⁹ After the conclusion of the Uskok War in 1618, he

⁶⁴ Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*, *passim*; Ferguson: Misc. Documents, pp.75, 229-230, 232, 333.

⁶⁵ Ferguson, *passim*.

⁶⁶ Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*, pp.143, 284.

⁶⁷ Steve Murdoch, *Network North: Scottish Kin, Commercial and Covert Associations in Northern Europe, 1603-1746* (Leiden, 2006), pp.13, 26, 40.

⁶⁸ Bingham, John (Aelianus), *The tacticks of Aelian...* (London, 1616), no page number; Dunthorne, *Revolt*, pp.61-63.

⁶⁹ *CSPV*, 1617-1619: 8 Dec. 1618—Giustinian to the D/S, p.374. See section three of this Chapter.

certainly tried to use his experience in the Dutch Republic to enter the service of Venice, informing the Venetian Ambassador in Germany that he had twenty-five years' experience fighting in the Low Countries while "in some command in all the principal sieges and battles which took place during that period," and that he had "an intimate knowledge of fortification."⁷⁰ Although he never joined Venetian service, he rose to the rank of Governor of Nikolsburg in the Holy Roman Empire, presumably using his experience in garrison life to gain this.⁷¹ Whether or not Bruce had joined Dutch service to learn the military trade, he used his service there to claim expertise, unsurprisingly, in something particular to the "Netherlands School of War:" siege warfare.⁷² This was something that would be also be important to the career of Sir James Livingston, a veteran of the Brigade, when he led the Army of the Covenant in besieging Newcastle in 1644.⁷³

Criminals and vagrants could end up in the Brigade, but it was probably not as high a number as some historians have suggested.⁷⁴ William Cuming was both a debtor and homeless in March 1621 and thought to likely "sterve through famine and cauld."⁷⁵ As noted above, he was recruited by Lieutenant Hamilton for service in the Low Countries, agreeing never to return to Scotland without license. In January 1623, three millers in Leith were sentenced to hang for stealing wheat from the "common mills" of the Burgh, but on Colonel Brog's intercession their sentence was changed to service in the Brigade.⁷⁶ The

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*: Same to Same, p.374.

⁷¹ Worthington, *Scots in Habsburg Service*, p.147.

⁷² Dunthorne, *Revolt*, pp.78-85, 99. One of the best introductions to "the character of the Low Countries' Wars" is in Geoffrey Parker, *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, 1567-1659* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 2004), pp.1-18.

⁷³ *Leslie*, p.134.

⁷⁴ Fallon, "Scottish Mercenaries," p.91; Dunthorne, "Wars," p.109.

⁷⁵ *RPCS*, 1619-1622: 20 March 1621, p.453.

⁷⁶ *RPCS*, 1622-1625: 14 Nov. 1622, 7 Jan. 1623, 21 Jan. 1623, pp.94, 137, 146.

millers never made it to the Republic: having escaped from the ships before they set sail they were apprehended again and resented to death.⁷⁷

Although an aspiring Scottish officer could never rise to a rank higher than colonel—unlike in Sweden or France—the Brigade was something of a meritocracy.⁷⁸ On at least two separate occasions, the Prince of Orange interceded on behalf of more experienced officers to support them over a less experienced noble from Scotland. In early 1612, Prince Maurice blocked the Earl of Buccleuch from taking the colonelcy of his father's regiment, instead installing Sir Robert Henderson, who had over seventeen years of experience.⁷⁹ An "*Acte Expectatif*" was passed in favor of Buccleuch, promising him "the first colonelcy that shall fall vacant among the troops of the Scottish nation."⁸⁰ Nonetheless, when a vacancy opened up in 1622, on the death of Sir Robert at Bergen-op-Zoom, Prince Maurice interceded again and placed Sir Francis Henderson in command of the regiment, despite the protestations of Buccleuch and Sir Dudley Carleton.⁸¹ This degree of protection offered by the Prince of Orange might have made Dutch service seem appealing to those who could not receive commissions based on wealth or noble status.⁸²

Elizabeth Stuart, the exiled Queen of Bohemia, was, since 1621, resident in the Dutch Republic and offered a degree of patronage to the men of the Brigade.⁸³ In 1639, ten years after the death of Colonel Halkett at 's-Hertogenbosch, Elizabeth wrote to

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*: 7 Jan. 1623, 14 May 1623, pp.137, 227. That same year, two brothers from the Borders were banished to the Low Countries, but it is unclear if the intention was for military service or not. See *RPCS*, 1545-1625, Addenda: 19 April 1623, pp.713-714.

⁷⁸ *Leslie*, p.177.

⁷⁹ Ferguson: 10 Jan.1612—Resolution, pp.258-259; *RSG*, 1610-1612: 10 Jan. 1612, p.552.

⁸⁰ Ferguson: 14 July 1620—'*Acte Expectatif*,' p.269.

⁸¹ *RSG*, 1621-1622: 25 Aug. 1622, 29 Aug. 1622, pp.619, 625.

⁸² This would seem to be supported by Keith Brown, who wrote that, in the Republic, "a more professional approach to warfare necessarily led to nobles losing out." Brown, *Noble Power*, pp.123.

⁸³ *Bohemia*, I: Introduction, p.31.

Constantine Huygens of her wish that Halkett's son would receive an ensign's commission.⁸⁴ The previous year, Elizabeth had acted as an intermediary in the release of four Scottish officers after their capture at Kallo.⁸⁵ Because she represented the honor of the House of Stuart, she served as another motivation for service in the Brigade.⁸⁶ This was, in fact, expressly stated by Henry Bruce when he tried to return to the Brigade from Imperial service, not wanting to serve against his sovereign's daughter and son-in-law.⁸⁷ Nonetheless, while defending Elizabeth of Bohemia may certainly have become an important motivation over time, it was patently not the motivation for many of the soldiers and officers in the Brigade. Some, like Sir Robert Henderson, had been serving before her deposition, and others, like Colonel Brog, had been serving before she was even born.⁸⁸

It is for this reason that the theory of "Calvinist Internationalism" holds much appeal. Colonel Henderson, in particular, consistently demonstrated his Calvinism. For example, he referred to one William Gordon, a deserter from his regiment, as a "debauched papist and a meddler with Jesuits."⁸⁹ Furthermore, on 23 August 1622, Henderson died from a wound to the leg inflicted at the siege of Bergen-op-Zoom, and the Venetian ambassador reported that, before dying, Henderson "recommended his soul to God and... displayed great piety in his Calvinist faith."⁹⁰ It can sometimes be difficult to gauge the Calvinism of individuals within the Brigade, given the lack of personal letters, papers, and journals outlining these feelings. Besides the fact that the Brigade was founded on the

⁸⁴ J.A. Worp (ed.), *De Briefwisseling van Constantijn Huygens*, II (6 Vols., The Hague, 1911-1917): 19 Feb. 1639—Huygens to van Schwartzenberg, p.436.

⁸⁵ *Bohemia*, II: 6 Aug. 1638—Gerbier to Elizabeth, p.696n.

⁸⁶ Murdoch, "Introduction," p.18.

⁸⁷ *Carleton*: 15 April 1620—Carleton to Naunton, p.456.

⁸⁸ Ferguson, pp.54n, 59-60n.

⁸⁹ TNA, SP84/90, f.18. Henderson to Carleton, 15 May 1619.

⁹⁰ *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 29 Aug. 1622—Surian to the D/S, p.400.

principle of “rewarding” Calvinist Scots for their service in the Marian Civil War, a few other examples exist indicating that those in the Brigade held deeply Calvinist beliefs.⁹¹

The Brigade always had a contingent of ministers attached to it who had been ordained in Scotland. In 1606, John Douglas was ordained as a minister for the “Auld North British Regiment in the Low Countries” at the behest of Colonel Sir William Edmond, and served there until around 1621.⁹² Reverend Andrew Hunter also served as a minister of the Brigade from around 1597, having been driven into exile from Scotland for his association with Francis Stewart, Earl of Bothwell.⁹³ The minister’s importance to the Brigade is illustrated by a letter sent to the States-General after Hunter’s death in 1630. All three colonels of the Brigade—William Brog, David Balfour, and George Coutts—signed a letter requesting that 100 more guilders be paid to Hunter’s widow and, during her lifetime, they would “provide for the support of our minister or ministers without assistance or grant” from the States-General or the Council of State.⁹⁴ Furthermore, officers in the Brigade were often involved in Scottish Kirks in the Republic. In 1643, Thomas Cunningham—who had previously supplied the Covenanters with arms during the Bishops’ Wars—asked Colonel Sir Philip Balfour to intervene against the erection of a coat of arms in the Scottish Kirk in Veere, because it was too much of an “[i]novatioune.”⁹⁵

This section, by examining recruitment and motivation, has shown the diverse make-up of the Brigade. No single point of origin nor motivation to join can be ascribed to all of its soldiers, and only a consideration of individuals within the Brigade over wide

⁹¹ *CSPS*, 1571-1574: 20 June 1573, p.590.

⁹² Hew Scott, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ*, V (Edinburgh, 1925), p.193.

⁹³ Dow, *Ministers*, p.62; *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House* (24 Vols., 1883-1976), IV: Aug. 1594—[Henry] Locke to [Sir Robert Cecil], p.600.

⁹⁴ Ferguson: 14 Nov. 1630—Letters to the States-General, p.439.

⁹⁵ *Leslie*, p.109; Elinor Courthope (ed.), *The Journal of Thomas Cunningham of Campvere, 1640-1654* (Edinburgh, 1928), sig.xix.

spectrum of time and circumstance can analyses of motivation and recruitment be made. However, the Calvinist tendencies of the Brigade cannot be overlooked. Colonel Henderson, again, and his company were involved, in Henderson's words, in "public service:" the repression of Arminians throughout the Dutch Republic during the "Calvinist Revolution" of the late 1610s.⁹⁶ This will be fully outlined in the following section, and it indicates that the Brigade was not just used to defend the Dutch Republic and the Dutch people, but as an instrument of the House of Orange and its "stern" Calvinist agenda against other Protestants in the Republic.

The Scots-Dutch Brigade and the "Calvinist Revolution" (1618-1621)

The Calvinism of the Brigade is nowhere more obvious than during the "Calvinist Revolution" of 1618-1621, during which time the Brigade was heavily involved in the internal political and religious strife that enveloped the Dutch Republic.⁹⁷ Although this is a period that is very instructive to the history of the Brigade, it has suffered from extreme historical neglect. Ferguson acknowledged that "Scottish troops were a powerful support to the House of Orange... and the Calvinists, [against] Johan van Olden Barneveld (*sic*) and the Arminian party," in little more than a footnote in the volume.⁹⁸ Sellin has also given brief information about the Scots' role, writing that Colonel Henderson's regiment helped to disarm the *waardgelders*—non-professional, temporary soldiers—at Utrecht and repress Arminians at Alkmaar.⁹⁹ That is about the extent of the information provided, without

⁹⁶ TNA, SP84/89, f.227. Henderson to Carleton, 30 April 1619; Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford, 1995), pp.450-477.

⁹⁷ Israel, *Republic*, pp.450-477.

⁹⁸ Ferguson, p.224.

⁹⁹ Sellin, "Souldiers," p.149; F.P. Wagenaar, "The 'Waardgelders' of Den Haag," in Marco van der Hoeven (ed.), *Exercise of Arms: Warfare in the Netherlands, 1568-1648* (Leiden, 1998), p.229.

clarifying how Scottish soldiers were actually used in these episodes. This section therefore provides the first serious analysis of the Brigade during the “Calvinist Revolution” and the Orange Coup.

In 1616, after the second Jülich-Cleves crisis, General Ambrosio Spinola and his Spanish army occupied parts of eastern Mark on the fringes of the Dutch Republic.¹⁰⁰ Prince Maurice believed this to be very dangerous for the Dutch Republic, as, after the termination of the Twelve Years’ Truce in 1621, it would allow Spain to resume the war “with vigor,” and thus wished to revoke the Truce immediately.¹⁰¹ However, this led to conflict with Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, the Advocate of Holland, who wanted indefinite peace with Spain. These international issues were coupled with internal political and confessional tensions that had been simmering for nearly a decade. In 1610, Arminians, with the support of Oldenbarnevelt, submitted a Remonstrance to the States of Holland, which, among other things, supported state authority over the Church and took a more moderate approach to predestination, amidst a growing debate with the more hardline Gomarists.¹⁰²

These issues then spread through the “length and breadth of the United Provinces.”¹⁰³ On 4 August 1617, the conflict reached its boiling point when a majority of the States of Holland passed the “Sharp Resolution.”¹⁰⁴ This resolution upheld the provincial sovereignty of Holland: there could be no national synod to resolve religious disputes, that individual towns represented by the States-General could raise their own

¹⁰⁰ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.205.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p.205; Helmers, “Foreign News,” p.257.

¹⁰² Israel, *Republic*, pp.393, 423, 425; Helmers, “Foreign News,” p.255-256.

¹⁰³ Israel, *Republic*, pp.427, 433.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p.441; Nimwegen, *Army*, p.206; Helmers, “Foreign News,” pp.255-257.

waardgelders that would swear allegiance to the town, and that all soldiers of the regular army in the pay of Holland owed their primary allegiance to the States of Holland rather than the States-General, and were thus obliged to follow the orders of Holland first.¹⁰⁵ This attempted “corrosion” of Maurice’s power led directly to the “Orange Coup” of 1618, in which Maurice, with the backing of the army, dismissed 900 *waardgelders* in Utrecht on 31 July and arrested Oldenbarnevelt the next month at The Hague.¹⁰⁶ Even after the eventual execution of Oldenbarnevelt on 13 May 1619, the civil unrest in the Dutch Republic did not subside.¹⁰⁷ There were still towns throughout the Republic with Arminian councils that were purged and riots continued to erupt in Rotterdam, Hoorn, Alkmaar, Schoonhoven, and Kampen from late 1618 well into 1619.¹⁰⁸

In North Holland the situation was particularly grim. Alkmaar, directly north of Amsterdam, a town “which before 1618 had been dominated by Remonstrant preachers,” continued to be a site of civic conflict during the Arminian troubles because of its “predominantly Remonstrant” [citizenry].¹⁰⁹ Rioting in March 1619 was met with a show of force from Maurice, and the troops he sent there had a distinctively Scottish character.¹¹⁰ Although Colonel Robert Henderson had a small company in Alkmaar as early as 1614, by early 1619 he was appointed commander “over the extraordinary troops sent thither expressly to suppress the tumults,” and also took over as garrison commander, on orders from Prince Maurice himself.¹¹¹ This is reflected in both the Alkmaar marriage registers

¹⁰⁵ Israel, *Republic*, p.441; Nimwegen, *Army*, p.206.

¹⁰⁶ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.206; Israel, *Republic*, pp.445-449.

¹⁰⁷ Israel, *Republic*, p.459.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, pp.453, 456, 462.

¹⁰⁹ Israel, *Republic*, p.394, 458.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.456, 462.

¹¹¹ TNA, SP84/90 f.178, Carleton and to Naunton, 18 June 1619; TNA, SP84/95 f.28, Henderson to Carleton, 11 March 1620; TNA, E157/2, p.56; *Carleton*: 18 June 1619—Carleton to Naunton, p.372.

and the records of the Exchequer. According to the Alkmaar marriage registers, between 1607 and 1619 there was no significant Scottish presence until March 1619.¹¹² However, between 1617 and 1621, the Scottish presence spiked dramatically, when no fewer than fourteen men from Henderson's regiment were married while in the garrison, along with an additional seven Scots who were either in the Anglo-Dutch Brigade or were servants to the *Landroost* (magistrate).¹¹³ Additionally, between 1617 and 1620, according to the Exchequer records, no fewer than four Scots had been sent directly into Alkmaar.¹¹⁴ Furthermore, an additional 32 joined Henderson in the garrison in 1621.¹¹⁵ Other Scottish officers present in the garrison included Captains William Orrock, Sir John Halkett, and Sir James Sandilands as well as Colonel Sir Robert Sidney and Captain William Sellinger of the Anglo-Dutch Brigade.¹¹⁶

A series of letters written by Henderson to Stuart ambassador Sir Dudley Carleton between 11 March and 26 July 1619 also indicate the part—sometimes sanguinary—that Scots played in repressing Remonstrant conventicles as the troubles in Alkmaar reached their peak. Colonel Henderson arrived in Alkmaar sometime before 11 March, and he reported that a convention of ministers from North Holland and deputies from the States of Holland had been meeting there sometime before this.¹¹⁷ However, during the ministers' and deputies' meeting in the church, eight or nine of the "bassest soort"—Arminians—began beating on the church doors with the intention of stopping the meeting and

¹¹² Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*, p.16.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, pp.16-18, 340.

¹¹⁴ TNA, E157/3, p.21, E157/5, pp.8, 60, 81

¹¹⁵ TNA, E157/7, pp.87, 92, 120, 140

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p.8, E157/5, p.81; Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*, pp.16-17.

¹¹⁷ TNA, SP84/95 f.28, Henderson to Carleton, 11 March 1620.

apprehending the ministers. The intruders finally broke down the doors, but not before the deputies and ministers had escaped out the back.

Henderson arrived in the town just after this episode and, after showing the magistrates of the town his commission, gave his opinion on the situation at hand. Henderson believed that the ministers should “presentlie begin thair assemblie and go forward with thair bussness.”¹¹⁸ This was possible, Henderson assured them, with the help of the “haul garrison” in Alkmaar. On 11 March, the assembly met again in the church, under the guard of Henderson’s own company. The rest of the garrison was commanded by Henderson to be ready at any occasion, in case of trouble. These were necessary precautions: Henderson reported that several burghers at Hoorn had recently been slain in the troubles, even with the presence of a garrison in the town.¹¹⁹

Several weeks later, further disturbances occurred in Alkmaar. On 30 April, Henderson reported that over the previous days, Remonstrants had been occupying the Great Church in Alkmaar and had “erestid” another part of the town for their services.¹²⁰ However, a decree from the States of Holland and the magistrates of Alkmaar ordered that any person who entered the former Arminian church would be prosecuted “under the paine of arbitral correction.”¹²¹ Early in the morning of 28 April, Henderson and his soldiers occupied the meeting places of the Arminians. In addition, for extra protection, he ordered his men to remain at arms until night, in case disorders arose after the States’ decree. There was to be no opposition that night, Henderson found “all things in

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹²⁰ TNA, SP84/89 f.227, Henderson to Carleton, 30 April 1619.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

quiettness,” and wrote of his hope that this would “give ane good example to other tounes to doe the [same]” when dealing with Remonstrants.¹²²

Unfortunately, the next occasions on which Henderson and his Scots met the Remonstrants, the situation did not remain in “quiettness.” As was reported both by Henderson and Carleton, as well as in a memoir of the troubles in Alkmaar, on 23 June 1619, a gathering of Remonstrants took place in the woods outside of the city.¹²³ The deputies of the States of Holland and the magistrates of Alkmaar went to break up the conventicle and Henderson, on orders from Prince Maurice of Orange, accompanied the deputies. They asked that Henderson not bring any soldiers with him. However Henderson, “fearing the danger more than they, [caused] some of the English officers... with some gentillman of my oune company without armis to accompany [them].”¹²⁴ He took further preparations in case of commotion, ordering a troop of 100 guards from the town to follow quietly behind them and commanding the remainder of his company and the garrison to go to arms “to be in readiness upon the first occasion.”¹²⁵

When Henderson and the deputies came to the conventicle, they ordered the Remonstrants to disperse, but to no avail. After some exclamations from the crowd, Henderson and the deputies were attacked with knives, but defended themselves with their swords until the company he had ordered to follow behind came up and forced the crowd to disperse.¹²⁶ On returning to the town, however, Henderson found that there were

¹²² *Ibid.*

¹²³ TNA, SP84/90 f.190, Henderson to Carleton, 24 June 1619; TNA, SP84/90 f.178, Carleton and to Naunton, 18 June 1619; NL-AmrRAA—95.001, Collectie Aanwinsten, inv.nr. 152, “Memorye.” Verhaal in kroniekvorm van het verzetten van de wet door prins Maurits en het gebeurde ten aanzien van de Remonstranten, oktober 1618-maart 1621, ff.4318-4321.

¹²⁴ TNA, SP84/90 f.190, Henderson to Carleton, 24 June 1619.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*; TNA, SP84/90 f.178, Carleton and to Naunton, 18 June 1619.

some well-armed people defying the magistrates and so he ordered the garrison to take up arms until everything had settled down.¹²⁷ The Remonstrants returned to their gathering place outside of the town, and although Henderson offered to send more soldiers out to dissolve this, the States and magistrates declined, citing the weakness of the garrison and the general commotion in the town.¹²⁸ Although evidently no blood was shed in this episode, Henderson told Carleton that “it was one of the most dangerous [pieces] of work” he had so far witnessed in Alkmaar and reported that companies were going to Hoorn to do similar service.¹²⁹

Another account of the use of Scottish soldiers against Remonstrants exists in a Dutch “Memorye” of the troubles in Alkmaar. Around midday on 28 July 1619, a gathering of Arminians was taking place in the center of Alkmaar on the old stone bridge.¹³⁰ There, without a preacher, they sang two or three psalms until an Arminian citizen and former alderman of Alkmaar approached them and warned them that they should go to their homes to pray and sing, because he feared it would not end well. This was refused, and the service continued.¹³¹ Soon after, a bailiff of Alkmaar approached also asking that they go home, but the Remonstrants laughed and jeered at him and again refused.¹³² A company of Scottish soldiers was then called upon to finally break up the conventicle. On coming to the bridge, the Scots began making their way through the people, beating them with their sticks and pikes. Some bystanders saw this abuse and hurled stones from the street at the Scots. In response, the Scots opened fire on the bystanders with their muskets, wounding

¹²⁷ TNA, SP84/90 f.190, Henderson to Carleton, 24 June 1619.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ NL-AmrRAA, “Memorye,” f.4326.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, ff.4326-4327.

¹³² *Ibid.*, ff.4327-4328.

four or five of them and scaring off the rest.¹³³ Two companies of soldiers were left to guard the bridge while another four were sent to patrol the town with loaded muskets but, feeling uneasy, they began shooting into the windows of houses in Alkmaar.¹³⁴

Around the same time, Sir Robert Henderson's brother, Sir Francis, became the center of a controversy that grew to involve the States-General, Council of State, Sir Dudley Carleton and James VI himself. During the summer and autumn of 1618, Prince Maurice and his troops had purged Arminian factions in the towns of Gelderland and Overijssel.¹³⁵ Maurice's troops, as in Alkmaar, had to be left in the towns to keep the peace. By October 1618, Sir Francis was garrisoned near Maurik in Gelderland when, according to his own testimony to the Council of State, a man named Sweer Adriaensz, under orders from his master, broke into Sir Francis's quarters and attempted to murder him.¹³⁶ Sir Francis grabbed Adriaensz, but the man managed to slip away and made a break for the door. Henderson, intending to stun the man, hit him on the head with the pommel of his sword. As Adriaensz fell, he slashed Henderson's shin with a piece of glass. Henderson hit him on the head again with the pommel, but, to his surprise, "be al apparances," he was dead; his tongue hanging out of his mouth in a manner most "unkeuthie."¹³⁷ Throughout his testimony, Henderson continued to express "extem grief" over the death, and the pain it

¹³³ *Ibid.*, f.4328.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, f.4329.

¹³⁵ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.206.

¹³⁶ NL-HaNA, RvS, 1.01.19, inv.nr. 584B, Ingekomen Brieven, 1618 Augustus-December. In Henderson's testimony, the man remains anonymous. However, on 30 Oct. 1618, one Arnoult Vijgh petitioned the States-General for a pardon for being with Henderson during the murder, in which he names Adriaensz. It is possible that this is the same Arnoult Vijgh who received a commission from the Council of State in 1619, and it is also possible he is related to Sir Francis' wife, Anna Vijgh. See *RSG*, 1617-1618: 30 Oct. 1618, p.538; NL-HaNA, RvS, 1.01.19, inv.nr. 37, Resoluties 1619, f.40; Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*, p.25.

¹³⁷ NL-HaNA, inv.nr. 584B, Ingekomen Brieven, 1618 Augustus-December,

would have caused Adriaensz's father.¹³⁸ Furthermore, he expressed dismay that Adriaensz should have died of only two hits, and reassured the Council that it was not at all his intention to slay the man. Instead, he wrote that he hoped "[your lordships] may easley consider if I had had any intentione to have takin hes lyf I could hav takin it in [any] urther fassione."¹³⁹ Regardless, the States-General and the Council of State took the matter extremely seriously and moved to prosecute Sir Francis for his crime.

On 14 November, Sir Francis, now in London, wrote to Sir Dudley Carleton on the matter.¹⁴⁰ Based on the longevity of his service, Henderson sought a pardon from the Council of State for the killing, and as a result, he was asking for intercession from James VI directly.¹⁴¹ Evidently, the King promised he would write letters to the States-General and the Prince of Orange on Henderson's behalf. After receiving this message, Carleton wrote to James VI, and had the letter delivered via Sir William Balfour, a captain in Henderson's regiment. The letter reiterated the gravity of the situation: "Sir Francis Henderson," wrote Carleton, "having killed a man in these parts, has no way to save his fortune but by his Majesty's recommendation to his Excellency [Maurice] and the States."¹⁴²

The King did indeed write in favor of Henderson and, on 5 January 1619, his letter was read out to the States-General, but the matter was passed on to the Council of State.¹⁴³ On 16 January, an attempt to resolve the issue in the States-General was blocked by an objection from Gelderland.¹⁴⁴ This continued over the following weeks, further objections

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁰ TNA, SP84/87, f.38, Henderson to Carleton, 14 Nov. 1618.

¹⁴¹ NL-HaNA, RvS, 1.01.19, inv.nr. 584B, Ingekomen Brieven, 1618 Augustus-December; TNA, SP84/87, f.38, Henderson to Carleton, 14 Nov. 1618.

¹⁴² *Salisbury Calendar*, XXI: 24 Nov. 1618—Carleton to Salisbury, p.79.

¹⁴³ *RSG*, 1619-1620: 5 Jan. 1619, p.9.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*: 16 Jan. 1619, p.17.

were lodged from Gelderland and so the pardon continued to be blocked.¹⁴⁵ On 25 February, Carleton appeared before the States-General and lobbied for a resolution in favor of a pardon.¹⁴⁶ Carleton wrote to Secretary Naunton about his appearance before the States-General, saying that, with the help of the Prince of Orange, he had prepared the defense of Henderson so well “that I could not will receive a deniall, though it was subject to many maine difficulties.”¹⁴⁷ The States-General responded by granting the pardon, “in his [Majesty’s] contimplation,” that day, despite their previous resolution to lay it aside.¹⁴⁸ The matter was voted on one last time on 13 March 1619 and, despite the fact that Friesland disagreed because of the “shamefulness” of the murder, the pardon was granted by a majority vote.¹⁴⁹

On 3 April 1619, Sir Francis wrote an effusive letter to Carleton, thanking him for his kindness and swearing to be his loyal servant.¹⁵⁰ However, on 28 April, Sir Francis wrote to Carleton on a note of panic. The previous day, Sir Francis, still in London, had received a letter from his brother, which stated that Sir Francis needed to appear before the Council of State within three months or there would be no pardon.¹⁵¹ However, the letter had apparently been greatly delayed, and two-and-a-half months had already expired. Sir Francis therefore asked once more for Carleton’s intercession, in order to get an extension of two or three weeks, writing too that he had asked James Hay, Viscount Doncaster to speak to the States on his behalf. Sir Francis appears to have received the extension, having

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*: 9 Feb. 1619, 25 Feb. 1619, pp.39, 53.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*: 25 Feb. 1619—No. 340, p.53.

¹⁴⁷ TNA, SP84/88 f.185, Carleton to Naunton, 17 Feb. 1619.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁹ *RSG*, 1619-1620: 13 March 1619, p.67.

¹⁵⁰ TNA, SP84/89 f.105, Henderson to Carleton, 3 April 1619.

¹⁵¹ TNA, SP84/89 f.213, Henderson to Carleton, 28 April 1619.

returned to the Dutch Republic and resumed his duties as lieutenant-colonel.¹⁵² By 1622, after the death of his brother, Sir Robert, at Bergen-op-Zoom, Sir Francis assumed the colonelcy of the regiment.¹⁵³ Thus, despite the trouble this affair caused Henderson in the short term, it does not appear to have left any permanent black mark on his career.

No definitive motivation can, as of yet, be ascribed to Sweer Adriaensz's attempted murder of Sir Francis Henderson. Sellin claims that it was an "insult" that made Sir Francis react so violently, but no evidence exists that this was the case.¹⁵⁴ At first glance, it might seem odd that, in a time of truce, a Dutch man would attempt to kill an officer of the Dutch army, especially if one were to assume that they were co-religionists. However, given the historical context of the wider religious and political divisions within the Dutch Republic, the circumstances directly surrounding the killing become clearer. As evidenced by Sir Robert Henderson's letters and the Arminian memoir, the Scots-Dutch Brigade was solidly on the side of the Prince of Orange and its soldiers were viewed as perpetrators of repression and violence by opposition groups in the Dutch Republic. Therefore, Sir Francis Henderson, like his brother, may very well have been engaged enough in the repression of Arminians to make himself a target of a religiously-motivated assassination.

The Brigade's role in the Orange Coup and in the "Calvinist Revolution" is instructive of its wider importance to the Dutch Republic, its society, and its history, beyond big battles and sieges. Scots, like Sir Robert Henderson, were at the forefront of the Orange faction, helping to disarm and repress Arminians throughout the Republic. While it is possible that

¹⁵² NL-HaNa, RvS, 01.19, inv.nr. 1244, Staten van Oorlog, 1620.

¹⁵³ There was some controversy over Sir Francis's assumption of the colonelcy. This was, however, less to do with Sir Francis and more to do with an *Acte Expectatif* passed in 1620 that said the Earl of Buccleuch would assume the next vacancy in the Brigade. *RSG*, 1621-1622: 25 Aug. 1622, 29 Aug. 1622, pp.614, 625.

¹⁵⁴ Sellin, "Soldiers," p.150.

the Scots were just following the Prince's orders, the vigor and intensity with which Scots perpetrated this repression can probably be better ascribed to the Calvinist tendencies of the Brigade. This was, after all, only an early example of Scottish conflict with Arminianism. Caroline and Laudian ecclesiastical innovations in Britain in the late 1630s were seen to be promoting Arminianism, and thus Catholicism, leading to the signing of the National Covenant and the outbreak of the Bishops' Wars in 1639.¹⁵⁵ To some, like Sir Robert himself, the repression of Arminians was important "public service."¹⁵⁶

Scottish interactions with Dutch people were evidently not, as Ferguson has written, "consistently friendly and cordial," nor were Scots sitting around in garrison during the Truce "meeting and courting local girls."¹⁵⁷ Similarly, the Brigade was not just a participant in a war waged between the Protestant Dutch Republic against Catholic Spain, it also played a part in internal Dutch politics. Furthermore, the Brigade was as much an instrument of the Prince of Orange as it was of the House of Stuart. As a military and political leader, the Prince could, and did, use the Brigade to further his own political and confessional agenda. The Brigade, beyond a purely military capacity, interacted with different groups in the Dutch Republic and, as a permanent community abroad, necessarily participated in all aspects of Dutch society.

¹⁵⁵ Allan MacInnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement, 1625-1641* (Edinburgh, 1991), pp.136, 147, 155; Margaret Steele, "The 'Politick Christian': the Theological Background to the National Covenant," in John Morrill (ed.), *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp.34-36, 38, 57.

¹⁵⁶ TNA, SP84/89 f.227, Henderson to Carleton, 30 April 1619.

¹⁵⁷ Ferguson, sigs.xxviii-xxix; Glozier, "French and Dutch," p.133.

Scotland and the Scots-Dutch Brigade

Some soldiers serving in the Scots-Dutch Brigade did not intend for the Dutch Republic to become their permanent home. Many chose to return to Scotland, and did so for a variety of reasons, ranging from the personal to the ideological. Unsurprisingly, Scottish soldiers continued to hold on to Scottish cultural values and their connections back in Scotland. Several key case studies will serve to demonstrate the dynamic relationship between Scottish soldiers and both their homeland and their fellow soldiers.

In recent decades, the Scottish returning veterans who have received the most scholarly attention are those who returned for ideological reasons and fought in the Wars of the Three Kingdoms.¹⁵⁸ Many certainly returned from the Republic to fight. Sir James Livingston, now Earl of Callendar, fought for the Covenanters at Marston Moor and at the siege of Newcastle, while Sir William Balfour served as lieutenant-general of the Covenanters' cavalry at Edgehill in 1642.¹⁵⁹ Two captains from Sir George Hay's temporary regiment also both fought for the Covenanters. One was William Kerr, who served at 's-Hertogenbosch in 1629 and later, as Earl of Lothian, raised regiments during the First and Second Bishops' Wars.¹⁶⁰ He was eventually made lieutenant-general of the Ulster Army and served in various battles and sieges in England during the 1640s.¹⁶¹ The second, George Home of Wedderburn, had briefly served in a Huguenot regiment in Dutch service before also serving as captain of his father's company under Hay at 's-Hertogenbosch.¹⁶² During the Civil Wars, Home was the lieutenant-colonel of the Merse Foot, again in his

¹⁵⁸ *Leslie*, pp.93-144.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p.122.

¹⁶⁰ Ferguson: Annexa II: Roll of names, p.400; *RPCS*, 1629: 11 June 1629, p.169; Ed Furgol, *A Regimental History of the Covenanting Armies, 1639-1651* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp.29, 60.

¹⁶¹ Furgol, *Regimental History*, pp.65, 98-99, 182, 200. He also later served under Argyll against Montrose.

¹⁶² NL-HaNa, RvS, 1.01.19, inv.nr. 46: Resoluties, 1629, p.157; Ferguson: Annexa II: Roll of names, p.400; *RPCS*, 1629: 31 March? 1629, p.124.

father's regiment.¹⁶³ Perhaps his previous experience at the siege of 's-Hertogenbosch gave him an edge when he and his regiment stormed the Pilgrim Street-Carliol Tower area at the siege of Newcastle in 1644.¹⁶⁴ Siege experience apparently did not help in field battles: the Merse Regiment served at Dunbar in 1650, where both Home and his father were killed.¹⁶⁵

Future scholarship will certainly identify more veterans fighting throughout the Wars of the Three Kingdoms. Nonetheless, the work that has already been done on those who returned to fight at home has, perhaps, overshadowed those veterans, Scots-Dutch or otherwise, who returned to Scotland outside the era of the Civil Wars. Unsurprisingly, in a war that lasted eighty years, a large number of soldiers returned home long before the Civil Wars ever started. These veterans probably returned home for any number of reasons, but most examples seem to fall into four general categories: those who returned on recruiting trips, on temporary leave, in transit to fight elsewhere, or intending to resettle or retire.

Many officers might return to Britain solely to recruit, but many also returned on paid leave, in order to visit their kith and kin, or to settle financial affairs. Many of the officers of the Brigade were still landholders in Scotland, and so some continued to settle their affairs in Scotland either in person or from a distance. On 10 July 1615, Colonel Robert Henderson signed a discharge in favor of George Seton, Earl of Winton.¹⁶⁶ Both Robert, and his brother, Lieutenant-Colonel Francis Henderson, signed the discharge, indicating that they were both back in Scotland at this time.

¹⁶³ Furgol, *Regimental History*, p.166; Anon. *A list of severall regiments and chief officers of the Scottish army quartered neer Newcastle* (London, 1644).

¹⁶⁴ Furgol, *Regimental History*, p.167.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p.353; Henry Paton (ed.), *Report on the Manuscripts of Colonel David Milne Home of Wedderburn Castle, N.B.* (London, 1902), pp.4, 7, 101.

¹⁶⁶ NRS, GD3/1/11/22/27. Discharge by Sir Robert Henderson in favor of George, Earl of Winton, 10 July 1615.

The journey home was not particularly time-consuming: Colonel Brog, in June 1617, reckoned he could reach Edinburgh from the Republic in just four days.¹⁶⁷ Going home on leave was, furthermore, perfectly acceptable to the States-General. On 25 January 1622, the States-General resolved, with the approval of Prince Maurice, that all foreign soldiers, of whatever rank, would be allowed paid leave for a period of up to four months.¹⁶⁸ The Council of State could allow additional leave, but if this extended beyond several more months the soldier or officer could be discharged or replaced.¹⁶⁹ By 15 December 1628, when the two regiments of the Brigade were split into three, a new resolution was specifically applied to the officers of the Scots-Dutch Brigade. It stipulated that the officers would be required to remain in the Republic throughout the summer but leave would be allowed in the winter.¹⁷⁰ Duration of leave was determined by one's rank: colonels were allowed six months, lieutenant-colonels were allowed four, and captains were given three months' absence.¹⁷¹

Other veteran soldiers would have found themselves back in Britain while on their way to fight elsewhere. This was somewhat less common for those already in the Dutch Republic. The Scots-Dutch Brigade existed in large part to provide the King with a trained pool of troops already on the Continent that could be mobilized more quickly than a levy back in Scotland.¹⁷² However, transit certainly could occur. For example in 1630, Sir John Swinton, a Scottish officer in the Anglo-Dutch Brigade, found himself in London to both recruit and await transportation to serve Venice in the War of Mantuan Succession, after

¹⁶⁷ *CSPV*, 1615-1617: 27 June 1617—Surian to D/S, p.535.

¹⁶⁸ *RSG*, 1621-1622: 25 Jan. 1622, p.389.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*: 25 Jan. 1622, p.389.

¹⁷⁰ *BSG*: 15 December 1628(14).

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*: 15 December 1628(14).

¹⁷² *Leslie*, pp.31-32.

leaving Dutch service.¹⁷³ The regiment of the Earl of Morton, on returning from the La Rochelle expedition, was scattered throughout Britain while waiting for redeployment to the Dutch Republic. Some, like Quartermaster James Melville, ended up back in Leith.¹⁷⁴ The bulk of the regiment, however, was billeted in England, especially on the Isle of Wight, where they were reported to be causing innumerable problems.¹⁷⁵ Drummer-Major James Spens also returned home temporarily from Brog's regiment around 1620-1622, perhaps to marry or perhaps because he was wounded at Bergen-op-Zoom.¹⁷⁶ He may have intended to stay there permanently but ended up in Swedish service shortly after, and so his time in Scotland ended up being transitory.¹⁷⁷ Nonetheless, veterans might choose to return to Scotland to either permanently resettle or retire. John Pollock, Spens's "auld commerad drumer," returned to Scotland before 1632, where he became the drummer for the Burgh of Aberdeen until at least 1636 or 1638.¹⁷⁸ Captain David Ramsay probably retired from Dutch service sometime in the 1610s. In 1620, Captain Henry Bruce (see below) returned to Scotland with a letter from one Cornelis Pieterszen asking repayment of a debt which Ramsay incurred while garrisoned in Bergen-op-Zoom.¹⁷⁹

Remembering the above criteria, a body of examples of veterans in pre-Civil War Britain exists that deserve analysis. The following examples do not form an exhaustive list of returning veterans, nor should be taken to represent the general character of a returning

¹⁷³ *CSPV*, 1629-1632: 1 July 1630—Gussoni to D/S, p.365.

¹⁷⁴ *RPCS*, 1629-1630: 16 June 1629, p.174.

¹⁷⁵ *CSPD*, 1627-1628: 26 Jan. 1628, p.530; *CSPD*, 1629-1630: 3 April 1628, 23 April 1628, pp.62, 86; TNA SP16/88 f.102, A note of misdemeanours, [undated] 1627.

¹⁷⁶ Grosjean, et al, "Drummer Major James Spens," p.77.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p.77.

¹⁷⁸ Grosjean, et al, "Drummer Major James Spens," p.95; Louise Taylor (ed.), *Aberdeen Council Letters, Vol. II: 1634-1644* (London, 1950): 20 Feb. 1638—Aberdeen Council to the Earl of Traquhair, pp.83-84.

¹⁷⁹ NRS, GD82/420. Cornelius Pieterszen to David Ramsay, 31 May 1620; Ferguson: 1 May 1607—To the Council of State, p.209.

veteran or Scots-Dutch soldier. A common thread ties the following examples together, possibly coloring the perspective the historian might have of Scots-Dutch veterans in Britain: nearly all are examples of officers or soldiers committing crime or disturbing the peace on their return. Good behavior is not as visible as bad behavior, making cases of crime readily accessible in source material.

In 1622, William Crawford, a Scots-Dutch veteran, was apprehended in Linlithgow for murder.¹⁸⁰ Crawford learned that a fellow indweller there, Joseph Frame, had come into the possession of some money and “under pretext and cullour of freindship (*sic*)” he murdered Frame and took his purse.¹⁸¹ Sometime afterward, Crawford came to the home of Frame’s daughter at midnight with halberd and pistol. He threatened her and her husband, “avowing mony horrible oathis,” and demanded that they give him a letter renouncing all “criminal persute” against him. From there, Crawford went to Frame’s widow and “in bragging maner utterit the lyk threatning and minassing speecheis.”¹⁸² Crawford’s ultimate fate, and whether he was in Scotland to attempt to resettle or if he was intending to return to the Dutch Republic, remains unknown.

A similar instance occurred in early July 1630, when one George Tillerye—of Belhelvie in Aberdeenshire—and his fellow soldier, James Gibson, went for a walk on the Links of Leith.¹⁸³ According to Tillerye’s own confession, both had returned recently from the wars and following some “little discord”, Tillerye slashed Gibson’s throat with a knife.¹⁸⁴ Tillerye, perhaps hoping to seek shelter at home, fled to Aberdeen but was

¹⁸⁰ *RPCS*, 1622-1625: 21 Nov. 1622, pp.99-100.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*: 21 Nov. 1622, p.99.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*: 21 Nov. 1622, p.100.

¹⁸³ NRS, JC26/10, High Court of Justiciary Processes, 1630-1633.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

apprehended there and the Privy Council ordered him to be transported back to Edinburgh.¹⁸⁵ His punishment was to be hanged in “the place in the Linkes where the murther was committit” and that “his bodie be hung up in chaines to the terrour of others.”¹⁸⁶ Because the murder occurred in Leith, the two soldiers may perhaps have intended to return home permanently or have been in transit.

Officers were not immune from causing disturbances. An episode with striking similarities to George Tillerye’s attack occurred in Leith several years previously. In this instance, the two officers who appear in Scotland are known to have returned to Dutch service, and therefore were only home temporarily. In early 1616, Captain Alexander Wishart and Sir William Balfour (who later returned to Scotland again to fight in the Civil Wars) caused “some disordour and trouble” in Leith.¹⁸⁷ Balfour, for reasons unknown, hit Captain Wishart with a stick and, taking great offence, Wishart attempted to draw his sword, breaking it in the process. Wishart then pulled out his pistol and tried to shoot Balfour, evidently missing.¹⁸⁸ The two men were apprehended and committed to Edinburgh Castle, and on release were ordered to keep the peace.¹⁸⁹ The Privy Council expressed great concern over “this spark of heit [and] discontentment,” believing that if the matter was not resolved, it might, on their return to the Brigade “burst oute in flames of disordour and insolencies... and consequentlie raise some distractioun and factionis amongis the Scottis capitanes and commanderis thair.”¹⁹⁰ The two officers made amends,

¹⁸⁵ *RPCS*, 1629-1630: 13 July 1630, pp.603-604.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*: 27 July 1630, p.624.

¹⁸⁷ *RPCS*, 1613-1616: 14 March 1616, p.476.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*: 14 March 1616, p.476.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*: 27 Feb. 1616, 14 March 1616, p.466., 476

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*: 14 March 1616, p.476.

although Balfour was found guilty of assault and Wishart was guilty of “wearing pistollets.”¹⁹¹

The motivations behind this fracas can be debated. Balfour, first appearing as an infantry captain in 1605, seems to have had an eye on Captain Wishart’s cavalry company.¹⁹² By 24 January 1615, Balfour and Wishart were negotiating for command of the company, with Balfour offering to both pay Wishart and lobby to the States-General that Wishart and his wife receive a pension of 500 to 600 guilders a year for life.¹⁹³ Wishart apparently declined this offer, as he was still listed as a captain of cavalry in 1617.¹⁹⁴ Balfour and Wishart probably clashed over these negotiations. Whatever the motivations, this example is instructive for several reasons. Firstly, conflicts within the Brigade could spill over into Scotland. Secondly, the Scottish Privy Council was obviously concerned about the Brigade’s internal affairs and prevented the officers from returning to the Republic without resolution. Thirdly, veteran officers were just as liable to cause issues at home as ordinary soldiers.

The final example here involves two returning veterans, each with very different motivations to come back to Scotland. The first, Captain Henry Bruce, had eschewed Dutch service after killing a fellow Scots-Dutch captain, William Hamilton, in a duel at The Hague in 1604.¹⁹⁵ Although Bruce appears to have been let off fairly easily for this, he left Dutch service for service in the Holy Roman Empire, rising to the rank of colonel and Governor of

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*: 14 March 1616, p.477. This was, in fact, not the first time Wishart had been guilty of this: in September 1614 he was accused of “convocatione and wearing pistollettis.” Between 17-19 August 1613, Wishart became embroiled in a dispute over land with Alexander Strauchan of Thorntoun, and it is probably from this that the accusation arose. See *Ibid.*: 15 September 1613, September 1614, pp.144, 273.

¹⁹² Ferguson: 1607—States of War, p.69n, 15 April 1605—Claims of Sir William Balfour, p.200.

¹⁹³ RSG, 1613-1616: 24 Jan. 1615, p.388; Ferguson: 25 (*sic*) January 1615—Resolutions of States-General, p.253.

¹⁹⁴ NL-HaNa, Staten-Generaal, 1.01.02, inv.nr. 8046, Staten van Oorlog 1617.

¹⁹⁵ RSG, 1604-1606: 14 Dec. 1604, p.143.

the garrison at Nikolsburg.¹⁹⁶ As mentioned previously, Bruce attempted to return to Dutch service in 1620, declaring that, in the wake of the Thirty Years' War, "he would not bear arms against his Majesty's [James VI] son-in-law [Frederick V of the Palatinate]."¹⁹⁷ However, he was denied a commission because of his service in the Empire and due to his Catholicism.¹⁹⁸ Bruce finally returned to Scotland by 1621, perhaps, as Worthington writes, with the intention of either raising a regiment for the Palatinate, or staying and pursuing a military career at home.¹⁹⁹

However, Bruce's return attracted the attention of the late Captain Hamilton's family. Margaret Hamilton attempted to bring charges against Bruce in 1621 for the death of her brother.²⁰⁰ On 13 November, Bruce petitioned the Privy Council, writing that it would be impossible to lay any charges against him, because the slaughter had occurred outside of "his Majesties dominionis."²⁰¹ Bruce argued too that he had no choice but to fight a duel with Hamilton, as the late captain had "frequently challenged [him] to combat," and Bruce could no longer deny the challenge without appearing to be a coward. The Council of War was evidently swayed by these arguments—deciding that Bruce "had done nothing unbeseaming the dewitie of a souldior supported with the testimony of a goode conscience," and Bruce was released from any charge by a warrant from the King.²⁰² It is, perhaps, suspicious that Bruce was let off so easily and his details surrounding the duel should probably not be taken at face value. Hamilton, unable to defend himself, may have

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*: 25 January 1605, p.388. Worthington, *Scots in Habsburg*, p.147.

¹⁹⁷ *Carleton*: 15 April 1620—Carleton to Naunton, p.456.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*: 15 April 1620—Same to Same, p.456.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 15 April 1620—Same to Same, p.456 and 10 May 1620—Same to Same, p.460; Worthington, *Scots in Habsburg*, p.48.

²⁰⁰ *RPCS*, 1619-1622: 13 Nov. 1621, p.588-589.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*: 13 Nov. 1621, p.589.

²⁰² *Ibid.*: 13 Nov. 1621, 26 March 1622, pp.589, 688.

had a very different account of the events leading to the duel. It also must be noted that Bruce was in the royal circle—by the time of his petition he was, in fact, a servitor to Prince Charles himself—and therefore may have been the recipient of royal favour.²⁰³

Bruce's release from justice did not please the Hamiltons. The second returning veteran of this case, William Hamilton, son of the slain Captain Hamilton and a soldier in the Brigade, returned to Scotland in 1624 for a reason that defies the criteria set out above: revenge! He intended to challenge "Captane Harie Bruce to the single combat or otherways to watche the opportunitie to bereave him of his lyffe."²⁰⁴ The Council, fearing that a duel might provoke a bloodfeud between the friends and family of the Bruces and Hamiltons, ordered both men to be apprehended and subsequently cautioned Bruce to keep the peace under pain of an 1,000 merk fine.²⁰⁵

The immediate aftermath of this is unclear, but certainly neither duel nor murder took place. Captain Bruce resettled permanently and continued his career in royal service. Ferguson implies he might be identical to Colonel Bruce who served in the Cadiz expedition of 1625, but certainly by 1626, he had been knighted and commissioned as General of the King's Artillery.²⁰⁶ His career may have continued: by 1636, there was a "Colonel Bruce" who was engaging in pro-Spanish activities in Scotland, and in 1638 a Sir Henry Bruce offered his services to the King at the opening of the rebellion in Scotland.²⁰⁷ The ultimate fate of William Hamilton is thus far unknown.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*: 13 Nov. 1621, p.588.

²⁰⁴ *RPCS*, 1622-1625: 3 Dec. 1624, pp.658-659.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*: 3 Dec. 1624, p.659, 4 Dec. 1624, p.659.

²⁰⁶ Ferguson, p.63n; *RPCS*, 1625-1627: 20 June 1626, pp.308-309.

²⁰⁷ It may seem unlikely that Bruce would be pro-Spanish after serving at Cadiz, but given his service in the Holy Roman Empire, it would not be impossible. Worthington, *Scots in Habsburg Service*, p.112; Ferguson, p.63n.

The two examples involving officers not only illustrate motivations to return to Scotland but also early modern Scottish cultural values and adherence to them at home and abroad. According to Keith Brown, peaceful humanist ideas began taking hold in Scotland in the mid-sixteenth century, but nonetheless, the Scottish nobility remained “committed to older ideas of martial identity and bloodfeud” throughout the early decades of the seventeenth century.²⁰⁸ Insults in early modern Scotland could appear to be mere trifles, but would not be taken lightly by the offended party. Words carried honor, and this meant that at both the highest and lowest echelons of Scottish society, there was an “extreme sensitivity to insult, real or perceived... [and] the deployment of careless or violent words... might trigger violence.”²⁰⁹

Whatever words may have been exchanged between Balfour and Wishart, the immediately hotheaded and violent responses between them was very Scottish. Ferguson himself even noted that in several instances in the Brigade’s history “the spirit of the old Scottish family feud [was] illustrated.”²¹⁰ Brown writes that the feud in England declined relatively early compared to Scotland.²¹¹ This is reflected in the Anglo-Dutch Brigade, where duels and feuds happened less frequently and rarely escalated to violence or death. In 1602, the Earl of Northumberland challenged Colonel Sir Francis Vere to a duel, but according to David Trim, Vere “felt secure enough to send a dismissive reply to the earl.”²¹² In another instance, during the Jülich-Cleves campaign of 1610, Edward Harwood called

²⁰⁸ Keith Brown, “Honour, Honours and Nobility in Scotland between the Reformation and the National Covenant,” in *The Scottish Historical Review*, XCI, 231 (April, 2012), p.46.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p.49.

²¹⁰ Ferguson, sig.xxix.

²¹¹ Keith Brown, *Bloodfeud in Scotland, 1573-1625* (Edinburgh, 1986), p.3. For more on bloodfeud see Harry Potter, *Bloodfeud: The Stewarts and the Gordons at War in the Age of Mary Queen of Scots* (Stroud, 2002).

²¹² David Trim, “Fighting ‘Jacob’s Wars.’ The Employment of English and Welsh Mercenaries in the European Wars of Religion: France and the Netherlands, 1562-1610,” (PhD Thesis, King’s College London, 2002), p.183.

out Sir Edward Cecil, but Prince Maurice defused the situation before blood was shed, insisting that both parties apologize.²¹³ Of course dueling between English officers still occurred, Captain Sir Thomas Dutton was dismissed in 1611 after killing a fellow captain.²¹⁴

The mere fact that Sir Francis Vere could simply refuse to duel without sacrificing his personal honor seems to denote a distinct cultural divide between Scotland and England, and therefore between Scottish and English soldiers in Dutch service. Furthermore, compared to the rate of Scots fighting Scots, and despite the assertions of Dunthorne, there are very few cases of Scots and English fighting—or killing—one another.²¹⁵ It was certainly not impossible. In June 1617, the son of Captain James Sandilands fell into a quarrel with an English lieutenant named Boynten.²¹⁶ However, the fight was broken up and satisfaction was given when Boynten “[offered] to take as goode a box on the eare as he gave.”²¹⁷ Still, this example seems to be the exception rather than the rule.

Brown notes that it was not just personal insult that could elicit a violent response, so did corporate insult bound up in the “deep-seated expectation... that the honor of the lineage would be defended by those who had temporary custody of it.”²¹⁸ In other words, living heirs were the defenders of both their names and their families. This is perfectly reflected in the Bruce-Hamilton case: even after two decades, the living William Hamilton felt the need to defend the honor of his family by challenging the man who killed his father.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, p.193.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p.193.

²¹⁵ Dunthorne, “Low Countries,” p.111.

²¹⁶ TNA, SP84/77 f.253, Carleton to Chamberlain, 22 June 1617.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*

²¹⁸ Brown, “Honour,” p.49.

The Privy Council's response is also reflective of Scottish martial culture and honor, and attempts by the royal government at controlling its unruly nobility. Crown policy towards dueling—illegal in Scotland after 1580—was to imprison the offenders until they “cooled down” and to “see the parties make peace in a manner that preserved honor on all sides.”²¹⁹

The threat of an all-out bloodfeud between the families and friends of the offended parties was very real, and in the above cases, the Privy Council made it very clear that no one could be released for fear of this occurring. The Privy Council's belief that “factionis amongis the Scottis capitanes and commanderis” could arise in the Dutch Republic shows that this problem was endemic to early modern Scots even within Scottish communities abroad.²²⁰ Indeed, duels, fights and feuds occurred in the Republic between the soldiers of the Brigade throughout its history. The first colonel of the Brigade, Andrew Ormiston, was killed in a duel with his subordinate in 1573.²²¹ In 1607, Ensign William Stuart killed the cousin-german of Captain David Ramsay in Bergen-op-Zoom, leading Ramsay to petition the Council of State for Stuart's dismissal from his company.²²² In 1619, Sergeant John Geddy and soldier John Bryson fell into a drunken argument about a wager over a footrace from Tiel to Nijmegen.²²³ Bryson insulted Geddy, and after some heated words, Bryson slapped him. Geddy, thereafter, ran his rapier straight through Bryson's back.²²⁴

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.62.

²²⁰ *RPCS*, 1613-1616: 14 March 1616, p.476.

²²¹ Ferguson, p.8.

²²² *Ibid.*: 1 May 1607—Letter to the Council of State, pp.208-209.

²²³ *Ibid.*: 19 March 1619—Evidence in the case of murder, pp.299-302; Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*, pp.280, 283. The distance from Tiel to Nijmegen is 35 kilometers—quite a distance for two drunken soldiers in February.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*: 19 March 1619—Same, pp.299-302.

Scots also demonstrated their links with Scotland in non-violent ways. Captain Mungo Hamilton, for example, worked as an intermediary between the Earl of Seaforth and the Dutch in the late 1620s for a proposed Dutch settlement on Lewis.²²⁵ Esther Mijers has argued that this was a particularly Scottish-Zeelandic initiative, and indeed, Captain Hamilton's role in the negotiations affirms this, as men from his company were garrisoned in Sluis, Cadzand, and Steenberg—all located in or around Zeeland.²²⁶ Further, in 1630, Lord Ogilvie was intending to take action against the lands of Balbogie, but Captain Allan Coutts wrote to the Earl of Mar from The Hague, that "lord ogilvie hes no mor right nor tithe to thais lands [than] I have to his lordship of ogilvie."²²⁷ In October 1643, one Patrick Scott wrote to Captain James Henderson about a horse his uncle was to send Henderson.²²⁸ Scott also noted that affairs at home were getting more dangerous—and that he hoped God would bring the troubles there "to a good conclusion... albeit we may suffer in it... in a cristian [and] resolute way... to god's glorie [and] the honour [and] happiness of this poore nation." Presumably, Scott was alluding to the recent signing of the Solemn League and Covenant earlier in 1643.²²⁹ Thus, Scott wrote that the bearer of the horse would be lucky to leave Scotland with it, because of these "mony difficulties."²³⁰

A full analysis of all returning veterans is key to understanding the world in which the Brigade existed and the relationship between Scots and their home country. Clearly, Scots-Dutch soldiers' dynamic and personal relationship with their home country never ceased, nor did their desire to return there vanish. Similarly, soldiers and officers remained

²²⁵ Mijers, "Partnership," pp.254-256.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.254-256; Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*, p.340.

²²⁷ NRS, GD124/15/87. Captain Allan Couttis to the Earl of Mar, 20 July 1630.

²²⁸ NRS, GD172/294. Patrick Scott to Sir James Henderson, 21 Oct. 1643.

²²⁹ *Leslie*, pp.120-123.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*

a part of the Brigade and its community, regardless of whether they were in Scotland or the Dutch Republic, and were still Scots. Interpersonal relationships and affairs, like the conflicts between Bruce and Hamilton, Balfour and Wishart, or Geddy and Bryson were not contained to Scotland, nor the Dutch Republic or its garrisons. Indeed, not all soldiers who chose to return to Scotland came back to become great leaders in the Civil Wars. Returning was a choice that could be made by soldiers of all ranks at any time, not just the late 1630s or 1640s. A wide spectrum of motivations brought people home over a long span of time.

Brown writes that private violence in Scotland declined after the first decade of the seventeenth century, as stability at home grew amid changes in noble values.²³¹ Violence was still perpetrated between the soldiers and officers of the Brigade into the 1610s and probably for several reasons. The Brigade was a Scottish military community, but it was remote from the Scottish crown and its policy towards violence. Despite new recruits arriving from Scotland, it remained distant from the attitude shifts Brown argues were occurring in Scotland. Thus, extreme sensitivity to insult and the hasty defense of both personal and corporate honor, were actually somewhat *antiquated* cultural values. Nonetheless, the soldiers of the Scots-Dutch Brigade were still Scottish, whether in the Dutch Republic or in Scotland, and they continued to be involved with Scotland whether at home or abroad.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined several aspects of the Scots-Dutch Brigade, beyond the battlefield. First, it corrected several assumptions related to the recruiting and transporting

²³¹ Brown, *Noble Power*, p.130.

of soldiers. While it might be expected that what would bring Scottish soldiers into the service of Sweden would be different from what might bring other soldiers to Spain, this chapter showed that what motivated two different soldiers to join the same service could also be very diverse. This, in turn, shows that combined attention should be paid to the demographic and cultural patterns within the Brigade, with an awareness of its heterogeneity.

The chapter then moved from a soldier's origin in Scotland to the Dutch Republic, where an original analysis of the Brigade's participation in the "Calvinist Revolution" and the Orange Coup showed the complex relationship between Scottish soldiers and the people and government of the Dutch Republic. The vigorous Arminian repression showed not only the Brigade's strong Calvinist tendencies but also that it was an instrument of the Prince of Orange available to further his own political agenda. It also showed that the Brigade's relations with Dutch people were not always positive.

Finally, the chapter came full-circle by considering the ways in which the soldiers of the Brigade continued to interact with Scotland and retain their "Scottishness." Many soldiers chose to return home, either temporarily or permanently, demonstrating an enduring affiliation with Scotland. Furthermore, the example of infighting and the threat of bloodfeud in the Brigade, showed that it was not just a military unit but in fact, a "bounded" Scottish community abroad, complete with Scottish cultural values.²³² Although soldiers of all nations would obviously retain a martial identity—especially soldiers of France or Italy, where there were strong cultures of dueling—the intervention of the Scottish Privy Council showed contemporaries' awareness that events in the Brigade had ramifications in both

²³² For this concept, see Grosjean and Murdoch, "Introduction," Grosjean, Murdoch (eds.), *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period* (Leiden, 2005), pp.15-19.

Scotland and the Dutch Republic.²³³ In a way then, the Brigade was a part of Scotland and can be considered to be on the fringes of Scottish society. In sum, the sections of this chapter have laid the necessary groundwork to properly contextualize the primary purpose of the Scots-Dutch Brigade: its military function.

²³³ Robert Baldick, *The Duel* (London, 1965), pp.49-62.

Chapter Two: The Scots-Dutch Brigade at War

While the Prince of Orange praised the Scots-Dutch Brigade as the “bulwark of the Republic,” some modern historians do not share Frederick Henry’s opinion of its importance.¹ Dunthorne asserted that “fluctuating numbers and quality of British troops in the Netherlands... make it difficult to evaluate Britain’s military contribution to the Eighty Years’ War.”² According to Dunthorne, Scottish—and English—military “achievement” in the Republic was “modest and mixed.”³ Glozier makes a similar claim—Scottish participation in the Dutch war effort was only “occasionally signal,” and the “vast majority of their service was... dominated by garrison duty.”⁴ Dunthorne believes that what really helped the Dutch war effort was not its foreign soldiers, but the “diversion of Spanish troops and resources to other areas of conflict,” including the Armada campaigns, the French Wars of Religion in the 1580s, and Mantua in the 1630s.⁵ Furthermore, some historians argue that the outbreak of the Bishops’ Wars in 1639 ended Scotland’s involvement in Continental affairs.⁶ In short, the Brigade was mostly ineffectual at fighting, if its men ever even managed to make it out of the garrison towns they were stationed in, and its influence had eroded by the 1640s.

This chapter tests these assertions in an original analysis of Scottish participation in Dutch military affairs during both the Twelve Years’ Truce (1609-1621) and the latter part of the Eighty Years’ War (1622-1648). The Dutch Republic, although at peace with Spain in Europe during the Truce, remained a highly militarized state and its army participated in

¹ Frederick Henry, Prince of Orange, as quoted in Ferguson, p.311.

² Dunthorne, *Revolt*, p.90.

³ *Ibid.*, p.90.

⁴ Glozier, “French and Dutch,” p.128.

⁵ Dunthorne, *Revolt*, p.90.

⁶ Wilson, *Tragedy*, p.594; Parrott, *Business*, p.133; Guthrie, *Later*, p.257.

several smaller conflicts throughout the period. This section outlines the Brigade's participation in the two Jülich-Cleves crises (1610/1614) and compares this to its participation in the Bohemian war at the outset of the Thirty Years' War (1618). The section also gives an original analysis of Scottish participation during the Dutch expedition in 1617 to the Adriatic during the Uskok War (1615-1618).

The rest of the chapter focuses on the period after the resumption of hostilities with Spain, taking two sieges as case studies and concluding with a survey of the Brigade in the late 1630s and in the 1640s. The case studies in their own way indicate the Brigade's key role at different points of the war and in its use in different capacities. The first siege, Bergen-op-Zoom (1622), is key both to the history of the Brigade and the history of the Dutch Republic, being the first major conflict in the wake of the Twelve Years' Truce. Bergen-op-Zoom is an excellent study of the Brigade in defense, it was one of the deadliest engagements for Scots during the entirety of the Eighty Years' War and resulted in the death of one of the Brigade's most celebrated officers: Colonel Robert Henderson.

The third section examines the siege of 's-Hertogenbosch (1629), perhaps the single most important to the history of the Brigade; the reorganization and introduction of a new regiment nearly doubled the size of the Brigade to 6,000 men.⁷ This makes 's-Hertogenbosch the largest siege for the Scots-Dutch Brigade, at least in terms of numbers. In contrast to Bergen-op-Zoom, in 1629 the Brigade was on the side of the besiegers, rather than the besieged.

⁷ Ferguson: 12 July 1622—States of War, p.322, Annexa II: Roll of names, p.400; BSG: 25 May 1629(23), 31 May 1629(1); Delft University of Technology. J. Blaeu, *Obsidio et Expvgnatio Sylvædvics, Aufpiciis Ordinum Belgicæ Fœderatæ, Ductu Illuftmi. et invictmi. Principis Frederici Henrici Araufionunfium Principis etc. cic ic c xxix*. Joan Blaeu, engraving, Toonneel der Steden van de Vereenighde Nederlanden, Amsterdam, 1649.

The final section analyzes the Brigade at the end of the Eighty Years' War. The losses after the siege of Breda (1637), the battle of Kallo (1638) and the eventual recruiting problems in the wake of the Wars of the Three Kingdoms are examined to determine the Brigade's worth in the 1640s. Kallo, especially, will provide yet another contrast to the previous sections. Neither a siege nor a victory, it was perhaps one of the greatest defeats suffered by the Brigade in its history. The eventual recovery of the Brigade and its use at the Lys (1644) and at Hulst (1645) shows, in the end, that the Brigade stayed in constant military use throughout the entire period covered by this dissertation.

The Scots-Dutch Brigade and the Twelve Years' Truce (1609-1621)

On 9 April 1609, the Twelve Years' Truce was concluded between Spain and the Dutch Republic, bringing the first half of the Dutch Revolt to a close.⁸ The Dutch Republic was now recognized as a sovereign state "by [all] of Europe [and] the Muslim powers of the Near East and North Africa," with full diplomatic privileges in both England and France.⁹ Although the Dutch "home" army was reduced from 50,000 to 30,000 men, with fifty companies cut outright, Olaf van Nimwegen writes that, during the Truce, "international tensions ensured that the proficiency of [Dutch] troops was... kept up to standard."¹⁰ The Dutch Republic, in other words, despite being "at peace" in Europe remained a highly militarized state. In fact "peace" meant the opposite. Now free of war with Spain, the Republic's strengthened position allowed it to intervene militarily in areas of Europe beyond the Low Countries. Principally, these were the two Jülich-Cleves crises of 1610 and

⁸ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.198.

⁹ Israel, *Republic*, p.405.

¹⁰ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.201.

1614, Bohemia at the outset of the Thirty Years' War, and in the Adriatic in 1617 on the side of Venice during the Uskok War.

As the Dutch army engaged in these various conflicts so too did the Scots-Dutch Brigade, and Scots from the Brigade participated in all of the above expeditions. The historiography of these episodes is surprisingly full. Ferguson provided a short overview of Scottish participation in the 1610 Jülich-Cleves episode, based mostly on Dalton's *Life of Cecil*.¹¹ Murdoch and Grosjean have also provided an introduction to both the 1610 and the 1614 crises, and they do well to emphasize the importance of joint Anglo-Scots cooperation in what were to be British initiatives.¹² Furthermore, J.V. Polisensky has highlighted Scots-Dutch participation in Bohemia at the outset of the Thirty Years' War.¹³ As yet, no real analysis exists of Scottish soldiers in the Dutch expedition to the Adriatic during the Uskok War between Venice and the Austrian Habsburgs, despite the sources available in *Calendar of State Papers, Venice*.

Even with these introductions, several questions still arise about the place of the Brigade within the Dutch army and Dutch international politics during the Twelve Years' Truce. Firstly, how did the massive reductions in the Dutch army affect the Brigade? What did demobilized Scottish soldiers do during the Truce and how could the Dutch Republic regain its strength so quickly in 1621? Given that the Brigade was an instrument of the House of Stuart, did Dutch international interests overlap or align with the King of

¹¹ Ferguson, pp.222-225; Charles Dalton, *The Life and Times of General Sir Edward Cecil, Viscount Wimbledon, Colonel of an English Regiment in the Dutch Service, 1605-1631*, (2 Vols. London, 1885), I.

¹² Leslie, pp.31-32; Murdoch, "Scottish-British," pp.12-15.

¹³ J.V. Polisensky, "A Note on Scottish Soldiers in the Bohemian War, 1619-1622," *Scotland and the Thirty Years War*, p.111; Polisensky, *The Thirty Years War* (London, 1971), p.130.

Scotland's, and did this involve the Brigade? This section answers these questions and also provides an original analysis of the Brigade and the Uskok war.

The States of War for the Dutch Army reflect the effects of the Truce on the Brigade. Before the Truce, each regular company in the Scots-Dutch Brigade had, notionally, 150 men, while the colonel's company had 200, totaling 4,900 men in the 32 companies of the Brigade.¹⁴ Unusually, the 1608 States of War appear to record the *actual* strength of each company, rather than its *notional* strength.¹⁵ Some companies were severely depleted by 1608: Captain Andrew Donaldson had only 91 men in his company, while captains William Hudson and John Halkett only had 74 and 73 men, respectively.¹⁶ Others had suffered very little, or had pursued a more aggressive campaign of recruitment: Captain Douglas still had 146 men, David Balfour had 149, while Buccleuch still had a full-strength company at 200 men.¹⁷ In total, in 1608, the Brigade had 3,753 men across 32 companies, averaging around 117 men per company.

In 1609, however, almost every single company in the Brigade was cut in half. All captains, regardless of initial strength, saw their companies reduced from 150 men to 70 men each.¹⁸ There were some exceptions: Lieutenant-Colonel Robert Henderson retained 100 men and Colonel Brog's company only dropped from 200 to 150 men.¹⁹ Only Buccleuch, perhaps because of his noble status, was able to keep his company at its full strength of 200 men.²⁰ The Brigade in 1609 still had 32 companies, but reduced to a total strength of 2,480 men, an average of 77 men per company. Based on the actual statistics

¹⁴ Ferguson, sig.xiii.

¹⁵ NL-HaNa Staten-Generaal, 1.01.02, inv.nr. 8044, Staten van Oorlog, 1608.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ NL-HaNa Staten-Generaal, 1.01.02, inv.nr. 8297, Staten van Oorlog, 1609.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*

recorded in the 1608 States of War, this was a loss of 1,273 men, however, notionally, this was a reduction of 2,420 men. Thus, after the Truce, the Brigade stood at only half of its intended strength.

Despite losing men, the Brigade largely did not lose companies. Only one recorded instance of a full company from the Brigade being cut from Dutch Service occurs in this period. On 6 October 1609, Johan de Witt complained to the Council of State that Captain John Gordon's company, garrisoned in Steenberg, was in a very poor state and practically leaderless.²¹ Gordon, his lieutenant, and his two sergeants were absent or sick, and the remaining ensign was apparently "a foul and useless drunkard."²² Although Gordon also petitioned the Council of State, complaining that he had not received payment for his company in three months, the company was entirely discharged by 14 October 1609.²³ In wartime, the company probably would not have been disbanded, as captains were usually very easily replaced. Given its poor upkeep, the Council of State was probably quite happy to have an excuse to let this company go following the Truce.

This company provides an example of what Scots-Dutch soldiers might do when unemployed. On 7 April 1610, one Willem Watse, a former *adelborst* (first-class soldier) under Captain Gordon, authorized fellow Scot David Johnson to pay 70 guilders on his behalf to the States of Holland, Westfriesland or Utrecht for victuals when he was garrisoned in Steenberg.²⁴ Watse was, by then, in Dutch maritime service, under "water captain" Cleijn Aeryaen, either as a sailor or still as a soldier.²⁵ This may indicate what

²¹ Ferguson: 6 Oct. 1609—Captain Gordon's Company, pp.236-237.

²² *Ibid.*, p.237.

²³ *Ibid.*: Undated [1609]—To the Council of State, p.238, 14 Oct. 1609—Gordon's Disbanded Company, p.239.

²⁴ SAR, (Gerrit Jansz van Woerden), 26/172/346. Machtiging, 7 April 1610.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

other unemployed Scottish soldiers might have done during the Twelve Years' Truce. Although the Dutch were at peace with Spain in Europe, they were still at war in the East Indies, rendering employment as a soldier in the Dutch East India Company (VOC) or as a sailor in the Dutch navy as possible options.²⁶

However, during the Twelve Years' Truce, the Brigade participated in no less than four international expeditions as part of the Dutch army. During the first two—the Jülich-Cleves expeditions of 1610 and 1614—they participated jointly with the Anglo-Dutch Brigade in what could probably safely be called “the first British army.”²⁷ In 1610, Johann Willem, Duke of Jülich-Cleves, Berg, Mark, and Ravensburg, died without an heir.²⁸ Two claimants for the Duchy of Jülich-Cleves both appeared in the wake of Johann Willem's death: Johann Sigismund—Elector of Brandenburg and husband to the niece of Johann Willem—and, Wolfgang Willem, Johann Willem's nephew.²⁹ Although the two men agreed to govern Jülich-Cleves jointly, the Holy Roman Emperor, Rudolf II, would not allow it because both were Lutherans, and he sent 2,000 men to occupy Jülich.³⁰ Both France and the Dutch Republic rushed to the aid of the two Lutherans. Henry IV pledged more than 29,000 troops, while Prince Maurice set out in July 1610 with 136 companies of foot and 36 troops of horse.³¹

The Dutch army contained a contingent of 4,000 English and Scottish soldiers made up of 49 companies of the Scots- and Anglo-Dutch Brigades, under the command of General

²⁶ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.198. There were at least five other Scots who joined the VOC during the truce. See Victor Enthoven, Steve Murdoch, Eila Williamson, *The Navigator: The Log of John Anderson, VOC Pilot-Major, 1640-1643* (Leiden, 2010), p.248.

²⁷ It certainly predates the 1627 expedition to La Rochelle, which has also been termed “the first British army.” Spring, *First British Army*; Murdoch, “Scottish-British,” pp.12-15.

²⁸ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.201.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p.201.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p.202; Helmers, “Foreign News,” p.257.

³¹ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.202.

Sir Edward Cecil.³² These men were divided between three regiments, two English and one Scottish, which drew on companies from each of the two regiments of the Scots-Dutch Brigade. Ferguson claims no more than nine Scottish companies made up the Scottish regiment in the expedition.³³ In fact, the number was much higher. Nineteen Scottish companies served in the Scottish regiment, a total strength of 1,360 men.³⁴ In total, British companies made up over one third of the entire expedition. Colonel Robert Henderson, according to an eyewitness account of the siege of Jülich, greatly distinguished himself in the fighting. In the night of 15 August, the besieged Imperial troops began throwing bombs into one of the British main artillery batteries, and a great fire broke out. Henderson, who had the guard, was said to have “shewed great judgement [to] quench it, [hindering] the enemy from attempting it anymore.”³⁵

The Dutch expedition was successful, and Jülich surrendered in early September.³⁶ However, a second crisis in Jülich occurred in 1614, when Johann Sigismund converted to Calvinism and Wolfgang Willem married the sister of the Duke of Bavaria, the head of the Catholic League.³⁷ This time, the stakes were higher for the Republic, as a large Spanish army under General Spinola was being raised to give aid to the Catholic forces in Cleves.³⁸ Not wanting a large Spanish force on the Republic’s borders, Maurice dispatched another army of 18,000 men into Jülich.³⁹ Of this force, no fewer than 72 companies were British: 52 under Sir Horace Vere, Sir Edward Cecil, and Colonel Ogle of the Anglo-Dutch Brigade,

³² Ferguson, pp.222-223; *Leslie*, pp.31-32; *RSG*, 1610-1612: 24 April 1610, p.99.

³³ Ferguson, p.222.

³⁴ TNA, SP84/67 f.96, Estimated cost of 4,000 men, 28 April 1610; TNA, SP81/10, f.41, Forces sent to Cleves, [Apr.] 1610.

³⁵ This account is reprinted in Dalton, *Cecil*, I, p.190.

³⁶ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.203.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p.203.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p.203-204.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p.204.

and twenty under Sir Robert Henderson and Sir William Brog of the Scots-Dutch Brigade.⁴⁰ After the Treaty of Xanten in November 1614, which ended the second crisis, 70 Dutch infantry companies were left in Jülich-Cleves, and Mark, which according to van Nimwegen, provided the Dutch Republic with an essential buffer against Spain.⁴¹ At least two companies left in Jülich were Scottish, under the command of captains Phillip Mowbray and Robert Scott.⁴² Furthermore, in 1615, a force of 62 companies under Count Henry of Nassau were dispatched towards Brunswick for an unknown purpose, of which seven companies were English and six were Scottish.⁴³

Of importance, in both of the Jülich-Cleves expeditions, is the combined interest for both the House of Stuart and for the Dutch Republic. While Jülich itself did provide the Dutch Republic with a buffer against Spain, it also was in the interest of James VI and I, who wished to support his Protestant allies.⁴⁴ The three regiments under Cecil were as much a part of a Dutch force as they were a British force in and of themselves. Not only was the force directly under King James' pay, but the commission for Sir Edward Cecil as General of the "English and Scottish troupes" came directly from the King in Britain.⁴⁵ Similarly, in mid-1620, Scottish soldiers were sent to Bohemia during the opening campaigns of the Thirty Years' War. According to Polisensky, these soldiers were commanded by Sir John Seton of Carchunoth and probably numbered about 1,000-1,500 men.⁴⁶ Being sent directly from the Dutch Republic served a dual purpose: Prince Maurice could further be projected as "the greatest Protestant paladine of Christendom" and, as has been argued by Murdoch and

⁴⁰ Henry Peacham, *A most true relation of the affaires of Cleve and Julick...* (London, 1615), no page numbers.

⁴¹ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.205.

⁴² TNA, E157/4, pp.52, 55.

⁴³ TNA, SP84/71 f.305, List of Dutch Army for Brunswick, under Count Henry of Nassau, [Undated] 1615.

⁴⁴ *Leslie*, pp.31-32; Murdoch, "Scottish-British," pp.12-13.

⁴⁵ *Leslie*, p.32; TNA, SP81/10 f.31, James I—Commission to Sir E. Cecil, for Cleves, 5 April 1610.

⁴⁶ Polisensky, *Thirty Years War*, p.130; Polisensky, "Bohemian War," p.111.

Grosjean, King James provided aid to his daughter and son-in-law with experienced soldiers already in service on the Continent.⁴⁷ Here the Brigade was fulfilling its role as an instrument of the House of Stuart and of the Dutch Republic.

While the “Britishness” of the Jülich-Cleves expeditions and the close cooperation between the Scots- and Anglo-Dutch Brigades are important to illustrate, it must not be forgotten that the Scots-Dutch Brigade existed within a multi-national army. The final case study of this section, the Dutch expedition in 1617 to the Adriatic during the Uskok War, illustrates this well. Although Scottish participation in the Uskok War was not as substantial as in Jülich-Cleves or Bohemia, it is an interesting example of Scottish participation in a theater of war that does not usually garner much attention.

In 1615, the Republic of Venice had begun to resent the Habsburg presence to the north and east, as well as unchecked piracy committed by Uskoks that inhabited parts of Habsburg Croatia.⁴⁸ War broke out on 20 December, and although the Venetians initially met with some success, a stalemate occurred when Gradisca was besieged.⁴⁹ By 28 October 1616, the Venetians were already treating for a Dutch expeditionary force of 4,000 soldiers to be led by Count Johan Ernst of Nassau-Stiegen.⁵⁰ On 11 March 1617, Count Johan had raised 3,200 men from Dutch service and was ready to depart for the Adriatic.⁵¹

By May 1617, Peter Wilson writes that a Dutch army of 3,000 men had arrived outside Gradisca.⁵² However, to refer to the expedition as simply “Dutch” would be misleading. Of the 21 officers split between the two regiments, only eight officers—

⁴⁷ Helmers, “Foreign News,” p.257, 259 ; *Leslie*, p.41.

⁴⁸ Wilson, *Tragedy*, pp.255-256; Geoffrey Parker, *Europe in Crisis, 1598-1648* (Brighton, 1980), pp.77, 155.

⁴⁹ Wilson, *Tragedy*, p.256.

⁵⁰ *CSPV*, 1615-1617: 28 Oct. 1616—To the Secretary Lionello in England, pp.335-336.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*: 11 March 1617—Suriano to D/S, p.461.

⁵² Wilson, *Tragedy*, p.256.

including Count Johan Ernst—were actually Dutch.⁵³ Of the remaining thirteen officers, four were French, four were German (including of the Dukes of Holstein), one was a Walloon and another was a Dane.⁵⁴ The last three were British and were veterans of the Anglo- and Scots-Dutch Brigades. Lieutenant-General John Vere, nephew of Sir Francis Vere, had served for thirteen years as a captain in the Dutch army, and was the second in command of the entire expedition. Henry Woodowes, another Englishman, had also served in the Anglo-Dutch Brigade for well over a decade and was serving as serjeant-major under Colonel Roquelore, one of the French officers and the commander of the second regiment.⁵⁵ The sole representative of the Scots-Dutch Brigade was one Captain Seton, who had previously served as a lieutenant in the company of his brother.⁵⁶ The second regiment was, therefore, led by a Frenchman, seconded by a Dutchman (Steven Koop), with an English serjeant-major and made up of diverse Dutchmen, Frenchmen, a Dane, a Walloon, a German, and a Scot.⁵⁷ Not only did Scottish and English soldiers in Dutch service work closely with each other, but they also worked together with, or under, soldiers of other nationalities within the Dutch army.

Scots engaged in various other capacities during the Dutch expedition to the Adriatic. Several served on Dutch ships that were loaned to the Venetians, and in some cases very may well have been ex-Brigade. Of the ten Scots that appear in Dutch ships during the expedition, only one, Robert Sterachem, had a specifically “maritime”

⁵³ *CSPV*, 1615-1617: 11 March 1617—Names and condition of the colonels and captains, pp.461-462.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*: 11 March 1617—Same, pp.461-462.

⁵⁵ TNA, SP84/77, f.253, Carleton to Chamberlain, 22 June 1617.

⁵⁶ *CSPV*, 1615-1617: 11 March 1617—Same, p.462. His brother was presumably Captain George or John Seton, who was killed at Bergen-op-Zoom (see the following section). By 22 June 1617, Seton had been killed at Gradisca along with some 30 or 40 of his men. TNA SP84/77, f.253, Carleton to Chamberlain, 22 June 1617.

⁵⁷ *CSPV*, 1615-1617: 11 March 1617—Names, p.462; *CSPV*, 1617-1619: 14 Nov. 1617—Extracts from the muster roll, p.43.

occupation, serving as an under-pilot on the ship *Emaus*.⁵⁸ Of the rest, three served as quartermasters, a rank commonly found in the army.⁵⁹ The others, James Danolson, Alexander Vlit, and David Stuart, were all included as soldiers or troops.⁶⁰ In Vlit's case, he was specifically named as a musketeer.⁶¹ The final two Scots, Jan Cooren and Thomas Mansi, were gunners—meaning they could have either been in the Brigade, in a Dutch artillery battery, or had simply always been in the Dutch marine.⁶² The final Scot was Jan Dreffft, and he had no occupation listed.⁶³

The fact that these ten Scots—with the exception of Dreffft—appear on the same three ships together (the *Glas*, the *Emaus*, and the *Drie Coningen*) indicates a possibly larger Scottish participation in the expedition than meets the eye. Four Englishmen also served on these ships as gunners, sailors, or soldiers.⁶⁴ Therefore, whole companies may have been on board these ships that equally may have been drawn from the existing Scots- or Anglo-Dutch regiments back in the Republic.

As a final note on Scots-Dutch participation in the Uskok War, it must be acknowledged that Scots appear to have also fought on the side of the Habsburgs. On 31 July 1618, the Venetian secretary in Naples reported to the Doge and Senate that, along with Spanish, Italian, and Irish soldiers, there were around 1,100 Scottish troops in the area, including 104 under one “Don Daniel Macdonel” at Santa Maria de Capua and 46

⁵⁸ *CSPV*, 1617-1619: 6 June 1617—Surian to D/S, p.229.

⁵⁹ The quartermaster on board the *Glas*, was named Willem Heynricksz, and as a common derivation of “Henderson,” he may have thus been linked to one of the many other Hendersons who served under Sir Robert or Sir Francis Henderson in the Brigade. The other was David Bruyn. See SAR (Gerrit Jansz van Woerden), 28/52/100-101. Testament, 1 July 1616; SAR (Gerrit Jansz van Woerden), 79/50/187. Testament, 23 March 1620; SAR (Nicolaas v.d. Hagen), 101/129/183. Attestatie, 8 March 1620.

⁶⁰ *CSPV*, 1617-1619: 6 June 1617—Surian to D/S, pp.229.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*: 6 June 1617—Same to same pp.229.

⁶² *Ibid.*: 6 June 1617—Same to same pp.229.

⁶³ SAR (Nicolaas v.d. Hagen), 101/82/113. Attestatie, 22 Nov. 1619. Dreffft was reported to have died at Corsoly. SAR (Nicolaas v.d. Hagen), 101/129/183. Attestatie, 8 March 1620.

⁶⁴ *CSPV*, 1617-1619: 6 June 1617—Surian to D/S, p.229.

under Erman Vuirpart at Fundi.⁶⁵ These men were certainly not ex-Brigade, but in Gradisca itself there was a Scottish officer who had commanded in the garrison. This man had, in fact, come out of the Brigade some years previously; Henry Bruce, the very same who, as a captain, had killed his fellow captain in Dutch service in 1604.⁶⁶

Van Nimwegen's assertion that international tensions kept the "proficiency" of the Dutch army high seems to hold true for the Brigade.⁶⁷ Many Scottish soldiers who were "cut" in 1609 did not return to Scotland, but remained to serve the Dutch Republic, albeit in different capacities and theaters. This provides the best explanation for how the Brigade could be back to full strength so quickly in 1621.⁶⁸ It was almost certainly the Brigade's continuous use throughout the 1610s that enabled it to secure victory at Bergen-op-Zoom the following year.

The Siege of Bergen-op-Zoom (1622)

On 4 June 1621, the Venetian ambassador in England wrote that Noel de Caron, the Dutch ambassador, claimed the army of the Dutch Republic now consisted of 60,000 foot and 45 companies of horse.⁶⁹ This is may be a high estimate, but nonetheless, van Nimwegen states that by the resumption of hostilities in 1621, the Dutch army was back up to full strength: at least 11,000 new soldiers had been recruited and 4,000 *waardgelders* were enlisted.⁷⁰ The veracity of this becomes apparent when examining the States of War for the Brigade before, and after, 1621. In 1620, each regular company of the Brigade still stood at half-

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*: 31 July 1618—Spinelli to D/S, p.279.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*: 8 December 1618—Gustinian to D/S, p.374. See the previous chapter.

⁶⁷ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.201.

⁶⁸ NLHa-Na, RvS, 1.01.19, inv.nr. 1244, Staten van Oorlog, 1620; NL-HaNa, Staten-Generaal, 1.01.02, inv.nr. 8048, Staten van Oorlog, 1621.

⁶⁹ *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 4 June 1621—Lando to D/S, p.59.

⁷⁰ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.207.

strength—only 70 men—and the colonel’s companies stood at 150 men.⁷¹ In 1621, the situation was entirely different. Each regular company nearly doubled in size to 120 men, and the colonel’s company jumped to 200 men.⁷² However, this was a reduction of 30 men in individual companies. As mentioned above, before the Truce, each company had 150 men, totaling 4,900 men in the Brigade.⁷³ With 120 men in the captain’s companies, the total notional strength of the Brigade was now 3,880 men distributed between 31 companies.⁷⁴

According to an English eyewitness, the Dutch army in 1622 was divided into three brigades.⁷⁵ The first brigade, made up of English and Dutch soldiers, was commanded by Maurice, Prince of Orange. The second, commanded by Frederick Henry comprised Walloon and French troops. The third brigade was commanded by Count Ernst of Nassau and contained Dutch and Scottish soldiers. Such was the bond of the Dutch and the Scots that it led the English author to remark that, “they (the Dutch) mingle and blind the Scottish among them, which are like Beanes and Peas amonge Chaffe, theis (the Scots) are sure men, hardy, and resolute, and their example holds up the Dutch.”⁷⁶

The two Scottish regiments in the field comprised ten companies, including Colonel Brog’s and Colonel Henderson’s own companies.⁷⁷ The remaining eleven companies of

⁷¹ Ferguson: 1620—States of War, pp.232-233.

⁷² *Ibid.*: 1621—States of War, pp.318-320.

⁷³ See the previous section of this dissertation.

⁷⁴ This number is very similar to the *actual* strength of the Brigade reflected in the States of War for 1608, which was 3,753 men. See the previous section of this dissertation.

⁷⁵ Anon. “A DISCOURSE of the beseiging, defendinge and releeuinge of the towne of Bergen vp Zome in the year 1622,” c. 1622, f.3. British Library, Royal MS 18 A LXIII.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, f.3.

⁷⁷ NL-HaNa, RvS, 1.01.19, inv.nr. 2061 II: Lijste van de garnizoenen, 1622.

Scots were scattered throughout the Dutch Republic in their respective garrisons.⁷⁸ Captain Walter Bruce was the sole Scottish officer originally in Bergen-op-Zoom, but close by, captains Hume and Brownfield defended Geertruidenberg.⁷⁹ Several English companies were present with Bruce in Bergen-op-Zoom, commanded by captains Pritchard, Meolis and Ogle.⁸⁰ By 12 July 1622, only 10 companies were garrisoned in Bergen-op-Zoom, with a total probably not exceeding 1,200 men.⁸¹

Within days, the little garrison at Bergen-op-Zoom was to be put under extreme duress, and the newly strengthened Dutch army would not be able to sit idle. The Spanish army under General Spinola had forced the surrender of Jülich on 2 February 1622, and looked ready to attack IJssel and Waal.⁸² However, on 18 July Spinola moved on Bergen-op-Zoom and besieged it with 20,000 troops instead.⁸³ Bergen-op-Zoom was a natural choice, as it was the “key to Zeeland,” near the Scheldt River, the sea, and the southern frontier of the Republic.⁸⁴ Despite its strategic advantages, van Nimwegen argues that any defense of the city looked untenable: the States-General did not believe that the “undermanned” companies garrisoned in the city could hold out long against the massive Spanish army.⁸⁵ This seems to be reflected by attitudes in England; even as late as 23 September, it was

⁷⁸ Ferguson has republished the list—see Ferguson: 1622—States of War, p.321. However, it is missing Captain Kinnimond in Cadzand, captains Orrock and Mowbray in Rees, and Captain Steven Brownfield at Geertruidenberg, all of whom are found in the original. See NL-HaNa, RvS, 1.01.19, inv.nr. 2061 II: Lijste van de garnizoenen, 1622.

⁷⁹ NL-HaNa, RvS, 1.01.19, inv.nr. 2061 II: Lijste van de garnizoenen, 1622.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² Nimwegen, *Army*, p.207; Israel, *Republic*, p.483.

⁸³ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.207; Ferguson, p.309; Wilson, *Tragedy*, p.339; Parker, *Army of Flanders*, p.180; HSL, III, p.95.

⁸⁴ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.207; Elka Schrijver, “Bergen op Zoom, Stronghold on the Scheldt,” *History Today*, 26, 11 (Nov., 1976), p.749.

⁸⁵ Nimwegen, *Army*, pp.207-208. The original States of War for 1622 make clear that van Nimwegen’s statement that 72 companies participated in the defense must refer to the entire siege, not just its beginning. See Lambertus de Rijcke, Nathan Vayus and Job du Rieu, *Bergen op den Zoom, Belegghert... erbarmt over fijn volck* (Middleburg, 1623), list appearing at the end of the book.

reported that bets on Bergen-op-Zoom's surrender were being made, with one person wagering six to one that the "loss [would happen] within three months."⁸⁶

On 21 July, three days after the beginning of the siege, the Council of Zeeland reminded the States-General of the importance of retaining Bergen-op-Zoom.⁸⁷ They asked that the States-General reinforce it with men and supplies, believing they only currently had enough lead, fuses, and weapons to last a few days.⁸⁸ However, Prince Maurice, upon hearing the Spanish were moving on the city, had already dispatched reinforcements.⁸⁹ These arrived between 20 and 22 July, and included eleven companies under Philips de Liévin, Lord of Famars and a further twenty companies under Colonel Sir Robert Henderson, who was also placed in command of all the Scottish and English troops in the garrison.⁹⁰ Fourteen of the companies arriving with Henderson were Scottish or English.⁹¹ These included the companies of Henderson and Sir David Balfour, as well as Lieutenant-Colonel Allan Coutts and Captain Seton from Brog's regiment.⁹² Still undermanned in comparison to their besiegers, it was reported by another English eyewitness that the strength of the city now stood at 5,000 men.⁹³

Almost immediately after their arrival, the Scottish reinforcements were put to use on 22 July in a nighttime attack, intended to "wake the Enemies out of their sleep."⁹⁴

According to both English eyewitnesses, the Scottish and English were in the vanguard of

⁸⁶ *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 23 September 1622—Valaresso to D/S, p.462.

⁸⁷ *RSG*, 1621-1622: 23 July 1622, p.575.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*: 23 July 1622, p.575.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*: 23 July 1622, p.575.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*: 23 July 1622, p.575; Anon., *A iournall or daily register of all those warlike atchievements which happened in the siege of Berghen-up-Zoome in the Low-countries... All faithfully translated out of the original Low-Dutch copie* (London, 1622), pp.2-3; Ferguson, p.309; *RSG*, 1621-1622: 20 Aug. 1622, p.614.

⁹¹ Rijcke, et al., *Beleghert*, p.49.

⁹² *Ibid.*, "Lijste van de Compagnien," appearing at the end of the book.

⁹³ Anon., *iournall*, p.2; Nimwegen, *Army*, pp.207-20.

⁹⁴ Anon., *iournall*, p.3.

this “grand sally,” followed by the Dutch and with the French in the rear.⁹⁵ Advancing in column, the British soldiers evidently moved with great haste, and reached the enemy before the rear had even left the town.⁹⁶ A furious fight ensued, and in the ensuing Dutch retreat, it was reported that around 25 to 80 men on the Dutch side were killed.⁹⁷ Of the Scots, Captain Seton was slain, while Lieutenant-Colonel Coutts, Captain Bruce, and the Lieutenant of Captain Balfour were all wounded.⁹⁸ There were also several wounded English officers.⁹⁹

On 15 August, Colonel Henderson reported to Sir Dudley Carleton that his troops were beginning to diminish and that the enemy was getting nearer to the city walls.¹⁰⁰ The following night, the besiegers made a desperate nighttime attack on the Scottish and English quarters on the *Nieu Beckaff*, a large hornwork on the south side of the city’s defenses.¹⁰¹ Around 10 that night, Italian soldiers in the service of Spain surprised the Scottish and English soldiers and captured two ravelins that were on the corner of the *Beckaff*.¹⁰² A sentry stationed there fired his musket to alert the English and Scottish soldiers at the *Beckaff* who, under the direction of Colonel Henderson, rallied and managed to drive off the attackers until relief came in the form of Dutch reinforcements and an artillery barrage from the city.¹⁰³ Nonetheless, the fight at the *Beckaff* lasted until early

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.3; Anon., “DISCOURSE,” f.7.

⁹⁶ Anon., “DISCOURSE,” f.7.

⁹⁷ Anon., *iournall*, p.4; Anon., “DISCOURSE,” ff.7-9; Rijcke, et al, *Beleghert*, p.62.

⁹⁸ Rijcke, et al., *Beleghert*, p.62; Anon. “DISCOURSE,” f.8; TNA, SP101/45, ff.44-45, Extract of a letter from Berghen-op-Zoom, 23 July 1622.

⁹⁹ Rijcke, et al., *Beleghert*, p.62; Anon., *iournall*, p.4; Anon. “DISCOURSE,” f.8; ; TNA, SP101/45, ff.44-45, Extract of a letter from Berghen-op-Zoom, 23 July 1622. Captains Courtney, Carey, and Killgrew were among the named English casualties.

¹⁰⁰ TNA, SP84/108, f.105, Henderson to Carleton, 15 Aug. 1622.

¹⁰¹ *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 22 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.395; Anon, *iournall*, p.9; RMA. *Beleg van Bergen op Zoom, 1622*. Print. RP-P-OB-80.997/FMH 1466-b/Hollstein Dutch 43-2(2). Claes Jansx. Visscher, Amsterdam, 1622.

¹⁰² *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 22 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.395; Anon., *iournall*, p.9.

¹⁰³ Anon., *iournall*, pp.9-10.

morning, and during the night the two ravelins were attacked eight times and taken twice by the Italians.¹⁰⁴ The fight ended with an hour's truce to bury the dead, and although the ravelins were attacked again, the Spanish forces were repulsed with another artillery barrage from the city.¹⁰⁵

Several sources seem to agree that this attack cost the defenders a little over 100 men.¹⁰⁶ Four English captains were mortally wounded, Captain Ralph Dexter, an engineer, was killed, while Captain Ferdinando Carey—who had evidently recovered from the wound incurred on 22 July—was severely wounded again.¹⁰⁷ Despite being repulsed in that first attack, the Spanish forces continued to try “their utmost to take the place.”¹⁰⁸ Several days later, on 20 August, the Italian soldiers unsuccessfully attacked the ravelins again, and it was reported that the Scots and English lost 15 men, with “many wounded on both sides.”¹⁰⁹ Of the Scottish dead, one Captain Caddel was killed, and Constantine Huygens reported that the English captain, William Lovelace, had also perished.¹¹⁰ While there is no firm report on the number of lower-ranking Scottish casualties at the engagements at the *Beckaff*, it is likely that Colonel Henderson's sergeant, Alexander Stuart, was killed alongside his colonel, as his wife petitioned the States-General for a pension a little over a week later.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, pp.10-11.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p.11.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p.10; *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 22 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.395; *RSG*, 1621-1622: 18 Aug. 1622, p.611.

¹⁰⁷ Anon., *iournall*, pp.3, 11; *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 22 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.395; *RSG*, 1621-1622: 18 Aug. 1622, p.611.

¹⁰⁸ *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 29 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.400.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*: 29 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.400.

¹¹⁰ Rijcke, et al., *Beleghert*, pp.146-147; *Briefwisseling van Huygens*, I: 24 Aug. 1622—Constantijn to Maurits Huygens, p.114.

¹¹¹ *RSG*, 1621-1622: 26 Aug. 1622, p.622; Maclean, *Huwelijksintekeningen*, p.36.

During the attack on 16 August, Colonel Henderson himself, standing at push of pike with the rest of his men, was shot in the thigh and the bone was broken.¹¹² He was taken to The Hague on 19 August and Sir Dudley Carleton sent for an English surgeon from Utrecht to try to operate on Henderson.¹¹³ However, the wound was too great and, with a heavy fever, he died on 23 August.¹¹⁴ There are two surviving accounts of his death, one of which states that Henderson “made but a recreation” of dying.¹¹⁵ He was said to have accepted the sacrament and, after remembering his friends, he drank a toast to King James, Prince Charles, the Queen of Bohemia, the Prince of Orange, and the Earl of Mar.¹¹⁶ Interestingly, the Venetian account also mentioned a deathbed toast, but to King James, the Queen and King of Bohemia, the States, Princes Maurice and Frederick Henry, and Count Ernest.¹¹⁷ The Venetian account also noted that Colonel Henderson’s last request was that his brother, Sir Francis, now take command of his regiment.¹¹⁸

On 21 August, Captain Hume and his company left the garrison at Geertruidenberg to bolster the forces at Bergen-op-Zoom.¹¹⁹ Prince Maurice, following Henderson’s departure from Bergen-op-Zoom, decided that a new officer should be sent to command the Scottish and English troops there.¹²⁰ Around 26 or 27 August, Colonel Sir Charles Morgan, of the Anglo-Dutch Brigade, was sent to the city with at least seven companies, two

¹¹² Anon., *iournall*, p.10; Anon., “DISCOURSE,” f.11; *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 22 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.395.

¹¹³ *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 22 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.395; TNA, SP84/108, f.98, Carleton to Buckingham, 15 Aug. 1622.

¹¹⁴ *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 29 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.400.

¹¹⁵ Anon. “DISCOURSE,” f.11; Ferguson, p.310.

¹¹⁶ Anon. “DISCOURSE,” f.11; Ferguson, p.310.

¹¹⁷ *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 29 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.400.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*: 29 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.400.

¹¹⁹ Rijcke, et al., *Belegghert*, p.153.

¹²⁰ *RSG*, 1621-1622: 20 Aug. 1622, p.614.

of which were Scots-Dutch, under the command of David Lindsay and William Scott.¹²¹

Morgan commanded the Scottish and English soldiers in another sally on the 15 September, and on 19 September Captain Scott was shot in the head and died.¹²² By 2 October, upon reports that an army under Count Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick was on its way to relieve the garrison, General Spinola lifted the siege.¹²³

Bergen-op-Zoom is an important case study of the Brigade. Quite simply, the Scottish—and English—soldiers aided in the defense of a key garrison town, whose loss would have been severely detrimental to the Dutch war effort. That Spanish forces concentrated many men over several days in attacking the *Nieu Beckaff* and the ravelins meant the spot must have been of particular importance or perceived weakness. Colonel Henderson and his soldiers were instrumental to the defense of these fortifications. In that respect, the siege of Bergen-op-Zoom is also an important example of close cooperation between the Scottish and English troops. They not only fought together in the van during the “grand sally,” they were quartered and fought together at the *Beckaff*, and even shared two commanding officers: colonels Henderson and Morgan.

Secondly, the officers of the Brigade sustained a very high casualty rate at the siege of Bergen-op-Zoom. As shown above, four out of the nine company commanders present at the siege were killed and two were wounded.¹²⁴ It was nearly as deadly as the fighting at Nieuwpoort in 1600, which, because of its high attrition rate, has received more attention than Bergen-op-Zoom.¹²⁵ At Nieuwpoort, five out of twelve company commanders were

¹²¹ Rijcke, et al., *Belegghert*, p.168; Anon., *iournall*, p.13.

¹²² Anon., *iournall*, pp.13, 18; *CSPV*, 1621-1623: 29 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.400; Rijcke, et al., *Belegghert*, p.230.

¹²³ Ferguson, p.310; Nimwegen, *Army*, p.208.

¹²⁴ This statistic does not include Sergeant Stuart, as was he was not the commander of a company.

¹²⁵ Ferguson, pp.31, 58-59n; Dunthorne, “Wars,” p.113; Glozier, “French and Dutch,” p.126.

killed on the field, and two more were executed by the Spanish after being captured—a casualty (and fatality) rate of about 58%.¹²⁶ At Bergen-op-Zoom, the rate of fatality was 44%, but the overall casualty rate for Scottish officers was 66%. These statistics alone indicate that the siege of Bergen-op-Zoom was one of the bloodiest engagements for the Brigade during the entirety of the Eighty Years' War and, by that measure, of equal importance to that of Nieuwpoort.

Finally, the siege had several ancillary ramifications. The families of soldiers killed in the siege had to search for aid from the government in order to support themselves. Digna van Loo, Sergeant Stuart's widow, and Anna Kirkpatrick, Henderson's widow, both had to petition the States-General for pensions after their husbands' deaths¹²⁷ Colonel Henderson's death also led to something of a succession crisis for the colonelship of the second regiment of the Brigade and led to the creation of the third regiment in late 1628. In short, as mentioned above, Sir Robert had requested that on his death the colonelship fall to his brother, Francis.¹²⁸ Although the Earl of Buccleuch had been promised the next vacancy in 1620, Prince Maurice wanted an officer with experience so Sir Robert's dying wish was granted and Sir Francis assumed the colonelship of the regiment.¹²⁹

The Siege of 's-Hertogenbosch (1629)

Between 1622 and 1629, the military and political situation in the Dutch Republic changed dramatically. As shown above, the Republic was largely on the defense in 1622. However, a

¹²⁶ Ferguson, pp.31, 58n-59n.

¹²⁷ RSG, 1621-1622: 26 Aug. 1622, 23 December 1622, pp.622, 734; Zickermann, Murdoch, "Scottish Widows," pp.119-120.

¹²⁸ CSPV, 1621-1623: 29 Aug. 1622—Surian to D/S, p.400.

¹²⁹ RSG, 1621-1623: 25 Aug. 1622, 29 Aug. 1622, pp.619, 625; Ferguson, p.378, 6 Feb. 1635—Huygens to States-General, p.393; Anon., "DISCOURSE," f.11.

series of successes for the Republic thereafter allowed it to begin a counterattack to “break the Spanish ring” around the Republic.¹³⁰ In a devastating blow, Spinola took Breda in 1625, but this was met with Dutch success at the sieges of Oldenzaal in 1626 and Groll (modern-day Groenlo) in 1627.¹³¹ The latter siege saw large-scale Scots-Dutch involvement and possibly cost captains Andrew Donaldson, Robert Scott, and Walter Bruce their lives.¹³² It is certain that Colonel Brog’s sergeant-major, William Drummond, died there, as it was reported to the Council of State that he was shot in the head on 1 August 1627.¹³³ Besides the death and subsequent replacement of these officers, personnel in the Dutch army also underwent some change during these years. Prince Maurice died on 23 April 1625 and his brother Frederick Henry was immediately proclaimed the new captain- and admiral-general by the States-General.¹³⁴ Furthermore, Colonel Sir Francis Henderson had died by December 1628 and command of his regiment fell to his lieutenant-colonel, Sir John Halkett of Pitfirrane.¹³⁵

Several political factors in the lead up to 1629 helped to bolster the Dutch strategic position. For one, the outbreak of the War of Mantuan Succession in December 1627 drained Spain of a potential 15,500 soldiers.¹³⁶ The Mantuan War also helped to offset the damage that the 1629 Treaty of Lübeck might have caused, enabling the full weight of a Spanish-Imperial assault on the Republic after humiliating Denmark-Norway.¹³⁷ The negotiated withdrawal of Denmark-Norway also meant that the surviving Anglo-Dutch and

¹³⁰ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.212; Israel, *Republic*, p.506.

¹³¹ Nimwegen, *Army*, pp.209, 214-215.

¹³² Ferguson, pp.310, 331-333.

¹³³ *Ibid.*: 2 Aug. 1627—Report from before Groll, p.353; Drummond, *House of Drummond*, pp.73, 250.

¹³⁴ *RSG*, 1624-1625: 23 April 1625, pp.344-345.

¹³⁵ Ferguson, p.65n.

¹³⁶ Wilson, *Tragedy*, p.440; Nimwegen, *Army*, p.217.

¹³⁷ Murdoch, *Denmark-Norway*, p.70; Nimwegen, *Army*, p.217.

Scots-Dutch soldiers who had been sent to serve Christian IV were able to return to Dutch service.¹³⁸

Further to returning veterans from Danish service, the Dutch Republic began recruiting on a massive scale, to capitalize on its strategic advantages and prepare for an offensive. After 's-Hertogenbosch was chosen as a target in early 1629—as its capture “would deliver Holland, Gelderland and Utrecht from Spanish raids”—6,000 more *waardgelders* were enlisted along with new levies intended to total around 12,000 men.¹³⁹ The Dutch field army thus may have stood at around 28 to 29,000 men, but Israel reckons that by April 1629 the Republic's total soldier count was over 77,000 men, presumably including the soldiers in the garrisons.¹⁴⁰ In addition, throughout the beginning of 1629, van Nimwegen writes “the States-General also entered into contracts with various colonels to provide battle-ready regiments for a period of two or three months.”¹⁴¹

Some historians have suggested that the “highpoint” of the Scots-Dutch Brigade was in 1626, and that its peak strength only reached 3,900 men.¹⁴² However, the growth of the Dutch army in 1629 was reflected directly in the Brigade. In 1628, its two regiments, under the command of colonels Brog and Halkett, were divided into three, and the new colonelcy was given to the Earl of Buccleuch.¹⁴³ While this did not change the Brigade's strength, a fourth regiment of 2,158 men, led by Sir George Hay of Kinfauns, was contracted in the

¹³⁸ Morgan's troops arrived in Enkhuizen by 27 July 1629. *HSL*, IV, pp.15-16; TNA, SP84/133 f.98, Apr. 2, 1627; *Bohemia*, I: 6 Aug. 1628—Elizabeth to Dorchester, p.707n and 27 July 1629—Frederick to Elizabeth, p.771; Nimwegen, *Army*, p.219; E.A. Beller, “The Military Expedition of Sir Charles Morgan to Germany, 1627-9,” in *The English Historical Review*, XLIII, CLXXII (October, 1928), pp.528-539.

¹³⁹ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.217. De Cauwer argues that the desired strength of 12,000 men was not achieved, and that “only the Scottish regiment exceeded the expectations of [Frederick Henry].” Cauwer, *Bloed*, p.58.

¹⁴⁰ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.217; Israel, *Republic*, p.507.

¹⁴¹ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.219.

¹⁴² Dunthorne, *Revolt*, p.67; David Onnekink, Gijs Rommelse, *The Dutch in the Early Modern World* (Cambridge, 2019), p.68.

¹⁴³ Ferguson: 1 Dec. 1628—Proposal to divide the Two Regiments of Scotsmen into Three, p.385

spring of 1629 for a period of four months.¹⁴⁴ Therefore, with the return of the Morgan expedition from Denmark and the addition of the new regiment, the “highpoint” of the Brigade was, in fact, 1629. Now, with four regiments, the Brigade had grown substantially from its strength of nearly 4,000 men in 1622 to over 6,000 men by 1629.¹⁴⁵ It is therefore obvious that, in terms of numbers, the siege of 's-Hertogenbosch was the single largest siege-action of the Brigade during the entirety of the Eighty Years' War.

The siege of 's-Hertogenbosch began on 1 May 1629, and over the next ten days, the Dutch army began to take up their positions around the city.¹⁴⁶ The Scottish regiments that arrived initially were, like at Bergen-op-Zoom, under the command of Count Ernst and were quartered near Hintham, a village just east of the city, with Frisians and some Dutch companies.¹⁴⁷ According to the Venetian Ambassador in the Dutch Republic, the two newly levied Scottish regiments had still not arrived in the country by 30 April.¹⁴⁸ However, Buccleuch's regiment probably had, in fact, arrived by then. According to orders dated 1 May, colonels Buccleuch, Brog, and Halkett were named as being among those who accompanied Count Ernst to Hintham.¹⁴⁹

Regardless, by 25 May, Hay's regiment had arrived in the Dutch Republic with around 2,000 men, and it was reported that although Hay himself was still en route, he was

¹⁴⁴ *RPCS*, 1629-1630: 9 March 1629, p.99, 31 March 1629, p.120; *BSG*: 14 April 1629(20). Hay's regiment had previously been under the command of the Earl of Morton and had served at La Rochelle in 1628. TNA, SP16/111 f.129, List of officers, [July ?] 1628; Spring, *First British Army*, pp.240-241.

¹⁴⁵ Ferguson: 12 July 1622—States of War, p.322; Blaeu, *Obsidio*.

¹⁴⁶ Wilson, *Tragedy*, p.437; Henry Hexham, *A historical relation of the famous siege of the Busse... and some other addition herevnto annexed* (Delft, 1630), p.7.

¹⁴⁷ Hexham, *Historicall relation*, p.7; Blaeu, *Obsidio*.

¹⁴⁸ *CSPV*, 1629-1632: 30 April 1629—Soranzo to D/S, p.34.

¹⁴⁹ *HSL*, IV: Orde om te marcheren, pp.276-277.

possibly bringing another 500 soldiers with him.¹⁵⁰ An extra company of 118 men under Captain Morgan Arnot had also arrived by 31 May, and appears to have joined Hay's other sixteen companies.¹⁵¹ Hay's regiment arrived at 's-Hertogenbosch on 11 June, and was sent to the quarters of Count Ernest and the other Scots.¹⁵² Hay himself arrived in the Republic by 18 June, when he took oath as colonel in the service of the States, presumably joining his regiment soon after.¹⁵³ The Scots had already seen action two days before Hay's arrival in the Low Countries, being forced out of their trenches by a sally from the *Hintemerpoort*, the gate to a hornwork facing the Scottish quarters at Hintham. Some English soldiers were also killed in this attack.¹⁵⁴

At the end of June, it looked as though there would be a joint Spanish and Imperial assault in the east, which Henry Hexham, an English soldier and chronicler of the siege, believed was a "way of diversion, to raise us from the siege" at 's-Hertogenbosch.¹⁵⁵ This threat continued through into mid-July, when it looked as though the Spanish might besiege Grave.¹⁵⁶ In an attempt to counteract this, Frederick Henry sent Otto van Gendt, Lord of Dieden to patrol the area around Grave, Wageningen, and the Rhine with English, French and Scottish companies.¹⁵⁷ Colonel Hay eventually replaced Dieden, and with at

¹⁵⁰ BSG: 25 May 1629(23). Hay was only required to levy 2,000 men, but when they arrived, the States-General found that there were 40 extra heads.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid*: 31 May 1629(1), 1 June 1629(1). Arnot is referred to as "Mungo Park" in *HSL*, IV, p.31; Blaeu, *Obsidio*. For the original sixteen captains serving under Hay, see Ferguson: Annexa II—Roll of Names, p.400.

¹⁵² Jacques Prepart, *A historical relation of the famous siege of the citie called the Busse...* (Amsterdam, 1630), p.8; Simon Pelegromius, *A description of S'Hertogenbosh... with the principall points and passages concerning the last siege...* (London, 1629), p.20; RMA, *Grote kaart van het beleg van Den Bosch door Frederik Hendrik, 1629*. Print. RP-P-OB-82.910/FMH 1612b/Hollstein Dutch 66-4(4). Claes Jansz. Visscher. Amsterdam, 1629.

¹⁵³ BSG: 18 June 1629(1).

¹⁵⁴ Prepart, *Historical relation*, p.9; Blaeu, *Obsidio*; RMA, *Beleg van Den Bosch door Frederik Hendrik, 1629*. Print. RP-P-BI-1048/FMH 1610, 1621/Hollstein Dutch 1. Cornelis Florisz. Van Berckenrode, 1629.

¹⁵⁵ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.218; Hexham, *Historical relation*, p.13.

¹⁵⁶ Nimwegen, *Army*, pp.218-219.

¹⁵⁷ Hexham, *Historical relation*, p.13; Cauwer, *Bloed*, p.109.

least part of his regiment, continued to patrol the eastern Betuwe and Wageningen.¹⁵⁸ Hay eventually joined the Arnhem garrison, where he remained until at least 18 August.¹⁵⁹

Around the same time, Major-General Herman Otto, Count of Limburg-Stirum attempted to prevent a Spanish crossing at the Ijssel around 22 or 23 of July.¹⁶⁰ However, when the Count moved with nineteen companies of foot and eleven of horse from Arnhem, he discovered that 2,000 Spaniards were already across the river and well entrenched.¹⁶¹ His attack was repelled, and according to Frederick V of the Palatinate, the Count took “Colonel [William] Brog’s brave resolution and [retreated] to the garrison,” the garrison, again, probably being Arnhem.¹⁶² Brog’s advice, or example, of retreating to the garrison probably saved the Count’s division from destruction when 23-24,000 Spanish and Imperial troops crossed the Ijssel at the end of the month.¹⁶³

On 15 August, back at 's-Hertogenbosch, the Scottish besiegers helped to repel a nighttime sally of 150 men, intending to flood the Dutch trenches near Hintham.¹⁶⁴ However, Captain William Brog’s company had the guard on the redoubt next to the trench, and raised the alarm.¹⁶⁵ A contingent of Dutch horse attacked the Spanish soldiers, forcing them to retreat back to the garrison. That the Scots managed to raise the alarm when they did was imperative to repelling this sally and prevention of their design—Hexham

¹⁵⁸ Cauwer, *Bloed*, p.109; *Bohemia*, I: 27 July 1629—Frederick to Elizabeth, p.771n.

¹⁵⁹ *HSL*, IV: 18 Aug. 1629—Lijste vande besettinghe der naervolgende plaetsen, p.279.

¹⁶⁰ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.219.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p.219; *Bohemia*, I: 27 July 1629—Frederick to Elizabeth, p.771n.

¹⁶² *Bohemia*, I: 27 July 1629—Frederick to Elizabeth, p.770.

¹⁶³ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.219.

¹⁶⁴ Prempart, *Historicall relation*, p.16; Hexham, *Historicall relation*, p.24.

¹⁶⁵ Captain Brog is not to be confused with Colonel Brog. Ferguson: 1636—Compagnien, p.322.

reckoned that if the enemy had “stayd but one halfe quarter of an houre longer, they [would have] effected the busines they came for,” and flooded the trench.¹⁶⁶

Four days later, the Scots were used in an assault on one of the Spanish hornworks, most likely at the *Hintemerpoort*. The besiegers had been laying a mine under the hornwork and it was sprung on 19 August.¹⁶⁷ After the explosion, Scottish and Dutch soldiers stormed into the breach and a furious fight occurred lasting 45 minutes.¹⁶⁸ Although this attack was initially repulsed, the hornwork was attacked at least three more times, but was not taken by the besiegers until the 21st.¹⁶⁹ Captain Ramsey, from Hay’s regiment, was killed in the fight on the 19th.¹⁷⁰ Lieutenant-Colonel James Haddon, of Colonel Balfour’s regiment, may have been killed in the assault on the 21st, as a “Captain Hatton,” was reported to have died when the hornwork was taken that day.¹⁷¹

Another prize of great value was taken on the 19th. In a surprise attack in the early hours of the morning, a small Dutch army captured Wesel, a town in Westphalia that had been serving as the springboard of invasion and resupply for the Spanish and Imperial forces in the Republic.¹⁷² In taking Wesel, the Dutch were able to eradicate Spanish supply lines and also captured 45 pieces of Spanish ordinance.¹⁷³ By September, the odds were fully stacked against the defenders at ’s-Hertogenbosch, and de Cauwer has written that the arrival of further Scottish reinforcements in Hintham at the end of August allowed the

¹⁶⁶ Prempart, *Historicall relation*, p.16. Hexham, *Historicall relation*, p.24.

¹⁶⁷ Hexham, *Historicall relation*, p.27.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p.27. Parker writes that it was only on 11 September that a mine was sprung. Geoffrey Parker, *the Military Revolution* (Cambridge, 1988), p.13.

¹⁶⁹ Hexham, *Historicall relation*, p.27.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p.27; *Queen of Bohemia*, I: No. 528. 19 Aug. 1629—Frederick V to Elizabeth of Bohemia, pp.776-778; Ferguson, p.311n, Annexa II—Roll of Names, p.400.

¹⁷¹ Prempart, *Historicall relation*, p.18; Ferguson, p.311n.

¹⁷² Nimwegen, *Army*, p.222; Israel, *Republic*, p.507; Wilson, *Tragedy*, p.437.

¹⁷³ Israel, *Republic*, p.507; Nimwegen, *Army*, p.222.

besiegers to intensify their attacks.¹⁷⁴ Subsequently, on 4 September, some of the Scottish troops besieging the city managed to take a ravelin that connected the hornwork to the town and six days later, another mine destroyed part of the city's main wall.¹⁷⁵ Sir William Kerr of Ancram—serving as a captain under Hay—wrote that on 11 September, “the enemies parley'd” and that terms of surrender were agreed on 13 September.¹⁷⁶ Kerr reported that the Prince of Orange took possession of the city on 17 September, and that another Scot—none other than Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia—joined her husband there to “see (*sic*) them march out.”¹⁷⁷

Aside from providing the Dutch Republic with an important victory—both tangibly and symbolically—the siege of 's-Hertogenbosch is another key case study for the Brigade.¹⁷⁸ In addition to the sheer number of Scots present, the Brigade also lost several officers of importance. Captain Ramsey, Lieutenant Huns, the ensign of the Earl of Buccleuch and Colonel Sir John Halkett, who died at the beginning of August.¹⁷⁹ Frederick V lamented the death of Halkett, writing to Elizabeth that after the colonel's death, Frederick “saw a miserable sight... the widow of the late Colonel Halkett who came to me with five little children to beg me to recommend her to the Prince [of Orange].”¹⁸⁰ Halkett's wife—Maria van Loon—was not the only widow. One anonymous woman lost her husband and

¹⁷⁴ Cauwer, *Bloed*, p.126.

¹⁷⁵ Prempart, *Historicall relation*, p.22; Wilson, *Tragedy*, p.437; Parker, *Military Revolution*, p.13.

¹⁷⁶ *Correspondence of Ancram*, I: 19 Sept. 1629—Sir William Kerr to Sir Robert Kerr, p.49; Parker, *Military Revolution*, p.13.

¹⁷⁷ *Correspondence of Ancram*: 19 Sept. 1629—Same to Same, p.50.

¹⁷⁸ Nimwegen, *Army*, pp.222-223; Israel, *Republic*, p.507. Wilson reckons that the defeat at 's-Hertogenbosch for the Spanish was “the most serious setback between the Armada and the battle of Rocroi in 1643.” See Wilson, *Tragedy*, p.437.

¹⁷⁹ Prempart, *Historicall relation*, p.2; Hexham, *Historicall Relation*, p.48; *Bohemia*, I: 19 August 1629—Frederick to Elizabeth, pp.777-778.

¹⁸⁰ *Bohemia*, I: 19 August 1629—Frederick to Elizabeth, pp.777-778; Zickermann, Murdoch, “Scottish Widows,” p.121.

her son when both were killed at the siege serving under Colonel Brog.¹⁸¹ Several other officers, Captain William Douglas, Sergeant-Major Archibald Bethune, and the above-mentioned Lieutenant-Colonel Haddon also died in 1629, probably at the siege.¹⁸²

The campaigns of 1629 also illustrate the importance of the Brigade's officers. Colonel Brog advised some of the highest-ranking officers in the Dutch army, despite the fact that in 1624 the Venetian Ambassador had referred to him as "an old man and useless."¹⁸³ Furthermore, battlefield decisions and actions made by Brigade men—like sapping and mining, or detecting the Spanish soldiers attempting to flood the trenches—contributed to the success of the siege. Finally, the recruitment of Scots for this siege expanded the Brigade from two to four regiments and Hay's temporary regiment was sought after by other powers after its termination.¹⁸⁴ In both 1622 and 1629, the Scots had proved their worth as both defenders and besiegers, but in 1638—at the battle of Kallo—the result would be far different.

Breda to Münster, 1637-1648

Some historians believe Scottish participation in Continental affairs ended in 1639 after the outbreak of the Bishops' Wars in Scotland, the beginning of the Wars of the Three Kingdoms.¹⁸⁵ Murdoch and Grosjean have, from a Scandinavian perspective, proved this to be decidedly false, having highlighted the importance of Scottish regiments in the

¹⁸¹ SAR (Jan van Aller Az.), 93/11/15. Attestatie, 27 Feb. 1631.

¹⁸² Ferguson, p.311n.

¹⁸³ *CSPV*, 1623-1625: 30 September 1624—Contarini to D/S, p.448.

¹⁸⁴ Sir James Spens had been trying to secure the regiment for Sweden. SRA, *Diplomatica Anglica III*. Sir James Spens to Gustavus II Adolphus, 5 June 1629. The Venetians were trying to convince Hay to come and serve in Italy, see *CSPV*, 1629-1639: 22 April 1630—Gussoni to D/S, p 327.

¹⁸⁵ Wilson, *Tragedy*, p.594; Parrott, *Business*, p.133; Guthrie, *Later*, p.257.

Torstensson War and in the final Swedish campaigns against the Empire in the 1640s.¹⁸⁶

While the two historians nod to the participation of Scots in the Dutch and French armies in the 1640s, there has been no adequate account of the Brigade's role in the last decade of the Eighty Years' War since the publication of Prince Frederick Henry's memoir in the eighteenth century.¹⁸⁷ The Brigade, despite some recruiting problems in the late 1630s and early 1640s, was in continuous use until the end of the war, and this section shows that the Brigade certainly did not lose its significance.

After 's-Hertogenbosch, the fourth regiment of the Brigade was disbanded, reducing the Brigade to three regiments until the end of the war.¹⁸⁸ Although no States of War appear to exist between 1622 and 1636, a list of the Army of Rheinberg dated to 25 June 1633 gives some idea of the strength of the Dutch standing army. In total, there were 162 companies split between eighteen regiments and an additional seven extraordinary companies.¹⁸⁹ Of these 169 companies, there were 22 companies of Scots split between three regiments (roughly 13% of the army) and 50 English companies (29.5%), while the rest were made up of various Dutch, French, Walloon, German and Flemish companies.¹⁹⁰ Thus, 42.5% of the Dutch standing army in 1633 came from Britain, with probably an additional eight companies from the Brigade in garrison throughout the Republic.

¹⁸⁶ Leslie, pp.145-168.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, pp.160-161; Ferguson, pp.314-317; Frederick Henry, *Memoires de Frederic Henri de Nassau, Prince D'Orange depuis 1621, jusqu'en 1646*, ed. Bernard Picart and Isaac de Beausobre, (Amsterdam, 1733).

Murdoch has given further overview of the final decade of the Eighty Years' War, especially in reference to the Anglo-Dutch Brigade. Steve Murdoch, "Nirina ad Heroas Anglos. An overview of the British and the Thirty Years' War," in Serena Jones (ed.), *'Britain turned Germany: The Thirty Years' War and its Impact on the British Isles, 1638-1660* (Warwick, 2019), pp.32-35.

¹⁸⁸ BSG: 11 November 1629(5), 12 Dec. 1629(7).

¹⁸⁹ NI-HaNa, Staten-Generaal, 1.01.02, inv.nr. 12548.212, "Lyste vant Leger van Rynberck affvarende den 25 Jun. 1633.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.* The colonels of the Scottish regiments were Sir William Brog, Sir David Balfour and the Earl of Buccleuch.

The States of War in 1636 listed 30 Scottish companies split equally between the three regiments.¹⁹¹ However, the following year, the siege of Breda proved especially costly to the Scottish regiments. William Lithgow recorded the Scottish casualties in his account of the siege. Lieutenant-Colonel James Henderson, the son of Sir Robert, was killed, along with Captain James Williamson, Lieutenant Gladstone, sergeants Lindsay, Inglis and Corbett, as well as several voluntaries named Moncrieff, Hamilton, and Ferguson.¹⁹² Lieutenant-Colonel George Coutts was possibly also killed at the siege, as he was replaced that year.¹⁹³ Among the wounded were Colonel Sir James Sandilands and Sergeant-Major Sir Philip Balfour, both shot through the arm, and one Drummond, who lost his leg.¹⁹⁴ If the severity of officers' and gentlemen voluntaries' casualties reflect the casualties among ordinary soldiers, this was probably an incredibly costly siege for the Brigade. Regardless, the Dutch managed to recover Breda, which had been lost to the Spanish some twelve years previously.¹⁹⁵

At first glance, it is easy to understand why one might think that the Scots-Dutch Brigade was less active during the 1640s. The depletion of numbers after Breda was matched by an even worse episode the following year at Kallo. On 13 June 1638, after the Dutch invasion of Flanders, Field-Marshal William of Nassau-Siegen attempted to blockade and seize Antwerp by establishing some rudimentary fortifications at the village of Kallo.¹⁹⁶ Of the roughly 64 companies of foot—around 5,700 men—present at Kallo, no fewer than

¹⁹¹ Ferguson: 1636—Compagnien, pp.322-326. In 1636, the colonels of the regiments were William Brog, David Balfour, and James Livingston, but Brog died later that year. Ferguson, 54n.

¹⁹² Lithgow, *Experimentall discourse*, pp.29-31.

¹⁹³ Ferguson, p.312n.

¹⁹⁴ Lithgow, *Experimentall discourse*, pp.26, 30.

¹⁹⁵ Anton van der Lem, *Revolt in the Netherlands: the Eighty Years War, 1568-1648*, translated by Andy Brown (English ed., London, 2018), pp.212-213.

¹⁹⁶ Nimwegen, *Army*, pp.255-256.

21 (c. 2,310 men) represented the three regiments of the Brigade.¹⁹⁷ However, a Spanish breach in the lines at Kallo in the night on 20 June resulted in a large-scale Dutch retreat.¹⁹⁸ Estimates vary, but between 1,500 to 2,200 soldiers were killed or drowned, while an additional 2,000 to 2,200 were captured.¹⁹⁹

This was one of the gravest defeats for the Dutch army during the entirety of the Eighty Years' War and was also one of the worst for the Brigade. The Scots had made up the rear of the retreat and were cut off early on, resulting in a high number of Scottish prisoners taken at the battle.²⁰⁰ Between 360 and 600 Scots were taken prisoner at Kallo, roughly 15 to 26% of those present, or 11 to 18.7% of the Brigade in total.²⁰¹ Of the officers, the majority captured were subalterns: ten lieutenants, nine sergeants, and six ensigns.²⁰² Additionally, six company commanders were captured: captains Patrick Stuart, George Lauder, James Balfour, Sergeant-Major Andrew Caddel, Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Phillip Balfour, and Colonel Sir James Sandilands.²⁰³ Sandilands' regiment suffered the most: at least 139 men were captured, including two captains, the sergeant-major and the colonel of the regiment.²⁰⁴ Sir David Balfour's regiment was also hit hard: 126 men were captured, but no company commanders.²⁰⁵ Sir James Livingston's regiment lost 101 men to capture,

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p.256; Ferguson: 15 March 1639—List of Soldiers, pp.450-455. After the Brigade was divided into three regiments, the average company size decreased. The colonel's company was made up of 150 men, the lieutenant-colonel's had 120, and the regular company had 100 men. This meant the total notional strength of the Brigade in the field and in garrison was 3,210 men. See Ferguson: 1643—States of War, pp.328-329. Also note, 21 companies is very similar to the Army of Rheinberg list mentioned above.

¹⁹⁸ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.256.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.256; Ferguson, pp.313-314.

²⁰⁰ Ferguson, p.313.

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*: 18 August 1638—Prisoners taken at Callo, p.449, 15 March 1639—List of Soldiers, pp.450-455.

²⁰² *Ibid.*: 15 March 1639—List of Soldiers, pp.450-455.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*: 15 March 1639—List of Soldiers, pp.454-455; TNA, SP105/15, f.520, Letter to Mr Dinley, 30 July 1629, f.520; TNA, SP105/15, f.529, Letter to Secretary Coke, 31 July 1639.

²⁰⁴ Ferguson: 15 March 1639—List of Soldiers, pp.453-455.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*: 15 March 1639—List of Soldiers, pp.450-452.

along with one captain and the lieutenant-colonel.²⁰⁶ On the intercession of Charles I, Elizabeth of Bohemia and the Prince of Orange, the prisoners taken at Kallo were released on the condition that the officers would not serve for a year and that an equal number of soldiers would be levied in England for service with the Habsburgs.²⁰⁷

Following Breda and Kallo, the strength of the Brigade had obviously taken a severe hit. The outbreak of the First Bishops' War in Scotland in 1639 made obtaining fresh recruits from Scotland difficult. On 2 May 1639, a missive from Albert Joachimi—Dutch ambassador in London—outlined these problems to the States-General.²⁰⁸ Sir James Livingston had evidently informed Joachimi of his “grave doubts [that] the Covenanters in Scotland would allow the sergeants and other officers who had come... to that country to enlist recruits, to return again,” and that he doubted the King’s ships would allow any transport ships bearing recruits from the Brigade to cross.²⁰⁹ Although the States-General requested that Charles I grant free passage to recruitment ships, by 1641 the recruiting situation remained unresolved.²¹⁰ On 15 October, the Prince of Orange requested permission from the Scottish Privy Council to allow some officers from the Brigade to recruit that winter, the regiments being “greatly decayed and diminished.”²¹¹ Whether or not this was allowed is uncertain, but given the departure of the Army of the Covenant to Ireland in 1641 and the outbreak of civil war in England in 1642, recruiting problems for

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*: 15 March 1639—List of Soldiers, pp.452-453. Livingston was, by 1638, back in Scotland. Stevenson, “Livingston, James.” *ODNB*.

²⁰⁷ Ferguson: 18 Aug. 1638—The Prisoners taken at Calloo, p.449; *Bohemia*, II: 6 Aug. 1638—Gerbier to Elizabeth, p.696n.

²⁰⁸ Ferguson: 2 May 1639—Resolution, pp.436-437.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*: 2 May 1639—Resolution, p.437.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 13 May 1639—Resolution, p.437.

²¹¹ RPS, A1641/8/90, Translated letter from the Prince of Orange, 20 October 1641.

the Dutch probably did not entirely cease, although the States of War for 1643 record a full notional strength.²¹²

Despite these setbacks and obstacles, the Brigade continued to make an important military contribution until the end of the war, and Scots did not cease being “an active participant in European affairs.”²¹³ While further scholarship is needed on those who returned home from the Republic to fight in the Civil Wars, the return of Scots-Dutch officers or soldiers seems unlike the return from Sweden.²¹⁴ No fewer than 33 Scottish companies appear in the States of War in 1643, and as stated above, each company was marked as having a full notional strength.²¹⁵

Regardless of the Brigade’s actual strength, it remained an important part of the Dutch army throughout the rest of the war. In 1644, the Dutch army reinvaded Flanders and made a crossing at the River Lys near the fort of St Angel.²¹⁶ The Prince’s army comprised his personal horse guard in addition to several troops of cavalry, several Dutch regiments of foot, four French regiments, the four regiments of the Anglo-Dutch Brigade, as well as the Scottish regiments of colonels James Erskine, John Kirkpatrick, and Sir Philip Balfour.²¹⁷ A very colorful account of the crossing is given in Prince Frederick Henry’s memoir. Soldiers from the Dutch army attempted to build a bridge of boats to cross the Lys, but Colonel Erskine’s impatience to cross led him over a bridge of reeds with his regiment.²¹⁸ Enemy soldiers at the fort of St Angel retreated when they saw that the Scots

²¹² *Leslie*, pp.118-119; NI-HaNa, RvS, 1.01.19, inv.nr. 1251, Staten van Oorlog, 1643.

²¹³ *Wilson, Tragedy*, p.594.

²¹⁴ *Leslie*, p.178.

²¹⁵ NI-HaNa, RvS, 1.01.19, inv.nr. 1251, Staten van Oorlog, 1643.

²¹⁶ *Ferguson*, pp.314-315.

²¹⁷ *Henry, Memoires*, p.331; Murdoch, “Nirina,” pp.33-34. The colonels of the English regiments were Lord Craven, Henry Herbert, George Goring, and John Cromwell.

²¹⁸ *Henry, Memoires*, pp.332-333.

had no intention of stopping. Erskine's regiment pursued them back to the fort, eventually taking it and killing or making prisoners of the garrison, allowing the Prince's army to finish the bridge of boats and to cross it.²¹⁹ The success of the crossing allowed the Dutch army to capture Sas van Gent from the Spanish in a siege that lasted from late July to September 1644.²²⁰ This in turn, gave the Dutch a "strong second base" in Flanders and opened up the possibility of besieging Ghent, Bruges or Hulst.²²¹

According to van Nimwegen, one major problem prevented a successful siege on Ghent or Bruges: the Dutch—who had been in a military alliance with France since 1634—would need substantial French aid to besiege the cities, and "the majority of regents [in the Republic] had no desire to see the French penetrate into the heart of Flanders."²²² Therefore, Hulst was besieged on 5 October.²²³ No fewer than 24 companies from the Brigade, split equally between the regiments of Erskine, Balfour and Kirkpatrick, were present at the siege, along with 51 companies from the Anglo-Dutch Brigade split between five officers.²²⁴ In two separate maps of the siege, the English and Scottish regiments are shown being quartered together, occupying the northeastern flank of the besieging army.²²⁵ The siege only lasted one month, but again, the Scots played an important part in taking the city. Towards the end of the siege, Colonel Kirkpatrick was ordered to construct

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.333.

²²⁰ Ferguson, pp.315-316; Nimwegen, *Army*, pp.270-273.

²²¹ Nimwegen, *Army*, pp.270-273.

²²² *Ibid.*, p.273; Lem, *Revolt*, p.213. They were not the only Scots fighting in Flanders. John Stirling, a soldier from St Andrews, was fighting in the French army. He reported on 22 November 1646 that his regiment, under Lieutenant-Colonel John Fullerton as well as the Garde Ecossais were in fact, "in ye hart of flanders," and had been present at the siege of Courtrai on 14 July. NRS, GD24/2/5/4, John Stirling to his Uncle, 22 November 1646.

²²³ Nimwegen, *Army*, p.277.

²²⁴ RMA, *Beleg van Hulst door Frederik Hendrik, 1645*. Print. RP-P-AO-16-16-1/KAN 1844/FMH 1904/Hollstein Dutch 101-2(2). Claes Jansz. Visscher. Amsterdam, 1645/1652.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*; RMA, *Beleg van Hulst, 1645*. Print. RP-P-1883-A-6951/FMH 1904-A/Hollstein Dutch 2. Abraham Dircksz. Santvoort. Northern Netherlands, 1645.

a bridge of reeds over a moat and onto a rampart outside the city.²²⁶ Kirkpatrick successfully laid the bridge and “par la diligence du Coronel & la valeur des Soldats,” they managed to pass onto the rampart.²²⁷ This episode must have occurred around the start of November, as several days later, on 3 November, the city capitulated.²²⁸

Fighting continued into the next year, but with little success for the Dutch. The French captured Fort Mardyck, Furnes, and Dunkirk, but Prince Frederick Henry failed to take Venlo in October 1646 and died the following year.²²⁹ No major Dutch military actions took place after 1646, and, in 1648, peace between Spain and the Dutch was signed at Münster.²³⁰ The Peace of Münster and the end of the Eighty Years’ War fundamentally changed the Brigade. As in 1609, the Dutch army was reduced in strength, and the final relevant States of War reflect the effects of peace on the Brigade. The colonels’ companies were reduced to 100 men, the lieutenant-colonels’ companies dropped to 70 men, and the rest of the companies in the Brigade were reduced to 50 men, numbers that would stay constant until at least the late 1680s.²³¹ By 1655, the Brigade was again reduced to two regiments, as Colonel William Drummond, now Earl of Roxburgh, had been absent from his regiment for some time.²³² Despite the setbacks it faced in the late-1630s, the Brigade did not stagnate in the 1640s, ensuring that it would remain a fixture in the Dutch army for another century and a half.

²²⁶ Henry, *Memoires*, p.359.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, p.359.

²²⁸ Ferguson, p.316; Nimwegen, *Army*, p.278.

²²⁹ Nimwegen, *Army*, pp.283-285.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, p.286; Israel, *Republic*, pp.595-596.

²³¹ NI-HaNa, Staten-Generaal, 1.01.02, inv.nr. 8055, Staten van Oorlog, 1648; Ferguson: Misc. States of War, pp.489-518.

²³² Ferguson, p.467.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has not been to insinuate that the Dutch Republic would have lost the Eighty Years' War without the help of the Scots, or to hero-worship the officers of the Brigade. Soldiers of all nationalities within the Dutch army, and indeed on both sides of the conflict, made sacrifices and decisions that made a collective difference on the battlefield over the course of the war. At the siege of Maastricht, for example, 28% of the officers killed were French, while nearly 50% of the common soldiers killed were English.²³³ The tremendous toll the war took on the Low Countries, north or south, and on their people, can also not be forgotten. This chapter has also not drawn on Spanish accounts of the same sieges that the Brigade participated in. To delve into the accounts of the other side would almost certainly differ from the unadulterated heroism afforded to the Brigade's soldiers in Dutch, English, and Scottish narratives. The ferocity Henderson's company showed in repressing Dutch Arminians, or shooting into the houses of Alkmaar, as described in Chapter One, cannot be forgotten.²³⁴ There were, of course, other factors that ultimately led to Spain's downfall, including war with France, loss of overseas colonies to emerging colonial powers, and destabilization at home with revolts in Portugal, Catalonia, and Andalusia.²³⁵ Nonetheless, Dutch victory in the Low Countries was never a forgone conclusion.

This chapter, instead, served to provide an analysis of the Brigade's most important aspect: its ability to achieve success on the battlefield or, in this case, at the siege-works.

²³³ Adam Marks, "England, the English and the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648)," (PhD Thesis, University of St Andrews, 2012), p.32.

²³⁴ NL-AmrRAA, "Memorye," f.4329.

²³⁵ Geoffrey Parker, "Why Did the Dutch Revolt Last Eighty Years?," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 26 (1976), p.66; David Parrott, *Richelieu's Army: War, Government and Society in France, 1624-1642* (Cambridge, 2001), p.84.

Were then, as Dunthorne wrote, British and Scottish contributions to the Dutch war effort, “modest and mixed?”²³⁶ Closer inspection reveals that Dunthorne based this assumption on only two examples of failure, both from an English perspective: Dutch disappointment in Leicester’s expedition in 1586 and the ineffectuality of several new English regiments in 1624.²³⁷ Two examples from two years are hardly representative of participation in a conflict that lasted eighty. This chapter, unlike Dunthorne, surveyed nearly forty of those years.

The Brigade was, in fact, perfectly capable of helping the Dutch army achieve success. Likewise, it could operate in both British and multi-national operations, as it did at Jülich-Cleves and the Uskok War. After the Twelve Years’ Truce, the high rate of casualties the Brigade sustained at Bergen-op-Zoom shows that its soldiers were at the frontlines of the city’s defense. In helping to prevent the capture of an important city early on in the resumption of hostilities, the victory there gave much-needed momentum to the Republic. The sheer number of Scots at ’s-Hertogenbosch was unmatched at any other siege in the era on the Continent.²³⁸ Not even the setbacks of Kallo or the Bishops’ Wars prevented the Scots-Dutch Brigade from seeing the war to its end, fighting its way through southern Zeeland and Flanders, and finally to Hulst.

²³⁶ Dunthorne, *Revolt*, p.90.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp.90-91; Murdoch, “Introduction,” p.5.

²³⁸ Compare to Stralsund. *Leslie*, pp.47-51.

Conclusion

The original analysis of the Scots-Dutch Brigade from 1609 to 1648 in this dissertation provides a new perspective on both the Eighty Years' War and on Scotland in the era of the Thirty Years' War. Previous studies of Scotland in this period have mentioned the Brigade, but lack a full account of its place within both Scottish and Dutch military and political affairs.

This dissertation could not address every available avenue for study. A full analysis of marriage-rates between Scots and other Scots or non-Scots is both viable and necessary. Furthermore, a comparison between the soldiery of the Brigade and the Dutch West and East India Companies could expose more links between Scottish soldiers in the Dutch Republic. As David Parrott has pointed out, at least 50% of the Dutch army was made up of foreign soldiers.¹ Thus, there would also be room for further comparisons between English, Scottish, and Huguenot soldiers there. Relationships also certainly existed between Scots in the Dutch Republic and those in other Continental powers. For example, in 1632, Lieutenant-Colonel James Sandilands wrote a pass for an *adelborst* in his own company, to enter Swedish service under Colonel Johan Skytte.² Further analysis of links like these could better illuminate the Brigade's networks throughout Europe.

Nonetheless, this dissertation has provided original analyses of the Scottish impact on the Brigade and how this in turn could affect the Dutch Republic. Scotland was the Brigade's recruiting grounds, and soldiers sought out its service for a variety of reasons. Many soldiers sought Dutch service to defend "goddis trew religioun," and it was largely for

¹ Parrott, *Business*, p.18.

² SRA, Depositio Skytteana, A:5, E5412, 3413; SSNE: Johan Skytte [SSNE 6280]; Grosjean, *Unofficial Alliance*, pp.81, 158.

this reason that the Prince of Orange used the Brigade in the “Calvinist Revolution” against Arminianism and in the Orange Coup of the late 1610s.³ Although the Brigade formed as a military community in the Dutch Republic, it also represented a “bounded” Scottish community abroad.⁴ The soldiers of the Brigade continued to interact with Scotland, other Scots, and “Scottishness” in a variety of ways, whether financially, violently, or in deciding to return to Scotland.

Finally, despite some modern historians’ damning assessments of the Brigade, it certainly made an important contribution to the Dutch war effort. From Flanders to the Adriatic, the Brigade participated in nearly every major action of the Dutch army between 1609 and 1648. It paid dearly at Bergen-op-Zoom, losing two-thirds of its officers to death or injury, and no other siege on the Continent during the period involved more Scots than at ’s-Hertogenbosch. Even considering the setbacks of the late-1630s, the Brigade continued to bolster the Dutch army, participating in the final siege of the war at Hulst. The Brigade’s service was more than just “occasionally signal” or dull garrison duty. If, perhaps, the Dutch Republic was a fortress and its army was its walls, the Scots-Dutch Brigade was, indeed, one of its bulwarks.

³ Ferguson, p.5.

⁴ Grosjean, Murdoch, “Introduction,” pp.15-19.

Bibliography

Archival Sources

England

London—The National Archives

- E157: Licenses to Pass beyond the seas.
- SP 16: State Papers Domestic, Charles I.
- SP 81: State Papers Foreign, German States, 1577-1784.
- SP 83: State Papers Foreign, Holland and Flanders, 1577-1584.
- SP 84: State Papers Foreign, Holland, c. 1560-1780.
- SP 101: State Papers Foreign, Newsletters, 1565-1763.
- SP 105: State Papers Foreign, Archives of British Legations, 1568-1701.

—The British Library

- Royal MS 18 A LXIII: Anon. "A DISCOURSE of the beseiging, defendinge and releeuinge of the towne of Bergen vp Zome in the year 1622," c. 1622.

The Netherlands

Alkmaar—Regionaal Archief

- 95.001, Collectie Aanwinsten.
 - 152, "Memorye." Verhaal in kroniekvorm van het verzetten van de wet door prins Maurits en het gebeurde ten aanzien van de Remonstraten, oktober 1618-maart 1621.'

Amsterdam—Rijksmuseum

- Beleg van Bergen op Zoom, 1622.* Print. RP-P-OB-80.997/FMH 1466-b/Hollstein Dutch 43-2(2). Claes Jansx. Visscher, Amsterdam, 1622.
- Beleg van Den Bosch door Frederik Hendrik, 1629.* Print. RP-P-BI-1048/FMH 1610, 1621/Hollstein Dutch 1. Cornelis Florisz. Van Berckenrode, 1629.
- Beleg van Hulst, 1645.* Print. RP-P-1883-A-6951/FMH 1904-A/Hollstein Dutch 2. Abraham Dircksz. Santvoort. Northern Netherlands, 1645.
- Beleg van Hulst door Frederik Hendrik, 1645.* Print. RP-P-AO-16-16-1/KAN 1844/FMH 1904/Hollstein Dutch 101-2(2). Claes Jansz. Visscher. Amsterdam, 1645/1652.
- Grote kaart van het beleg van Den Bosch door Frederik Hendrik, 1629.* Print. RP-P-OB-82.910/FMH 1612b/Hollstein Dutch 66-4(4). Claes Jansz. Visscher. Amsterdam, 1629.

Delft—Delft University of Technology

- Obsidio et Expvgnatio Sylvædvics, Aufpiciis Ordinum Belgicæ Fœderatæ, Ductu Illuftmi. et invictmi. Principis Frederici Henrici Araufionunfium Principis etc. cic ic c xxix.* Joan Blaeu, engraving, Toonneel der Steden van de Vereenighde Nederlanden, Amsterdam, J. Blaeu, 1649.

The Hague—Nationaal Archief

1.01.19: Raad van State.

37, Resoluties 1619.

46, Resoluties 1629.

584B, Ingekomen Brieven 1618.

1244, Staten van Oorlog 1620.

1251, Staten van Oorlog 1643.

2061 II, Lijste van de Garnizoenen 1622.

1.01.02: Staten-Generaal.

12548.212, Stukken betreffende de bemoeiingen van de Staten-Generaal met het uittrekken en terugkomen van burgers for militaire diensten ter verdediging van de frontieren, 1632-1633.

8044, Staten van Oorlog 1608.

8046, Staten van Oorlog 1617.

8048, Staten van Oorlog 1620.

8297, Staten van Oorlog 1609.

8055, Staten van Oorlog 1648.

Rotterdam—Stadsarchief Rotterdam (Individual Documents as cited in-text)

Notary: Aller Az., Jan van

Notary: Hagen, Nicolaas v.d.

Notary: Woerden, Gerrit Jansz van

Scotland

Edinburgh—The National Records of Scotland

GD 3, Papers of the Montgomerie Family, Earls of Eglinton.

GD 24, Papers of the family of Stirling Home Drummond Moray of Abercairny, Perthshire. c. 1210-1934.

GD 82, Makgill, Viscouts Oxfuird. 1220-1978.

GD124, Papers of the Erskine Family, Earls of Mar and Kellie. 1189-1957.

GD 172, Papers of the Henderson Family of Fordell, 1217-1931.

JC 26/10, High Court of Justiciary Processes, 1630-1633.

Sweden

Stockholm—Riksarkivet

Diplomatica Anglica, III.

Depositio Skytteana, Vol. A, E5412.

Published Primary Sources

Akkerman, Nadine (ed.), *The Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia* (2 Vols, Oxford, 2011-2015).

- Anon., *A iournall or daily register of all those warlike atchievements which happened in the siege of Berghen-up-Zoome in the Low-countries... All faithfully translated out of the original Low-Dutch copie* (London, 1622).
- Anon., *A list of severall regiments and chief officers of the Scottish army quartered neer Newcastle* (London, 1644).
- Bingham, John (Aelian), *The tacticks of Aelian...* (London, 1616).
- Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House* (24 Vols., 1883-1976).
- Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, First and Second Series* (36 vols., London, 1856-1897).
- Calendar of State Papers relating to English affairs, existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice and in other Libraries of Northern Italy*, ed. A.B. Hinds (38 Vols., London 1864-1947).
- Calendar of the State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots: preserved in the Public Record Office, the British Museum and elsewhere in England* (13 Vols., Edinburgh, 1898-1969).
- Carleton, Sir Dudley, *The Letters from and to Sir Dudley Carleton, Knt. During His Embassy in Holland, from January 1615/16, to December 1620*, (3rd Edition, London, 1780).
- Courthope, Elinor (ed.), *The Journal of Thomas Cunningham of Campvere, 1640-1654* (Edinburgh, 1928).
- England, Privy Council. *Acts of the Privy Council of England* (45 Vols., London, 1890-1964).
- Enthoven, Victor, Murdoch, Steve, and Williamson, Eila, *The Navigator: The Log of John Anderson, VOC Pilot-Major, 1640-1643* (Leiden, 2010).
- Ferguson, James (ed.), *Papers Illustrating the History of the Scots Brigade in the Service of the United Netherlands, 1572-1782* (3 Vols., Edinburgh, 1899-1901).
- Fraser, William, *The Scotts of Buccleuch* (2 Vols., Edinburgh, 1878).
- Hexham, Henry, *A historical relation of the famous siege of the Busse... and some other addition herevnto annexed* (Delft, 1630).
- Laing, David (ed.), *Correspondence of Sir Robert Kerr, First Earl of Ancram and his son William, Third Earl of Lothian* (2 Vols., Edinburgh, 1875).
- Lithgow, William, *A true and experimentall discourse, upon the beginning, proceeding, and victorious event of this last siege of Breda With the Antiquity and annexing of it, to the house of Nassaw, and the many alterations it hath suffered by armes, and armis, within these threescore yeares. Together with the prudent plots, projects and policies of warre... Written by him who was an eye witnesse of the Siegee. William Lithgow.* (London, 1637).
- Maclean, Dr. Ir. J., *De Huwelijksintekeningen Van Schotse Militairen in Nederland: 1574-1665* (Zutphen, 1976).
- Netherlands, States-General. *Resolutiën der Staten-Generaal: Nieuwe Reeks, 1610-1670*, ed. J.G. Smit, A.T. van Deursen, and J. Roelevink, (7 Vols., The Hague, 1971-1994).
- , *Besluiten Staten Generaal, 1626-1630*, ed. I.J.A. Nijenhuis, P.L.R. De Cauwer, W.M. Gijsbers, et al. (The Hague: Instituut Nederlandse Geschiedenis, 2007).
- Paton, Henry H. (ed.), *Report on the Manuscripts of Colonel David Milne Home of Wedderburn Castle, N.B* (London, 1902).
- Peacham, Henry, *A most true relation of the affaires of Cleve and Gulick... With the articles of the peace, propounded at Santen. By Henrie Peacham.* (London, 1615).

- Pelegromius, Simon, *A description of S'Hertogenbosh... Together with the principall points and passages concerning the last siege...* (London, 1629).
- Picart Bernard (ed.), *Memoires de Frederic Henri de Nassau, Prince D'Orange depuis 1621, jusqu'en 1646* (Amsterdam, 1733).
- Prempart, Jacques, *A historicall relation of the famous siege of the citie called the Busse... by Iames Prempart, ingener to his Majestie of Sweden* (Amsterdam, 1630).
- Raa, F.J.G. Ten, and Bas, F. De, *Het Staatsche Leger, 1568-1795* (11 Vols., Breda/The Hague, 1911-1950).
- Rijcke, Lambertus de, Vayus, Nathan, and Rieu, Job du, *Bergen op den Zoom, Belegghert op den 18 Iulij 1622, ende Ontleghert den 3 Octobris des selven Iaers... ende heft sich erbarmt over fijn volck*, (Middleburg, 1623).
- Rogers, Charles (ed.), *The Earl of Stirling's Register of Royal Letters, Relative to the Affairs of Scotland and Nova Scotia from 1615-1635* (2 Vols., Edinburgh, 1885).
- Scotland, Parliament. *The Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland* (12 Vols., London, 1814-1875).
—, *Records of the Parliaments of Scotland*—Published online by the University of St Andrews at: www.rps.ac.uk.
- Scotland, Privy Council. *Registers of the Privy Council of Scotland, First Series, 1545-1625* (14 Vols., Edinburgh, 1877-1898).
—, *Registers of the Privy Council of Scotland, Second Series, 1625-1660* (8 Vols., Edinburgh, 1899-1908).
- Steuart, A. F. (ed.), *Papers Relating to the Scots in Poland: 1576-1793* (Edinburgh, 1915).
- Taylor, L.B. (ed.), *Aberdeen Council Letters* (6 vols., Oxford, 1942-1961).
- Thomson, E.M. (ed.), *The Chamberlain Letters* (London 1965).
- Urquhart, Sir Thomas, *The Jewel*, ed. R.D.S. Jack and R.J. Lyall (Edinburgh, 1983).
- Worp, J.A. (ed.), *De Briefwisseling van Constantijn Huygens* (6 Vols., The Hague, 1911-1917).

Printed Secondary Sources

- Bajer, Peter Paul, *Scots in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, 16th-18th Centuries: The Formation and Disappearance of an Ethnic Group* (Leiden, 2012).
- Baldick, Robert, *The Duel: A History of Duelling* (London, 1965).
- Beller, E.A. "The Military Expedition of Sir Charles Morgan to Germany, 1627-9," in *The English Historical Review*, Vol. XLIII, Issue CLXXII (October, 1928), pp.528-539.
- Bennet, Martyn, "The Officer Corps and Army Command in the British Isles, 1620-1660," in D.J.B. Trim (ed.), *The Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism* (Leiden, 2003), pp.291-315.
- Boys, Jayne E.E., *London's News Press and the Thirty Years War* (Woodbridge, 2012).
- Brandon, Pepijn, *War, Capital, and the Dutch State (1588-1795)* (Leiden, 2015).
- Brown, Keith, *Bloodfeud in Scotland, 1573-1625* (Edinburgh, 1986).
—, *Noble Power in Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution* (Edinburgh, 2003).
—, "Honour, Honours and Nobility in Scotland between the Reformation and the National Covenant," in *The Scottish Historical Review*, XCI, 231 (April, 2012), pp.42-75.
- Burke's Peerage, Baronetage and Knightage, Clan Chiefs, Scottish Feudal Barons* (3 Vols., 107th Edition, 2003).

- Cameron, James K., "Some Scottish Students and Teachers at the University of Leiden in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries," in G.G. Simpson (ed.), *Scotland and the Low Countries, 1124-1994* (East Lothian, 1996), pp.89-103.
- Catterall, Douglas, *Community Without Borders, Scots Migrants and the Changing Face of Power in the Dutch Republic, c. 1600-1700* (Leiden, 2002).
- , "The Rituals of Reformed Discipline: Managing Honor and Conflict in the Scottish Church of Rotterdam, 1643-1665," in *Archive for Reformation History*, 94 (2003), pp.194-222.
- , "Scots Along the Maas, c. 1570-1750," in A. Grosjean and S. Murdoch, (eds.), *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period* (Leiden, 2005), pp.169-189.
- Cauwer, Peter de, *Tranen van bloed, Het Beleg van 's-Hertogenbosch en de oorlog in de Nederlanden, 1629* (Amsterdam, 2008).
- Dalton, Charles, *Life and Times of General Sir Edward Cecil, Viscount Wimbeldon, Colonel of an English Regiment in the Dutch Service, 1605-1631, and one of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, 1628-1638* (2 Vols., London, 1885).
- Davidson, John, and Gray, Alexander, *The Scottish Staple at Veere, A Study in the Economic History of Scotland* (London, 1909).
- Donagan, Barbara, "Halcyon Days and the Literature of War: England's Military Education before 1642," in *Past & Present*, 147 (May, 1995), pp.65-100.
- Douglas, Sir Robert, *The Baronage of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1798).
- Dow, Alexander Crawley, *Ministers to the Soldiers of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1962).
- Drummond, William, *The Genealogy of the Most Noble House of Drummond* (Glasgow, 1831).
- Dukes, Paul, "The First Scottish Soldiers in Russia," in Grant G. Simpson (ed.), *The Scottish Soldier Abroad, 1247-1967* (Edinburgh, 1992), pp.47-54.
- Dunthorne, Hugh, "Scots in the Wars of the Low Countries, 1572-1648," in G.G. Simpson (ed.), *Scotland and the Low Countries, 1124-1994* (East Lothian, 1996), pp.104-121.
- , *Britain and the Dutch Revolt, 1560-1700* (Cambridge, 2013).
- Fedosov, D., *The Caledonian Connection: Scotland-Russia ties, Middle Ages to early Twentieth Century. A Concise Biographical List* (Aberdeen, 1996).
- Fischer, T.A., *The Scots in Germany: Being a Contribution Towards the History of the Scot Abroad* (Edinburgh, 1902).
- Furgol, Edward M., *A Regimental History of the Covenanting Armies, 1639-1651* (Edinburgh, 1990).
- Frost, Robert, "Scottish Soldiers, Poland-Lithuania and the Thirty Years' War." in S. Murdoch, (ed.), *Scotland and the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648*, (Leiden, 2001), pp.191-213.
- Geyl, Pieter, *Orange and Stuart, 1641-72* (London, 1939).
- , *The Netherlands in the 17th Century, Part One: 1609-1648* (2nd Edition, London, 1961).
- Glozier, Matthew, "Scots in the French and Dutch Armies during the Thirty Years' War," in Steve Murdoch (ed.), *Scotland and the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648* (Leiden, 2001), pp.116-141.
- Grosjean, Alexia, *An Unofficial Alliance: Scotland and Sweden, 1569-1654* (Leiden, 2003).
- , and Murdoch, Steve, "Introduction," in A. Grosjean and S. Murdoch, (eds.), *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period* (Leiden, 2005), pp.1-24.
- , and Murdoch, Steve, *Alexander Leslie and the Scottish Generals of the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648* (London, 2014).

- Guthrie, W.P., *The Later Thirty Years' War: From the Battle of Wittstock to the Treaty of Westphalia* (Westport, 2003).
- Helmets, Helmer, "Foreign News in Times of Domestic Crisis: the Truce Conflicts, the Thirty Years' War, and the Rise of the Dutch Newspaper," in A. Wilkinson, G. Kemp (eds.), *Negotiating Conflict and Controversy in the Early Modern Book World* (Leiden, 2019), pp.253-268.
- Howat, G.M.D., *Stuart and Cromwellian Foreign Policy* (London, 1974).
- Hutton, Ronald, and Reeves, Wylie, "Sieges and Fortifications," in John Kenyon, Jane Ohlmeyer (eds.), *The Civil Wars: A Military History of England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1638-1660* (Oxford, 1998), pp.195-233.
- Israel, Jonathan, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford, 1995).
- , "Frederick Henry and the Dutch Political Factions, 1625-1642," in *The English Historical Review*, 98, 386 (Jan., 1983), pp.1-27.
- , "Conflict of Empires: Spain and the Netherlands, 1618-1648," in *Past & Present*, 76 (Aug., 1977), pp.34-74.
- Jong, M.A.G. de, "Dutch public finance during the Eighty Years War: the case of the province of Zeeland," in Marco van der Hoeven (ed.), *Exercise of Arms: Warfare in the Netherlands, 1568-1648* (Leiden, 1998), pp.133-152.
- Lem, Anton van der, *Revolt in the Netherlands: 1568-1648*, translated by Andy Brown (London, 2018).
- Little, Andrew R., "British Seamen in the United Provinces during the seventeenth century Anglo-Dutch Wars: the Dutch navy—a preliminary survey," in Hanno Brand (ed.), *Trade, Diplomacy and Cultural Exchange* (Hilversum, 2005), pp.75-92.
- MacCoinnich, Aonghas, "'His spirit was given only to warre': Conflict and Identity in the Scottish *Gáidhealtachd*, c. 1580-1630," in S. Murdoch and A. Mackillop (eds.), *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, c.1550-1900* (Leiden, 2002), pp.133-161.
- Macinnes, Allan, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement, 1625-1641* (Edinburgh, 1991).
- Markham, C.R., *"The Fighting Veres." Lives... of Sir Horace Vere, General of the English Forces in the Low Countries, governor of the Brill, master-general of ordnance...* (Cambridge, 1888).
- Marks, Adam, "Recognizing Friends from Foes: Stuart Politics, English Military Networks and Alliances with Denmark and the Palatinate," in Valentina Caldari and Sara J. Wolfson (eds.), *Stuart Marriage Diplomacy: Dynastic Politics in their European Context, 1604-1630* (Woodbridge, 2018), pp.173-185.
- McCusker, John J., *Money and Exchange in Europe and America, 1600-1775: A Handbook* (Williamsburg, 1978).
- Miggelbrink, Joachim, "The End of the Scots-Dutch Brigade," in S. Murdoch and A. Mackillop (eds.), *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, c.1550-1900* (Leiden, 2002), pp.83-103.
- Mijers, Esther, "A Natural Partnership? Scotland and Zeeland in the Early Seventeenth Century," in A.I. Macinnes and A.H. Williamson (eds.), *Shaping the Stuart World, 1603-1714: The Atlantic Connection* (Leiden, 2006), pp.232-260.
- Miller, James, *Swords for Hire: the Scottish Mercenary* (Edinburgh, 2007).

- Moor, J.A. de, "Experience and Experiment: some reflections upon the military developments in the 16th and 17th centuries," in Marco van der Hoeven (ed.), *Exercise of Arms: Warfare in the Netherlands, 1568-1648* (Leiden, 1998), pp.17-32.
- Morrissey, John, "A Lost Heritage: The Connaught Rangers and multivocal Irishness," in M. McCarthy (ed.), *Ireland's Heritages: Critical Perspectives on Memory and Identity* (Aldershot, 2005), pp.71-87.
- Murdoch, Steve, "Introduction," in in Steve Murdoch (ed.), *Scotland and the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648* (Leiden, 2001), pp.1-26.
- , "James VI and the formation of a Scottish-British Military Identity" in S. Murdoch and A. Mackillop (eds.), *Fighting for Identity: Scottish Military Experience, c.1550-1900* (Leiden, 2002), pp.3-31.
- , *Britain, Denmark-Norway, and the House of Stuart, 1603-1660* (East Lothian, 2003).
- , *Network North: Scottish Kin, Commercial and Covert Association in Northern Europe, 1603-1746* (Leiden, 2006).
- , *The Terror of the Seas? Scottish Maritime Warfare, 1513-1713* (Leiden, 2010).
- , "The Repatriation of Capital to Scotland, a case study of seventeenth-century Dutch testaments and miscellaneous notarial instruments," in Mario Varricchio (ed.), *Back to Caledonia: Scottish Homecomings from the Seventeenth Century to the Present* (Edinburgh, 2012).
- , "Medic! An Insight into Scottish Field Surgeons, Physicians and Medical Provision during the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648," in *Northern Studies*, 48 (2016), pp.50-65.
- , "Nirina ad Heroas Anglos. An overview of the British and the Thirty Years' War," in Serena Jones (ed.), *'Britain turned Germany: The Thirty Years' War and its Impact on the British Isles, 1638-1660* (Warwick, 2019), pp.15-36.
- Nimwegen, Olaf van, *The Dutch Army and the Military Revolutions, 1588-1688*, translated by Andrew May (English Ed., Woodbridge, 2010).
- Onnekink, David and Rommelse, Gijs, *The Dutch in the Early Modern World: A History of a Global Power* (Cambridge, 2019).
- Parker Geoffrey, *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, 1567-1659* (2nd Ed., Cambridge, 2004).
- , "Why Did the Dutch Revolt Last Eighty Years?," in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 26 (1976), pp.53-73.
- , *The Dutch Revolt* (London, 1977).
- , *Europe in Crisis, 1598-1648* (Brighton, 1980).
- (ed.), *The Thirty Years' War* (New York, 1984, 1987).
- , *The Military Revolution: Military innovation and the rise of the West, 1500-1800* (Cambridge, 1988).
- Parrott, David, *Richelieu's Army: War, Government and Society in France, 1624-1642* (Cambridge, 2001).
- , *The Business of War: Military Enterprise and Military Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2012).
- Polisensky, J.V., *The Thirty Years War* (London, 1971).
- , "A note on Scottish Soldiers in the Bohemian War, 1619-1622," in Steve Murdoch (ed.), *Scotland and the Thirty Ynortheears' War, 1618-1648* (Leiden, 2001), pp.109-116.
- Potter, Harry, *Bloodfeud: The Stewarts and the Gordons at War in the Age of Mary Queen of Scots* (Stroud, 2002).

- Prak, Maarten, *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, 2005).
- Rothenberg, Gunther E., "Venice and the Uskoks of Senj: 1537-1618," in *The Journal of Modern History*, 33, 2 (Jun., 1961), pp.148-156.
- Rowen, Herbert H., *The Princes of Orange: The Stadtholders in the Dutch Republic* (Cambridge, 1988).
- Scott, Hew, *Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanæ* (11 Vols., Edinburgh, 1915-1961).
- Schrijver, Elka, "Bergen op Zoom, Stronghold on the Scheldt," in *History Today*, 26, 11 (Nov., 1976), p.749-752.
- Sellin, Paul, "'Souldiers of one Army': John Donne and the Army of the States General as an International Protestant Crossroads," in Mary Arshagouni Papazian (ed.), *John Donne and the Protestant Reformation: New Perspectives* (Detroit, 2003), pp.143-192.
- Simpson, G.G., (ed.) *The Scottish Soldier Abroad, 1247-1967* (Edinburgh, 1992).
- Spring, Laurence, *The First British Army, 1624-1628: The Army of the Duke of Buckingham* (Solihull, 2016).
- Steele, Margaret, "The 'Politick Christian': the Theological Background to the National Covenant," in John Morrill (ed.), *The Scottish National Covenant in its British Context* (Edinburgh, 1990), pp.31-67.
- Swart, K.W., *William of Orange and the Revolt of the Netherlands, 1572-1584*, ed. R.P. Fagel, M.E.H.N. Mout, and H.F.K. van Nierop (Aldershot, 2003).
- Talbott, Siobhan, Grosjean, Alexia, and Murdoch, Steve, "Drummer Major James Spens: Letters from a Common Soldier Abroad, 1617-1632," *Northern Studies*, 47 (2015), pp.76-101.
- Trim, David, "Army, Society and Military Professionalism in the Netherlands during the Eighty Years' War," in D.J.B. Trim (ed.), *The Chivalric Ethos and the Development of Military Professionalism* (Leiden, 2003), pp.291-315.
- , "Calvinist Internationalism and the English Officer Corps, 1562-1642," in *History Compass*, 4, 6 (2006), pp.1024-1048.
- Vogel, H.Ph., "Arms production and exports in the Dutch Republic, 1600-1650," in Marco van der Hoeven (ed.), *Exercise of Arms: Warfare in the Netherlands, 1568-1648* (Leiden, 1998), pp.197-210.
- Wagenaar, F.P., "The 'Waardgelders' of Den Haag, in Marco van der Hoeven (ed.), *Exercise of Arms: Warfare in the Netherlands, 1568-1648* (Leiden, 1998), pp.211-230.
- Wedgwood, C.V., *The Thirty Years War* (1938).
- Wilson, Peter *Europe's Tragedy* (London, 2009).
- Worthington, David, "Alternative Diplomacy? Scottish Exiles at the Courts of the Habsburgs and their Allies, 1618-1648," in Steve Murdoch (ed.), *Scotland and the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648* (Leiden, 2001), pp.51-76.
- , *Scots in Habsburg Service, 1618-1648* (Leiden, 2004).
- Young, John R., "The Scottish Parliament and European Diplomacy, 1641-1647: The Palatinate, The Dutch Republic and Sweden," in Steve Murdoch (ed.), *Scotland and the Thirty Years' War* (Leiden, 2001), pp.77-108.
- Zickermann, Kathrin and Murdoch, Steve, "'Bereft of all Human Help?': Scottish Widows during the Thirty Years' War (1619-1648)" in *Northern Studies*, 50 (2019), pp.114-134.

Zwitzer, H.L., "The Eighty Years War," in Marco van der Hoeven (ed.), *Exercise of Arms: Warfare in the Netherlands, 1568-1648* (Leiden, 1998), pp.33-55.

Online Secondary Sources

- Furgol, Edward M. "Balfour, Sir William (d. 1660), parliamentarian army officer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Published 23 Sept. 2004; revised 3 Jan. 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-1198>. [Accessed 26 Feb. 2019].
- Grosjean, A. and Murdoch, S., "Scotland, Scandinavia, and Northern Europe, 1580-1707" (*SSNE*)—Published online by the University of St Andrews at: <https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/history/ssne/index.php>. Published by the University of St Andrews, November, 2004.
- Lockyer, Roger. 2008 "Cecil, Edward, Viscount Wimbledon (1572–1638), soldier and politician." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Published 23 Feb. 2004; revised 3 Jan. 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-4975>. [Accessed 26 Feb. 2019].
- Stevenson, David. "Livingston [Livingstone], James, first earl of Callendar (d. 1674), army officer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Published 23 September 2004. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-16808>. [Accessed 26 Feb. 2019].
- Trim, D. J. B. 2009 "Vere, Horace [Horatio], Baron Vere of Tilbury (1565–1635), army officer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Published 23 Sept. 2004; revised 8 Oct. 2009. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-28211>. [Accessed 26 Feb. 2019].

Unpublished Dissertations

- Fallon, Jame A., "Scottish Mercenaries in the Service of Denmark and Sweden, 1626-1632," (PhD Thesis, University of Glasgow, 1973).
- Marks, Adam, "England, the English and the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648)," (PhD Thesis, University of St Andrews, 2012).
- Miggelbrink, Joachim, "Serving the Republic: Scottish soldiers in the Republic of the United Provinces, 1572-1782," (PhD Thesis, European University Institute, 2005).
- Trim, David J.B., "Fighting 'Jacob's Wars.' The Employment of English and Welsh Mercenaries in the European Wars of Religion: France and the Netherlands, 1562-1610," (PhD Thesis, King's College London, 2002).