

# The Liturgy and Order of the Mid-Sixteenth Century English Church in Geneva

*Some reflections on the life and influence of a Refugee church*

Robert Jackson

Thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the MTh degree,  
Ecclesiology, at the University of Stellenbosch

Supervisor: Dr Robert Vosloo



ž ¼«

## Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and that I have not previously submitted it at any university for a degree.

Signature:

March 2012

## Summary

What are the predominant characteristics of the Refugee churches established in Europe in the mid-sixteenth century? They are, undoubtedly, those of disputation and argument, dissension and fraction. But there are exceptions, the most notable of which is the English church in Geneva, which was formed in the autumn of 1555 and whose life officially ended when the last English exiles left Geneva in the spring of 1560. The origins of the church lay in the conflicts that had arisen over liturgy in the English church at Frankfurt and these conflicts continued later in Elizabethan England when the Marian exiles, many of them from Geneva, endeavoured to impose their vision of a truly Reformed church on the church of their homeland. For a short period – between the time spent at Frankfurt and the return to England – the English exiles in Geneva were a peaceable community at home with their maker and each other and created there a church that was broad rather than narrow in sympathy. The absence of conflict appears to have enlarged understanding and tolerance of others rather than narrowed it. This had much to do with the liturgy of the church which was one centered on prayer. It was also a liturgy that emphasized practicality, participation and community. The order of the church reflected its liturgy with, in a limited sense, a democratic rather than an authoritarian flavour. The failure of the Marian exiles to impose their view of a truly reformed church on the Elizabethan Church of England reminds us of the alternative approach to ecclesiological arrangements adopted in the Netherlands. While the Dutch Reformed church became the officially established public church of the Netherlands, it was nevertheless accepted, from inception, that only a minority of the population would become communicating members, a situation which has more flavour of the twentieth century than the sixteenth. But the ecclesiological arrangements in the Netherlands were unique and it is sad to record that the effect of the refugee churches was to harden confessional differences between Protestants of the Reformed and Lutheran traditions, making unity between them increasingly unlikely.

# Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Topic.....	2
1.3 Research Problem and Hypothesis .....	2
1.4 Methodology .....	3
1.5 Structure .....	4
<b>Chapter 2. The pre-history of the English church in Geneva – the English church at Frankfurt.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Chapter 3. The life of the English Church in Geneva .....</b>	<b>39</b>
3.1 The Geneva Background .....	39
3.2 The English church in Geneva – Its beginnings and its nature.....	44
3.3 Activities of the English exiles in Geneva.....	51
<b>Chapter 4. The Liturgy and Order of the English church in Geneva .....</b>	<b>63</b>
4.1 ‘Forme of the Common Prayers’ – Confession of Faith – Prayers .....	63
4.2 The Order of the church .....	70
4.3 The Discipline .....	73
4.4 The Morning Service – Prayers .....	76
4.5 The Sacraments and other rites of the church .....	79
4.5.1 The Order of Baptism .....	79
4.5.2 The manner of the Lord’s Supper .....	85
4.5.3 The forme of Marriage .....	88
4.5.4 The visitation of the Sicke .....	90
4.5.5 Of Buriall .....	93
4.5.6 ‘Music’ .....	94
4.6 Liturgy and Order and the life of the church .....	95
4.6.1 Liturgy .....	95
4.6.2 Order .....	99
4.6.3 Liturgy and the Theology of the English exiles in Geneva.....	101
4.6.4 The last days of the English church in Geneva .....	110
<b>Chapter 5. Some comparisons with other Refugee Churches .....</b>	<b>117</b>
5.1 The Stranger Churches in London .....	117
5.2 The English church at Emden .....	127

5.3 The English Church at Frankfurt 1555-1558 .....	132
5.4 The Refugee Churches in Wesel .....	137
5.5 The English Aftermath – Aarau .....	141
5.6 The Flemish and Walloon Refugee churches in Frankfurt .....	143
5.7 The Stranger churches in London – The aftermath .....	149
5.7.1 Doctrinal and other disputes .....	151
5.7.2 Political and economic regulation .....	154
5.7.3 The social and welfare work of the consistories .....	155
<b>Chapter 6. Conclusions .....</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>162</b>
<b>Glossary .....</b>	<b>164</b>

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### 1.1 Background:

The Refugee churches in mid XVI century Europe were the product of persecution, undertaken by defenders of the traditional church, against supporters of the Reformed faith. It has been said that in the Netherlands, more martyrs suffered for the Christian faith than in any other country, "Charles V's determination to root out heresy might be frustrated in Germany, but in his hereditary Netherlands the evangelicals had no powerful patrons to intercede for them."<sup>1</sup> It was thus from the Netherlands that Walloon (French speaking) and Dutch (Low German speaking) refugees, fleeing persecution, became the shock troops of the Refugee churches established in Germany.

At the period we are considering, Germany was part of the Empire, which in the sixteenth century encompassed most of Western Europe outside of France and England. But the Empire was wide and fissiparous. There were parts of it where traditional rights of local princes or city authorities resulted in a certain tolerance of the Reformed faith - a fact of vital importance to Protestant refugees - that would not otherwise have been accepted by the Emperor Charles V.

France also produced its own Protestant refugees and, though far less numerous than their French speaking Walloon counterparts, they were large enough to constitute the basis of the first refugee church, founded in Strasbourg as early as 1538.

These same refugees also fled beyond the lands of Charles V and in England became the basis of the Stranger Churches founded in London in England during the reign of the very protestant Edward VI (1547-53). This movement of peoples, however, became a two way trade when the death of this young king in 1553 saw a reversal of the flight of religious refugees across the English channel. Protestants, fleeing the persecution of Mary Tudor, a vigorous defender of the traditional church, then established refugee churches in various parts of the Empire.

The life of the churches formed by English Protestant refugees was, however, short, their members returning to England on the accession of the Protestant Queen Elizabeth in 1558. In contrast, the lives of the Walloon and Dutch refugee churches were, in some cases, somewhat more long lasting; only towards the end of the century was Protestantism established in the Netherlands and then only in the northern part of the country. The churches formed of this diaspora occasionally lived on beyond the early - modern period. Indeed, the Dutch church in London exists to the present day.<sup>2</sup>

### 1.2 Topic:

This thesis examines the liturgy and order of the mid-XVIth century English church in Geneva, and compares it to that of the major refugee churches elsewhere. The events mentioned above, as well as the Edict of Nantes (1598) in France, act as a sort of time boundary to our study. It is not the intention of this thesis to examine in any detail the lives of the refugee churches - where they continued to exist - into the late XVIth century and beyond.

---

<sup>1</sup> Carter Lindberg, *The European Reformations*, p.283.

<sup>2</sup> Randolph Vigne and Charles Littleton, eds, *From Strangers to Citizens*, p.1 Introduction.

The phrase refugee church perhaps requires definition. As defined here a refugee church is understood as a church founded outside the country of origin of its members for their own use.

Thus, in Strasbourg in the mid sixteenth century there was a Reformed church, but there was also a Reformed refugee church in the city for French speakers. In Geneva in the 1550's there was also a Reformed church. But the French Protestant refugees who overran the city at this time worshipped with the local population, while their less numerous Italian and English Protestant counterparts worshipped in their own churches. Language, at this period, was thus the key factor behind the formation of a refugee church.<sup>3</sup>

Mention should also be made of the peculiar case of Emden in East Friesland, on the far outskirts of the Empire. Here, as a result of the actions of the Regent, Countess Anna of Oldenburg, a local Reformed church had been established by 1545, its membership subsequently becoming strongly influenced by refugees from the nearby Netherlands. However, the church at Emden had not been established specifically for these refugees so does not, technically, on the basis of the definition used above, constitute a refugee church.

It is the assumption of this thesis that liturgy and order may be seen to be the expression of the way in which human beings think of themselves and each other and their relationship to God. What, therefore, do we learn of how the mid sixteenth century Protestant refugees thought of themselves, their relationship to each other and to God from their adopted liturgies and orders? What were the major differences between the various orders and liturgies and what was the significance of these differences?

### **1.3 Research Problem and Hypothesis:**

Should we say that a refugee church tends to be a conflictual one? Perhaps so. But it is suggested here that it can also be a peaceful community. Furthermore, if liturgy and order may be considered to represent the essence of the life of a church and its members it should help us answer three underlying questions which are posed in this thesis.

*Firstly*, who were these Refugees? Were they all what J.J. Scarisbrick has referred to as Protestants of the "hotter sort - hot gospeller as opposed to cold statute protestant?"<sup>4</sup> Or were they collections of people who, out of personal interest, happened to have assembled together outside their own country rather as, put in a twentieth century context, might the members of a local tennis club? Or, perhaps they were something of both?

*Secondly*, was there any identifiable type or character of Refugee church? Was there a natural tendency towards disputation and fraction in these communities or to one of unity?

*Thirdly*, did the Refugee churches, exercise any influence on the course of church history as well as on the history of the countries of origin of their members?

---

<sup>3</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers En Pays Rhénans (1538-1564)*, p.622.

<sup>4</sup> J.J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English people*, pp.179 and 162.

#### 1.4 Methodology:

This thesis will examine these issues primarily through the life of the XVIth century English church in Geneva. How can we know anything of the life of this church? We are, to a large extent, hostages to the accounts of others who have gone before us. Yet, we are also “like dwarfs standing on the shoulders of giants; thanks to them we see farther than they.”<sup>5</sup> This must be our aspiration, for the seminal work on the English Church in Geneva was undertaken by Charles Martin, a former pastor in the Geneva church, who completed his *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin, 1555-1560 Leur Eglise-Leur Ecrits* in 1915.

But, the world around us is changing, while our interpretation of the past is changing too. This is reflected in an ever changing historiography. Who, for instance, would now endorse Martin’s comment, on the first page of his study, when, in talking of the traditional church in England, he says: “malgré la haine que le clergé avait inspirée par ses excès de tous genres.”<sup>6</sup> But, secondary literature nevertheless remains an important guide to an interpretation given at the beginning of the twenty first century as it would have done to one made at the beginning of the twentieth.

In the case of the English church in Geneva, however, we are also fortunate to have access to primary sources, particularly the *Livre des Anglois*, a form of church register recording the names of officers at the church, its members, as well as the births, marriages and deaths that occurred there during its short life of just over three and a half years. A careful analysis of the manuscript of the *Livre des Anglois* suggests that some of the conventional assumptions about the church, and not those necessarily associated with Charles Martin, need to be challenged. One of the most widely held of these is that the English church in Geneva was made up of Scarisbrick’s Protestants of the ‘hotter sort’. The view expressed in this thesis is that this was not the case and that the church was much more latitudinarian in tendency than is generally thought. Unfortunately, or fortunately, according to taste, the English church in Geneva has lived on appearance rather than reality as much for the modern student as it did for her contemporaries.

Any assessment of the particular influence of this church perforce needs to be put into the context of that of the life of other refugee churches. In this study a brief examination of some of these other churches will be made through the secondary literature. Their life and the context in which it was lived was often very different from that of the church of the English exiles in Geneva. Whereas the latter manifested a tendency towards unity, most of the other refugee churches showed one towards disputation and fraction. One aim of this thesis is to establish why this was the case.

This is a literary thesis and one undertaken within the faculty of theology of the University of Stellenbosch. It has long been fashionable to condemn confessional interpretations of the XVI century Reformation as inevitably partisan and the consequent emphasis over much of the last half century has thus been placed on secular interpretations. It would be absurdly pretentious to suggest that this thesis endeavours to go against this trend but to the extent that assumptions are here challenged, all assumptions are challenged, secular ones as much as any other.

---

<sup>5</sup> Carter Lindberg, *The European Reformations*, p.1, quoting Peter of Blois (d.1212).

<sup>6</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin*, p.1. “in spite of the hatred that the clergy had inspired by its excesses of every sort.”



## 1.5 Structure:

Chapter 1: *Introduction*

Chapter 2: *The pre-history of the English church in Geneva - the English church at Frankfurt.* The English church in Geneva sprang out of disputes over liturgy that took place in Frankfurt; a group from the Frankfurt church subsequently establishing a church in Geneva. Liturgy at Frankfurt had been the source of disputation and fraction, not one of unity. The view expressed in this thesis is that these arguments were quite unnecessary and that the differences between the two antagonistic groups were more apparent than real. The arguments that took place do not reflect well on a Christian community.

Chapter 3: *The life of the English church in Geneva* is portrayed against the dramatic changes, both religious and economic, that took place in Geneva prior to the arrival of the English exiles in 1555. These changes provided a supportive background for the English refugees. Contrary to the widely accepted view, their church is portrayed in this thesis as of a broad rather than a narrow sympathy and it is suggested here that its 'latitudinarian' nature is one reason for its peaceableness which was not a feature of most refugee churches elsewhere.

Chapter 4: *The liturgy and Order of the English church in Geneva* is then set out in the context both of the theology of the English exiles and the many literary or, rather, theological works that they produced while in exile. More important, as liturgy is linked to life, it is also set out in the context of real people, in the baptisms, marriages and deaths that occurred at the church. It is suggested that the key to the liturgy was practicality, participation and community.

Chapter 5: *Some comparisons with other refugee churches:* Mention is made here of the Stranger churches in London, the English church in Emden and Aarau as well as the refugee churches in Wesel and Frankfurt. Both differences and similarities to 'Geneva' are highlighted. From these churches, unlike from the English church in Geneva, come the seeds of Congregationalism. Most of these churches also lived at the time of, and contributed to, the hardening of confessional differences within the Protestant tradition.

Chapter 6: *Conclusions:* The legacy of these churches is incredibly diverse. While a beacon of light, the immediate influence of 'Geneva' on subsequent developments in England was slight and that a negative one. The Dutch and Walloon refugee churches in London can be judged to have had a much more heroic influence in keeping alive the churches under the cross in the Netherlands and on the subsequent formation of the Dutch Reformed church. But the refugee churches within the empire also contributed to the hardening of confessional differences within Protestantism which made impossible any unity between the Lutheran and Reformed traditions.

The liturgy and Order of the various refugee churches has not left any uniform legacy.

*Bibliography*

*Glossary*

## Chapter 2: The pre-history of the English church in Geneva – the English church at Frankfurt

“While the martyrs helped to ensure a reversal of Mary’s policy, the radicalism and the swiftness of that reversal may largely be ascribed to another group of the queen’s opponents, the so-called Marian exiles.”<sup>7</sup> Such is the assessment of the influence of the Protestant refugees from the England of Mary Tudor in A.G. Dickens’s study of the English Reformation.

The major source of information on these English<sup>8</sup> exiles - on which Dickens draws - remains the work of Christina Hallowell Garrett published in 1938.<sup>9</sup> Garrett lists a total of 472 exiles in her compendium, though this is probably an underestimate for Andrew Pettegree has pointed out in ‘The English Church at Emden’<sup>10</sup> that Garrett did not visit the Emden archives as part of her study, which would account for the low number (eleven) of exiles that she associates with the English church there. In fact the English church at Emden was founded with 32 families, implying a congregation of over one hundred.<sup>11</sup> This gives a considerable boost to Garrett’s list of 472 for all exiles or 788 persons when wives, children and unaccompanied women are included.

These exiles, unlike members of the refugee churches established by the diaspora from the Netherlands, were predominantly privileged people, Dickens suggesting that “it would be hard to find in European history such a concentration of intellectual and social distinction within an emigrant body of such modest numbers.”<sup>12</sup> Garrett goes further and states that “the predominant character of the exodus was aristocratic”<sup>13</sup> Over forty percent of Garrett’s exiles are listed by her as Gentry, followed up closely by Clergymen and Students. She draws our attention to the interesting fact that students (119), in which category she includes deacons,<sup>14</sup> “theological students in the making, self-constituted preachers and ex-religious not in orders”<sup>15</sup> well outnumber ordained clergymen (67) of whom only eight had been ordained during the reign of the very protestant Edward VI. Only twelve per cent of Garrett’s exiles are listed by her as artisans and/or workers and she suggests that some of these were probably servants<sup>16</sup> travelling in the household of a privileged exile. No doubt the social status of these exiles spoke for a far greater influence than their numbers, but it is nevertheless worth

---

<sup>7</sup> A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, p.386.

<sup>8</sup> The adjective English is used advisedly. For the Marian exiles included not only English protestants fleeing the traditional church of Mary Tudor but also members of the Stranger churches. These had been established in England, during the reign of Edward VI, Mary Tudor’s step-brother, to shelter Protestants fleeing religious persecution of the traditional church on the continent of Europe.

<sup>9</sup> Christina Hallowell Garrett, *The Marian Exiles. A study in the origins of Elizabethan Puritanism*.

<sup>10</sup> Andrew Pettegree, ‘The English Church at Emden,’ *Marian Protestantism*, p.12.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p.13.

<sup>12</sup> Dickens, *The English Reformation*, p.388.

<sup>13</sup> Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.41.

<sup>14</sup> The status of Deacon in the Church of England reflected the unreformed structure of that church. A deacon was a cleric who would normally proceed to further ordination as a priest. In reformed churches the deacon was a layman, normally responsible for the care of the poor and the sick.

<sup>15</sup> Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, p.42.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

remembering that, in total, they represented an infinitesimal percentage of the population of England which was, at the time, estimated at four million.<sup>17</sup>

The original five of these communities of exiled English Protestants were established in Emden, Frankfurt, Strasbourg, Wesel and Zurich. Basle, Geneva and Aarau were their subsequent offshoots: Aarau becoming the home of exiles expelled by Lutheran intransigence from Wesel; Geneva and Basle for the disaffected party who left the English exile church established in Frankfurt. However, it should also be mentioned that Garrett gives some prominence to a number of exiles who, as Dickens records, “nevertheless lingered in France where the government also had ample reason to encourage anti-Spanish plotters and would be invaders of England.”<sup>18</sup> It may be true, as Garrett tells us,<sup>19</sup> that “between religion and politics in the mentality of the Marian Exiles the difference was but a hair’s breadth” but these people whose interests were ‘political’ rather than ‘religious’ stand outside the mainstream of Marian exiles, representing less than ten per cent of Garrett’s own compendium.

Mary Tudor was proclaimed Queen in July 1553 and the first exiles appear to have left England in the autumn of that year, a movement which gathered pace during 1554. It was in June 1554 that the first English exiles: William Whittingham, William Williams, Edmund Sutton and Thomas Wood and their companies, arrived in Frankfurt. Here they were met by Valérand Poullain, who had previously ministered to a group of Walloon weavers, Protestant exiles from persecution in the Netherlands, at Glastonbury in Somerset in England. The Glastonbury project was the first planned settlement on English soil - undertaken on the initiative of the Protector, the Duke of Somerset - with an unashamedly economic motive. In addition to houses, land and other financial inducements, these skilled foreign workmen were also allowed to establish an independent church community on the pattern of the London stranger churches. It was the strongly religious character of the Glastonbury settlement which ensured that it would not survive the change of religion in 1553. On 5 September of that year the government gave orders that the foreign weavers be evicted from their property and by the end of the year Poullain had led them back to the continent.<sup>20</sup>

Of all the English exile communities established on the continent of Europe during the reign of Mary Tudor, it is undoubtedly the one at Frankfurt that has attracted the most attention of historians of the period, given the arguments that occurred there over the *Book of Common Prayer*, the order and liturgy of the Church of England. For, it was the unexpected death of the young King Edward VI in 1553 which resulted in the peculiar state of that church at the end of his reign, one that Diarmaid MacCulloch has described as “the Cuckoo in the Nest,”<sup>21</sup> a church with a reformed doctrine enshrined in the 1553 Edwardian articles of religion, yet accompanied by an unreformed structure and liturgy only partially reformed. This point is of the utmost importance and must be borne in mind throughout the Frankfurt troubles. For, the dispute between the two parties was not about doctrine but about the only partially reformed liturgy. Many of the English exiles felt that, as the process of reformation had been interrupted by the young King’s death, so it was only normal for them to continue the process of reformation from continental exile.

---

<sup>17</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.40.

<sup>18</sup> A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, p.389.

<sup>19</sup> Garrett, *The Marian Exiles* pp. 14 and 33.

<sup>20</sup> Andrew Pettegree, ‘The London Exile community’ *Marian Protestantism*, p.69.

<sup>21</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The later Reformation in England 1547-1603*, p 32.

MacCulloch has raised the question: what would the Church of England have looked like if Mary Tudor had not acceded to the throne when she did? He suggests that “the reform of canon law would have been achieved, the 1553 primer and catechism would have become the standard, the Forty-Two articles would have been unmodified by Elizabethan sacramentalist hesitations”<sup>22</sup> and “Archbishop Cranmer, living to his allotted three-score years and ten or beyond, could have produced the third version of his Prayer Book, in the light of friendly criticism from Continental Reformers whom he respected, like Martyr, Bullinger and Calvin.”<sup>23</sup> But, this, of course, is speculation and, as Patrick Collinson reminds us, for the exiles abroad, with Mary Tudor having acceded to the English throne, their situation raised a haunting question. Where did authority reside within the Church of England now that it was transplanted (or parts of it) to a foreign soil? For the exiles at Frankfurt this became an “an essentially political contest for the right to consolidate the English Reformation in exile and to determine its destiny.”<sup>24</sup>

*A Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfurt* is the first record that we have of the English exiles who fled abroad to the continent of Europe during the reign of Mary Tudor. It is generally regarded as a highly partisan document, published in England at the height of the controversy in the 1570's between supporters of the existing Prayer Book and those advocating its further revision or reform.<sup>25</sup> In this sense the *Discourse* both anticipated arguments between supporters and opponents of the 1559 religious settlement that came to dominate the Elizabethan church, as well as reflected them.

Apart from the original edition of the *Discourse*, published in Heidelberg in 1575, the pamphlet has been republished three times: in 1708, in 1846 by John Petheram and in 1908 by Edward Arber. Patrick Collinson is of the view that the best modern text is Petheram's and that Arber's suffers from editorial idiosyncrasies and is sometimes inaccurate.<sup>26</sup> However that may be, Arber's layout and paragraphing are helpful for the reader and, for the purpose of this study, it is this edition that has been followed. Arber's text, as with Petheram's, is unaltered from the 1575 edition. Where, however, Arber differs from his predecessors is in his inclusion of documents that did not appear in the original text: a life of William Whittingham by an anonymous but sympathetic author; John Knox's account of his banishment from Frankfurt - though part of this account is included in the introduction to Petheram's edition; the letter of the Prayer Book supporters at Frankfurt to Calvin in April 1555, a

---

<sup>22</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, p.618.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p.618.

<sup>24</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal 1519 – 1583*, p.73.

<sup>25</sup> One party came to be labelled Conformist, the other Puritan. Definitions, however, pose enormous problems. For, Conformists were often Puritans, the best example being Archbishop Grindall whose defiance of Queen Elizabeth, over the suppression of prophesyings, echoes down the ages: “Bear with me Madam, if I choose rather to offend your earthly Majesty than to offend the heavenly majesty of God.” However, at the risk of simplification the term Puritan is used in this study to describe someone who felt that a truly reformed church was one that should follow the model already established in parts of Continental Europe. At the time we are considering, Puritan or Precisian was a term of abuse, used by their opponents to describe a group of people they perceived as one setting themselves apart from other people. As John Guy tells us in *Tudor England*, p.305, “the core of the puritan position lay in the capacity of ‘godly’ protestants to recognize each other within a corrupt and unregenerate world.” Within their own company Puritans referred to themselves as the Godly.

<sup>26</sup> Patrick Collinson, ‘The authorship of A Brieff Discours off the Troubles begonne at Frankford’ *Godly People - Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*, p.191.

subsequent letter to Calvin from a similar group at Frankfurt five months later, as well as a letter, at the same period, from Whittingham to Calvin announcing his forthcoming arrival in Geneva.

Both 1846 and 1908 editions assume that the author of the *Discourse* was William Whittingham; indeed a large part of Petheram's introduction to his own edition is devoted to comments in support of Whittingham's authorship, something that Collinson finds "unlikely, if not incredible" given that by 1567 Whittingham, as Dean of Durham, had become more conformist.<sup>27</sup> This was a source of considerable bitterness between himself and his old friend Thomas Wood, whom Collinson suggests is the real author of the *Discourse*, a suggestion that is now largely accepted by historians of the period.

It has already been stated that the *Discourse* is generally regarded as partisan, written from a strongly Puritan point of view in defense of the position of the dissidents who eventually left Frankfurt. This may be so, but there appears to be less need to question its record of events even though one might raise questions regarding its interpretation of them. It is thus the text of the *Discourse* which is used as the basic guide to developments at Frankfurt as recounted in this study.

Events moved fast for the English exiles who arrived in Frankfurt on the 27 June 1554. Not only did Valérand Poullain, who acted as a sort of mentor and sponsor for the exiles, find them lodgings but by the end of the month he had obtained permission from the city magistrates not only for them, but for other Englishmen who might come to Frankfurt for similar reasons, to reside in the city. No doubt Poullain was keen to repay the English exiles for the hospitality he had himself recently received in their own country.

Poullain and his community of Glastonbury weavers had arrived in Frankfurt only three months previously and, following negotiations with the former Prioress, had already received permission to use the Weissfrauenkirche (Church of the White Ladies) for worship. Their first service was held there on 19 April 1554. Three months later, the English exiles also received permission to use this same church but with the important proviso, laid down by the city magistrates that they "should not dissent from the Frenchmen in Doctrine or Ceremonies; lest they should thereby minister occasion of offence."<sup>28</sup> To seal this agreement the new arrivals were asked to sign the same confession of faith - La Confession de Foy - as the French, which was the same Confession as that used at Glastonbury and is enshrined in Poullain's *Liturgia Sacra*.

Here we enter on one of the strange - perhaps the most strange - aspects of the English exile. The original arrivals in Frankfurt - with the possible exception of Edmund Sutton - would later be labelled Puritans; people whom one would have thought would have been sympathetic to Poullain's liturgy and order. Indeed, later in the *Discourse* Whittingham describes the *Liturgia Sacra* "which is according to the Order of Geneva, the purest Reformed Church in Christendom."<sup>29</sup> As the Frankfurt magistrates had specifically asked the English exiles to follow the French order, why, then, did they not do so? Language was not the problem. Unlike his colleagues, Whittingham was a competent linguist, an urbane and sophisticated man, one who was widely travelled and who had previously spent part of

---

<sup>27</sup> Patrick Collinson, 'The authorship of A Brieff Discours off the Troubles begonne at Frankford' *Godly People*, p.196.

<sup>28</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfurt 1554-1558*, p.24.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p.74.

his earlier career as a diplomat. He was on good terms with the English Ambassador in Paris, Sir William Pickering, and frequently went to the French court with him.<sup>30</sup> To translate the *Liturgia Sacra* from French into English - quite apart from Latin into English - would have presented him with no problem whatsoever. Had he done so and had this liturgy become that of the English exile church in Frankfurt, there would, presumably, have been no troubles at Frankfurt and, perhaps, no English church in Geneva. The English at Frankfurt would have been seen as a passive, obedient community, following the order of the local magistrate and one who, on their own account, was a godly one. But leaders of the English exiles in Frankfurt were neither passive nor obedient and clearly had another motive which was, as Collinson has suggested, "to consolidate the English reformation in exile and to determine its destiny"<sup>31</sup>

The Frankfurt exiles thus immediately set to work on the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer* having established, so the *Discourse* tells us, that "they were not so strictly bound, as was told them, to the Ceremonies of the French by the Magistrates; but that if the one allowed of the other, it was sufficient."<sup>32</sup> From the Edwardian 1552 Prayer Book it was "concluded that the answering aloud after the minister not be used: the Litany, Surplice and many other things also omitted."<sup>33</sup> The general confession of the Prayer Book was also replaced by what the *Discourse* calls one "both of more effect, and also framed according to the state and time."<sup>34</sup>

With an agreed order of service the congregation then chose their minister and deacons. Having departed from the 1552 Prayer Book in Liturgy, they did so in Order with the installation of Deacons with responsibilities typically associated with those in Reformed churches. Ministers could, of course, hardly be appointed by Bishops or lay patrons, as this was the Church of England in exile. The congregation thus chose their minister, presumably by election. In this they were in a peculiar situation as their leader, William Whittingham, was not ordained, a situation that would cause him considerable embarrassment later in the century in Elizabethan England when he served as Dean of Durham. It was thus John Makebray, a Scot, who became the first minister of the church. In this choice the exiles, whatever their apparent hostility to the order of the traditional church, showed a strong respect for ordination, a rite that was indeed to become of the utmost importance in the Reformed church established in Geneva. Some observers have even gone so far as to suggest that Calvin thought that the call to ordination should be considered as a sacrament.<sup>35</sup> In this, Calvin's influence - ten years before his death in 1564 - had already spread to the English exiles in Frankfurt.

Crucial to a reformed church, a discipline was also drawn up, in which rules were made both for the congregation as a whole as well as for church officials. The first part of the discipline concerned the whole church, in which no one was to be admitted as a member before both making a declaration of faith before the minister and elders as expressing agreement with the doctrine of the church and a readiness to submit to its discipline. No one whose beliefs or behaviour were tainted was to be accepted as a member without due repentance. Members were obliged to attend meetings for prayer,

---

<sup>30</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.119.

<sup>31</sup> See above page 7.

<sup>32</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.24.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p.24.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

<sup>35</sup> Georg Plasger, *Ecclesiology, The Calvin Handbook*, p.330 - see also William J. Bouwsma *John Calvin*, Chapter 14.

preaching and hearing of God's word, as well as the administration of the sacraments.<sup>36</sup> Provision was also made for catechising the youth, as well as for the correction of private and privy offences and public and open crimes, a procedure that led from a private rebuke between one member of the congregation and another to excommunication, where repentance was not forthcoming.

The second part of the discipline concerned the election and respective duties of the officers of the church: the pastor or minister, the preachers<sup>37</sup> - who were to assist the minister in his duties, especially in matters of doctrine - as well as the elders and deacons.<sup>38</sup> The discipline also notes that the same Order and Form is to be used for the reformation of offences and crimes in Ministers and Elders, which is described for other offenders; and to be done towards them with somewhat more severity. At the same time "it was determined by the congregation that all such as should come after, should do the like, before they were admitted as members of the church."<sup>39</sup>

The first service of the church was held on 29 July 1554. Its structure was very simple. Following the confession the congregation sang a psalm in metre in a plain tune, after which the minister led a prayer for the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, then proceeding to the sermon. After the sermon there followed a general prayer for all estates and a special one for England. Then came the Creed, another psalm and the benediction. "Scripture-reading was omitted as a useless formality."<sup>40</sup> Arber, in a footnote to his edition of the *Discourse*, states that "in the above Calvinistic Scheme of Public Worship, the Public Reading of the Scriptures has no place"<sup>41</sup> yet, as we have seen, church members were obliged to attend meetings, presumably held during the week, for prayer, preaching and hearing of God's word.

The first liturgy of the morning service thus looks as follows:

- Confession
- Psalm
- Prayer for assistance of the Holy Spirit
- Sermon
- Prayer for all estates and a special one for England
- Creed
- Psalm
- Benediction

It should be noted that this first liturgy of the Frankfurt exiles appears to be virtually identical to that set out for service in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, the liturgy subsequently adopted by the English Church in Geneva.

---

<sup>36</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.144.

<sup>37</sup> In other reformed traditions this office was frequently referred to as Doctor, as discussed in Philip Benedict *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, pp. 451-4.

<sup>38</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.148.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p.26.

<sup>40</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.120.

<sup>41</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse* (ed, Arber) p.25, footnote.

The *Discourse* records that, thus established, it was then thought:

Good among themselves, that forthwith they should advertise their countrymen and brethren dispersed, of this singular benefit, the like whereof could nowhere else, as yet, be obtained: and to persuade them, all worldly respects put apart, to repair thither, that they might all together, with one mouth and one heart, both lament their former wickedness, and also be thankful to their merciful Father that had given them such a Church in a strange land wherein they might hear GOD's Word truly preached, the Sacraments rightly ministered and Discipline used; which in their own country could never be obtained.<sup>42</sup>

The *Discourse* appears incorrect in its assertion that "the like whereof could nowhere else, as yet, be obtained" for the first services at the English church in Emden probably took place in the spring or early summer of 1554.<sup>43</sup> However, the extent of the facilities offered to the exiles at Frankfurt could be regarded as the justification for the letter sent out by the church to the exiles based in Zurich, Strasbourg, Emden and elsewhere on 2 August 1554.

One of the fascinating aspects of the *Discourse* is the recorded list of signatories to letters sent out by, as well as those received by, the Frankfurt exiles. They give us an insight into the shifting currents and mood of the English exiles. The church in Frankfurt was growing and it is understandable that new names should appear as signatures to correspondence over time. However, it is interesting to note, in this context, that the name of Edmund Sutton, who had arrived at Frankfurt with Whittingham, Wood and Williams, does not appear as signatory to the letter of August 1554 sent out to the English exiles in other locations. Sutton could, of course, have been out of town at the time the letter was prepared. But, it is possible that the absence of his signature reflects, even at an early stage, a division between the zealous and less zealous members of the church and that Sutton wished to disassociate himself from the overture, or the tone in which the overture to the other exiles was phrased. Garrett, in her compendium, lists him as a person of substance and importance for, on 7 March 1555, he became a citizen of Frankfurt, an honour for which only the rich could pay. Sutton did not follow Whittingham to Geneva and appears to have remained in Frankfurt throughout the exile.<sup>44</sup>

From what might Sutton have wished to disassociate himself in the Frankfurt letter? M.M Knappen is right to say of this letter that "on first reading it has a strange ring for a message from one set of exiles to others who have also left their country rather than betray their faith."<sup>45</sup> In fact, the letter hardly reads like an invitation at all but is rather "a peremptory summons, couched in the hortatory and holier than thou language of a call to repentance."<sup>46</sup> It reflects that irritating aspect of the Godly, perceived by outsiders, namely that only they - the Godly - knew the Lord; it was therefore their duty to bring the Lord to others. In this role the English exiles in Frankfurt, or some of them, did indeed perceive that only they knew the Lord and that it was their duty to bring the Lord to others. A taste of their letter comes in its conclusion: "Consider Brethren, it is GOD's cause. He requireth you. It is your duty. Necessity urgeth. Time willeth. Your Father speaketh, Children must obey. Our enemies are

---

<sup>42</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.25.

<sup>43</sup> Andrew Pettegree 'The English church at Emden' *Marian Protestantism*, p.13.

<sup>44</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, pp. 300-1.

<sup>45</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.121.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p.121.



diligent; and the adversary is at hand.”<sup>47</sup> Frankfurt indeed thought of themselves as the flagship of the English exiles whose responsibility it was “to consolidate the reformation in exile and to determine its destiny.”<sup>48</sup>

Frankfurt was in for a shock. For the first reply to their letter came from the English exiles in Strasbourg who purported not to understand its contents. They had interpreted the letter as a request for a minister. It is hard to avoid the suspicion that Strasbourg’s reply was disingenuous, particularly when they suggested John Ponet, John Bale, John Scory or Richard Cox as ministers for the Frankfurt exiles. Indeed the *Discourse* recounts that from Strasbourg Edmund Grindal wrote to John Scory, then at Emden, persuading him to take up the job.

Patrick Collinson has described the original Frankfurt exiles, Whittingham excepted, as nonentities, in the sense that they had held no high offices in government, the Church or the universities in England.<sup>49</sup> N.M. Sutherland emphasises the same point when she says: “The majority of the refugees claimed that they had gone into exile for the sake of the second Edwardian Prayer Book - - if this appears to be surprising, one must remember that many of the individuals in question had been establishment men, who still hoped to resume their interrupted careers.”<sup>50</sup> We thus have here a sociological distinction between the two groups; establishment men and outsiders. Undoubtedly Strasbourg, with its clutch of Edwardian ecclesiastics, was pulling rank on Frankfurt in an effort to bring recalcitrant fellow countrymen - and Christians - into line. For establishment men in Strasbourg, correct behaviour meant use of the 1552 Prayer Book. Disingenuous or no, Strasbourg’s suggestion of a minister came too late, for the *Discourse* records that Frankfurt had already elected Knox, then at Geneva, Lever at Zurich and Haddon at Strasbourg to be their ministers.

It is worth observing - given the importance that the Strasbourg exiles attached to the Prayer Book - that Grindal’s suggestion of Scory, a former Bishop of Rochester who actually accepted the proffered post at Frankfurt, had it still been available, appears surprising. For, while Scory was minister at Emden it appears that the church there may not have been following the 1552 Prayer Book. Pettegree states that while no order of service has survived, the congregational life of the English church in Emden owed a great deal to the pattern and inspiration of John à Lasco’s London Stranger church. The English church adopted a congregational regime largely patterned upon à Lasco’s church order where the two ministers Scory and Young - a future Archbishop of York - were assisted by six elders and nine deacons. A reformed order might have led to a reformed liturgy. At all events, it appears that Grindal was misinformed about the English church in Emden which, in a letter to Nicholas Ridley in 1555, he referred to as “not very frequent.”<sup>51</sup> It was, in fact, very frequent for it was both organised and thriving.

We do not know from the *Discourse* how the other exile centres replied to the Frankfurt letter, with the notable exception of Zurich who, though slow to reply, fully understood the implications of the Frankfurt letter. The Zurich reply was dated 13 October 1554 and actually crossed a second letter from Frankfurt to them dated 26 September. This second letter from Frankfurt was notably softer in

---

<sup>47</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.30.

<sup>48</sup> See p.7.

<sup>49</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.74.

<sup>50</sup> N.M. Sutherland ‘The English Refugees at Geneva 1555-1559’ *History Today* (December 1977), p.780.

<sup>51</sup> Andrew Pettegree, ‘The English church at Emden’, *Marian Protestantism* p.13.

tone, as reflected by the opening paragraph: “to pray together, to comfort, instruct and profit, one another,”<sup>52</sup> perhaps Frankfurt had, in the meantime, learnt something from the Strasbourg reply. However, the Zurich reply of the 13 October was to Frankfurt’s original letter and it questioned whether such a suggested move was really necessary. Yet, the Zurich exiles stated that they would not utterly deny the request from Frankfurt and if their fellow exiles insisted, they would visit them the following Easter (14 April 1555).

But there was a condition attached to this commitment, “that we may all together serve and praise God as freely and as uprightly (whereof private letters received lately from Frankfurt make us much to doubt) as the Order last taken in the Church of England permitteth and prescribeth - for we are fully determined to admit and use no other.”<sup>53</sup> Zurich confirmed this position in a second letter to Frankfurt dated 27 October 1554: “we will not deny to remove from hence unto you- - - that we, with you, may, and shall, use the same Order of Service concerning Religion which was in England last set forward by King Edward.”<sup>54</sup>

It is clear that in the initial period of the exile Strasbourg and Zurich had emerged as the staunch supporters of the 1552 Prayer Book. Mention has already been made of the interesting case of Emden, while the other original refuge of the English exiles, Wesel, may also be regarded as something of a special case. It may well be that this town appears, like Emden, to have adopted à Lasco’s form of church polity, in spite of the fact that “the congregation’s sympathies were wholly with Knox’s opponents in the Frankfurt dispute;”<sup>55</sup> yet they resolved, as MacCulloch also tells us, only “to retain so much of the book heretofore in our own country received as now most fitly standeth with this time, places and persons.”<sup>56</sup> This would suggest only muted support of the Prayer Book. However, MacCulloch, in an apparent contradiction of the foregoing, adds that “the radical step that Knox and his allies then proposed was not to modify the book as Cranmer might presume to have intended, but to replace it altogether by the English translation of the Geneva liturgy published in London in 1550. No other exile community, he continues, was prepared to do this: no one else (Wesel?) was even prepared to accept the compromise pick-and-mix of Geneva and the Prayer Book which Frankfurt then offered.”<sup>57</sup> Robin Leaver gives some confirmation of this by bringing our attention<sup>58</sup> to another source that has only come to light in recent years, the small metrical psalter, *Psalmes of David in Metre* (Wesel, 1556) which, he suggests, was clearly designed to be a companion to the Prayer book for the exile congregation in Wesel, since, unlike the Frankfurt and Geneva documents, it includes no liturgy.<sup>59</sup> Wesel may, therefore be regarded as Prayer Book supporters, albeit muted ones.

It was Richard Chambers who brought Zurich’s letters with him when he arrived in Frankfurt at the beginning of November 1554. He had been sent by Zurich to negotiate with Frankfurt but had no success in closing the divergent positions of the two cities over the 1552 Prayer Book. Chambers was more than just a messenger. Wealthy in his own right, Garrett suggests that, with supporting patrons,

---

<sup>52</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.34.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, p.33.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, p.35.

<sup>55</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, p.183.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p.184.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p.177.

<sup>58</sup> Robin Leaver, *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*, p.4.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

he was the financier behind the whole exile.<sup>60</sup> It is no surprise, therefore, that the next mention of him in the *Discourse* is his arrival at Frankfurt at the end of November 1554 but not from Zurich but from Strasbourg and in the company of Edmund Grindal. A week or so earlier John Knox had arrived at Frankfurt to take up his post as minister of the English church there, thus now setting the scene for a major confrontation between supporters and opponents of the Edwardian Prayer Book.

The debate centered on the question of Ceremonies. The opponents of the Edwardian 1552 Prayer Book occupied what Euan Cameron has described as the exclusive position, namely one that only permitted worship which could be proved to be scriptural.<sup>61</sup> This was pre-eminently the position of John Knox. This stance stood in contrast to what might be called the inclusive position; one that would outlaw only what was explicitly contrary to Scripture. This was the position of the supporters of the 1552 Prayer Book. It might be assumed that the “exclusivists” had the advantage of logic or consistency on their side and that the position of the “inclusivists” was a weaker one because it was inevitably more fluid. This was not necessarily the case. Cranmer, for example, delighted in scoring points off his opponents when he told the exclusivists that “whatsoever is not commanded in the scripture is against the scripture and ungodly is the chief foundation of the error of the Anabaptists.”<sup>62</sup>

But, Cranmer’s point had been made to the Edwardian council in London and not to the Frankfurt exiles, who, in a reply to Zurich’s two letters stated: “As touching the effect of the Book, we desire the execution thereof as much as you, so far as GOD’s Word doth commend it: but as for unprofitable Ceremonies, as well by his consent as by ours, are not to be used. And although they were tolerable, as some are not; yet, being in a strange common-wealth, we could not be suffered to put them in use: and better it were, they should never be practiced; than they should be the subversion of our Church, which should fall in great hazard by using them.”<sup>63</sup>

These latter words reflect the spirit of an observation made by Peter Martyr that the problem with adiaphora, (things indifferent) was that they tended to become entrenched over time and what started as a thing indifferent eventually became a thing central.

This issue is of such importance that it is worth labouring at some length. What follows is the statement on the issue from the *Book of Common Prayer*, the edition<sup>64</sup> that was used in the Church of England throughout most of the twentieth century and which itself was not substantially changed from the 1552 Prayer Book. It is quoted in its entirety and sums up the issue clearly:

OF CEREMONIES – Why some be abolished, and some retained.

Of such Ceremonies as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning by the institution of man, some at the first were of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and superstition: some entered into the Church by indiscreet devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge; and for because they were winked at in the beginning, they

---

<sup>60</sup> Christina Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, pp.111-114.

<sup>61</sup> Euan Cameron ‘Frankfurt and Geneva. The European Context of John Knox’s Reformation.’ Roger A Mason ed, *John Knox and the British Reformations*, p.62.

<sup>62</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, p.526.

<sup>63</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.37.

<sup>64</sup> References to the *Book of Common Prayer* are from this edition throughout this study.

grew daily to more and more abuses, which not only for their unprofitableness, but also because they have much blinded the people, and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut away, and clean rejected: other there be, which although they have been devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still, as well for a decent order in the Church (for the which they were first devised) as because they pertain to edification, whereunto all things done in the Church (as the Apostle teacheth) ought to be referred.

And although the keeping or omitting of a Ceremony, in itself considered, is but a small thing; yet the willful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God, *Let all things be done among you, saith Saint Paul, in a seemly and due order*: The appointment of the which order pertaineth not to private men; therefore no man ought to take in hand, nor presume to appoint or alter any publick or common Order in Christ's Church, except he be lawfully called and authorized thereunto.

And whereas in this our time, the minds of men are so diverse, that some think it a great matter of conscience to depart from a piece of the least of their Ceremonies, they be so addicted to their old customs; and again on the other side, some be so new-fangled, that they would innovate all things, and so despise the old, that nothing can like them, but that is new; it was thought expedient, not so much to have respect how to please and satisfy either of these parties, as how to please God, and profit them both. And yet lest any man should be offended, whom good reason might satisfy, here be certain causes rendered why some of the accustomed Ceremonies be put away, and some retained and kept still.

Some are put away, because the great excess and multitude of them hath so increased in these latter days, that the burden of them was intolerable; whereof Saint *Augustine* in his time complained, that they were grown to such a number, that the estate of Christian people was in worse case concerning that matter than were the Jews. And he counseled that such yoke and burden should be taken away, as time would serve quietly to do it. But what would Saint *Augustine* have said, if he had seen the Ceremonies of late days used among us; whereunto the multitude used in his time was not to be compared? This, our excessive multitude of Ceremonies was so great, and many of them so dark, that they did more confound and darken, than declare and set forth Christ's benefits unto us. And, besides this, Christ's Gospel is not a Ceremonial law (as much of *Moses* law was,) but it is a Religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit; being content only with those Ceremonies which do serve to a decent Order and godly Discipline, and such as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification, whereby he might be edified. Furthermore, the most weighty cause of the abolishment of certain Ceremonies was, That they were so far abused, partly by the superstitious blindness of the rude and unlearned, and partly by the unsatiable, avarice of such as sought more their own lucre, than the glory of God, that the abuses could not well be taken away, the thing remaining still.

But now as concerning those persons, which peradventure will be offended, for that some of the old Ceremonies are retained still: If they consider that without some Ceremonies it is not possible to keep any Order, or quiet Discipline in the Church, they shall easily perceive just cause to reform their judgements. And if they think much, that any of the old do remain, and

would have all devised anew: then such men granting some Ceremonies convenient to be had, surely where the old may be well used, there they cannot reasonably reprove the old only for their age, without bewraying of their own folly. For in such a case they ought rather to have reverence unto them for their antiquity, if they will declare themselves to be more studious of unity and concord, than of innovations and new-fangleness, which (as much as may be with the true setting forth of Christ's religion) is always to be eschewed. Furthermore, such shall have no just cause with the Ceremonies reserved to be offended. For as those be taken away which were most abused, and did burden men's consciences without any cause; so the other that remain, are retained for a discipline and order, which (upon just causes) may be altered and changed, and therefore are not to be esteemed equal with God's Law. And moreover, they be neither dark nor dumb Ceremonies, but are so set forth, that every man may understand what they do mean, and to what use they do serve. So that it is not like that they in time to come should be abused as other have been. And in these our doings we condemn no other Nations, nor prescribe any thing but to our own people only: For we think it convenient that every Country should use such Ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition; and that they should put away other things, which from time to time they perceive to be most abused, as in men's ordinances it often chanceth diversely in divers countries.<sup>65</sup>

We should keep the above words in the front of our minds, for the question of Ceremonies is an issue that will occur again and again in the story of the Frankfurt exiles.

Frankfurt's letter to Zurich, mentioned earlier, also raises a related and important issue with the words: "And although they were tolerable, as some are not; yet being in a strange common-wealth, we could not be suffered to put them in use"<sup>66</sup> This was a point taken up by Calvin in his letter to the Frankfurt exiles in January 1555, namely that while certain Ceremonies might be tolerated, for a season, in the mother-country, because they were already in place, there was no need to re-establish them on a foreign soil where they did not previously exist.

Such was the background to the Strasbourg visit. When Grindal and Chambers arrived in Frankfurt at the end of November 1554, they were fully apprised of Frankfurt's intentions. Strasbourg indicated that they were now ready to move their community to Frankfurt and discussion took place of the potential problems that might be involved in such a move, not least that of accommodation. However it was made clear, in a letter read to the Frankfurt exiles, that Strasbourg demanded acceptance and use of the Edwardian Prayer book. While Grindal's tone, in an address to the Frankfurt congregation after he had read Strasbourg's letter to them, may have been more eirenic: "not that they meant, as he said, to have it so strictly observed but that such Ceremonies and things which the country could not bear, might well be omitted; so that they might have the substance and effect thereof"<sup>67</sup> it seems to have done little to lower the temperature of the dispute. Strasbourg's letter also suggested that to alter the 1552 Book would provide the exiles' opponents ammunition to "accuse our doctrine of

---

<sup>65</sup> *Book of Common Prayer* p.ix-xi.

<sup>66</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.37.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.

imperfection and us of mutability”<sup>68</sup> as well as to condemn its authors, who were now suffering martyrdom. There was no sense whatsoever in Strasbourg’s letter of the need and obligation to further consolidate the Reformation from exile.

Knox and Whittingham then asked the Strasbourg visitors what they meant by the substance of the Book. Grindal and Chambers replied that they had no commission to discuss such matters while their hosts told them that they would accept “what they could prove of that book to stand with GOD’S Word and that the country would permit, should be granted to them.”<sup>69</sup> Discussions went no further and the *Discourse* records that Grindal and Chambers then left Frankfurt taking with them Frankfurt’s reply for the Strasbourg congregation. One paragraph in this letter of reply perhaps deserves particular mention: “And yet we think not that any godly man will stand to the death in the defense of Ceremonies; which, as the Book specifieth, upon just causes, may be altered and changed”<sup>70</sup> an excerpt from the rubric on Ceremonies in *The Book of Common Prayer* just cited above.

It is hard to escape the impression, from the nature of the Grindal/Chambers visit, that Strasbourg was already putting a plan afoot to bring Frankfurt into line. At all events the Strasbourg visit encouraged the Frankfurt church to return to what might be described as their ever present obsession with liturgy. The *Discourse* records that “it was agreed that the Order of Geneva which then was already printed in English, and some copies there among them, should take place, as an Order most godly and farthest off from superstition”<sup>71</sup> which was something that one would have thought that the church had already.<sup>72</sup> However, John Knox, rigorously consistent and true to the pursuit of his ideal of a national church, then stated that he could not agree to use the Genevan Order without the agreement of the English exiles elsewhere. Nor, however, could he in conscience administer communion according to the Edwardian rite. He therefore suggested that someone else might administer communion and he would simply preach. If neither solution was acceptable, Knox asked if he could resign.

This the congregation refused, which prompted Thomas Lever, who had recently arrived in Frankfurt as elected co-minister and who “assembling the congregation requested that he might, with their consents, appoint such an Order as should be both godly without respect of the Book of or any other”<sup>73</sup> until Easter 1555. We do not know what the Order was or would have been, except that the *Discourse* records that when the congregation understood that “the Order which he would place and use was not altogether such as was fit for a right Reformed Church; they would no wise yield to the same.”<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.38.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.39 and 37.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, p.42.

<sup>72</sup> There is no difference between the order of service adopted by the Frankfurt exiles – see page 10 - and the *Forme of the Common Prayers* later adopted as the liturgy of the English Church in Geneva except for the introduction of the Lord’s Prayer after the prayer for the ‘Whole State of Christ’s Church,’ called the ‘Prayer for All Estates’ in the first Frankfurt liturgy.

<sup>73</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.43.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, p.43.

From this impasse Knox, Whittingham and others decided to draw up a Latin summary of the Prayer Book and send it to Calvin, who did not understand English, explaining to him the dilemma in which the English church in Frankfurt found itself and requesting his views. The *Discourse* relates, of the summary sent to Calvin that “this description is very favourably put down.”<sup>75</sup> Arber’s description of the summary as scoffing is far more accurate.<sup>76</sup> MacCulloch describes it as “witheringly caricatured.”<sup>77</sup> It is certainly rapid and terse. In the description of Morning Prayer the Benedictus appears to be confused with the Benedicite, the congregation is described as “falling down upon their knees” instead of “devoutly kneeling.” The words “at length” are used in a pejorative sense. In discussion of the Communion service occurs the phrase “and that not without a long heap and mixture of matters” while the summary states that “all Holy Days are now in like use, as were among the Papists; only very few excepted” which is a travesty of Cranmer’s changes to the liturgical year.<sup>78</sup> The conclusion to the summary of the Communion service again bears the phrase “as it was used among the Papists.”<sup>79</sup> The other offices of the church, apart from Burial of the dead, receive similar summary treatment: Baptism “also he shall make a cross”, Confirmation, “and lest any should think any error to be in this Confirmation; they take a certain pamphlet of a Catechism, which consisteth of the Articles of Faith, the Lord’s Prayer and Ten Commandments: and all this is dispatched in less than two leaves, Marriage, “of which (that we may pass over many petty Ceremonies) these follies, who can suffer?”<sup>80</sup> Visitation of the Sick, “And all that dwell in the same” is incorrectly cited as an answer and, finally, the Purification of Women where occurs the phrase “also common with the Papists: but also with the Jews.”<sup>81</sup> In conclusion the summary states: “Other things, not so much shame itself, as a certain kind of pity, compelleth us to keep close.”<sup>82</sup>

Such was the summary of the Prayer Book received by Calvin. Dickens records that Calvin replied in “urbane and moderate terms.”<sup>83</sup> They were also conciliatory, for at the beginning of his reply Calvin laments “that contention should arise among brethren banished and driven out of their country for one faith.”<sup>84</sup> The letter continues by saying that “in the liturgy of England, I see that there were many tolerable, foolish things. By these words I mean, that there was not that purity which was to be desired. These vices, though they could not, at the first day, be amended; yet, seeing there was no manifest impiety, they were, for a season, to be tolerated”<sup>85</sup> Adding “Therefore as I would not have you fierce over them whose infirmity will not suffer to ascend an higher step; so would I advertise others that they please not themselves too much in their foolishness.”<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.49.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, Introduction, p.xiv.

<sup>77</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, p.179.

<sup>78</sup> Wood *Brief discourse*, p.46.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, p.47.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, p.48.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, p.49 This last comment contains some plausibility. Abandoned in the reformed tradition, the churching of Women retained a place in both the Lutheran as well as the Anglican rite.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, p.49.

<sup>83</sup> A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, p.395.

<sup>84</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.50.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, p.51.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, p.51.

The *Discourse* records that when Calvin's letter of January 1555 was read to the Frankfurt Congregation, many who had previously seen good in the Book were now bent against it. Yet there were divisions in the Congregation - which was presumably growing<sup>87</sup> - for when Knox, Gilby, Fox and Thomas Cole, who had been asked to draw up a new order, presented the congregation with their recommendation - the Order of Geneva (as before!) - the *Discourse* records that while "This Order was very well liked of many; but such as were bent to the Book of England could not abide it."<sup>88</sup>

At first sight this statement seems odd for it was, after all, only a few weeks previously that the congregation had turned down Lever's liturgy as "not altogether such as was fit for a right Reformed Church"<sup>89</sup> and now they (or some of them) were turning down a liturgy that was, presumably, regarded as too reformed. Clearly the Congregation was not only growing but was incorporating broader sympathies than those with which it started out.

The *Discourse* records that contention grew so great that Gilby kneeled down before the two parties imploring them to reform their judgements. Following this plea the Congregation asked Knox and Whittingham, on the one side and Parry and Lever on the other - who might be described respectively as Prayer Book opponents and supporters - to devise some order to "end all strife and contention."<sup>90</sup>

It is important to note the comments of John Knox, at this stage in the proceedings, when the *Discourse* recounts his words: "Forsomuch, as I perceive that no end of contention is to be hoped for, unless the one part something relent; this will I do, for my part, that quietness may ensue."<sup>91</sup> An order was eventually agreed upon: some part taken from the Prayer Book, which should last until April 1555 and if, in the meantime, any contention arose, it was to be adjudicated by Calvin, Musculus, Bullinger and Viret. The *Discourse* records that the agreement was put in writing on 6 February 1555. Which day was one of great rejoicing and that communion was celebrated.

There has been much discussion over the content of this liturgy, generally referred to as the "Liturgy of Compromise". In 1870 a manuscript was discovered in a drawer of a piece of furniture in Leicester, tied up with various other contemporary documents, some in the hand of Thomas Sampson who died in Leicester in 1589, having previously served as Master of Wigston's Hospital there.<sup>92</sup> The manuscript was a liturgy of the Frankfurt church. Was this liturgy to be regarded as the "Liturgy of Compromise" mentioned above? G.W Sprott who first edited the manuscript in 1905, thought that this was so.<sup>93</sup> Charles Martin, whose seminal work on the English church in Geneva: *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au Temps de Calvin, 1555-1560*, appeared in 1915, accepted this

---

<sup>87</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.125.

<sup>88</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.52.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, p.43.

<sup>90</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, pp. 245-6. Henry Parry was Chancellor of Salisbury Cathedral before and after the exile. Knox, in his account of his banishment from Frankfurt, states that Parry along with Edward Isaac, betrayed him to the Frankfurt magistrates.

<sup>91</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.53.

<sup>92</sup> Robin Leaver, *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*, p.3.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3.



interpretation.<sup>94</sup> However, this was not the view of Christina Garrett writing in 1938<sup>95</sup> nor of A.G Dickens.<sup>96</sup> Robin Leaver has also convincingly suggested that this liturgy contains too many things which Knox would never have accepted - in spite of his offer to “something relent” just mentioned - such as the canticles and versicles and responses at Morning and Evening Prayer, and especially the litany.<sup>97</sup> Leaver’s study first appeared in 1984. However, the view that the manuscript discovered in Leceister in the nineteenth century was indeed the ‘Liturgy of compromise’ persists, not least in the eyes of Dan Danner, whose study *Pilgrimage to Puritanism, History and Theology of the Marian Exiles at Geneva 1555-1560* was produced in 1999. However, it should be mentioned that Danner nowhere mentions the work of Leaver and may indeed think that his work is not relevant to his own study. Danner’s reference to the topic is a direct translation from the French of a piece from Charles Martin. Danner’s translation reads as follows:

The “Liturgy of Compromise” as it has become labelled, was based on the Second Edwardian Prayer Book with certain modifications. There were no congregational responses, for example, and only the Lord’s Prayer and Apostles’ Creed were recited by the congregation. The Collects and Special Prayers were eliminated, and the litany, said by the minister without response by the congregation, was made optional. Christmas, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost and Feast Days of the Saints were absent. The communion service remained fairly intact but the congregation likely did not kneel before the altar-table. Private Baptisms were removed, as were godparents’ responses on behalf of infants - the parents, instead, affirmed in their own name to raise their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. No sign of the cross was allowed in marking the infant, and confirmation by a bishop was deemed unnecessary. Catechetical instruction to each child was mandatory before the child could receive communion; this began with a doctrinal exposition on baptism and the new birth and continued with the Decalogue, the Apostles’ Creed, and the “Our Father” with accompanying commentary. The ring was excluded from the marriage rite as was the father giving his daughter in marriage. The Prayer Book was made optional for the visitation of the sick and the funeral service. An order of ecclesiastical discipline was added. Provisions were made for the elections of ministers, and deacons. The church order concluded with two prayers, one inspired by persecution contained intercession for prisoners, martyrs and exiles, the other for King Philip and Queen Mary that their hearts might be softened so that they could become defenders of the gospel.<sup>98</sup>

The question of the origins of this 1555 liturgy will be taken up again later, its importance being, quite simply that, if it is accepted that this liturgy was not the liturgy of compromise but one devised by Richard Cox, after Whittingham and his followers left Frankfurt, it clearly shows that the divisions between the exiles over liturgy were small, not large.

---

<sup>94</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au Temps de Calvin 1555-1560*, pp. 28-30.

<sup>95</sup> Christina Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, pp.58 and 135.

<sup>96</sup> A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, p.395.

<sup>97</sup> Robin Leaver, *Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*, p.3.

<sup>98</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism, History and Theology of the Marian Exiles at Geneva 1555-60*, pp.20-21.

It would be worth our while at this stage to look at the *Book of Common Prayer*<sup>99</sup> examining the Order for Morning Prayer both in the context of the above but, more particularly, in the context of Knox's exclusivist position as well as subsequent developments at the Frankfurt church.<sup>100</sup>

The Order begins with a general confession of sins, following an invocation of the minister, which is followed by the absolution and the Lord's Prayer. None of this should have been objectionable to Knox. The first problem occurs with the Versicles and Responses when the Prayer Book records that the minister shall say: O lord, open thou our lips, to which the congregation shall reply: and our mouth shall show forth thy praise etc. In reformed eyes such an action presumably reeks of the traditional church with a priest intoning some formula which the congregation, ignorant of what they are saying, replies to in a mechanical fashion. While Reformed liturgy would no doubt accept that prayers should be lead by the minister, they would nevertheless expect them to be undertaken together with the congregation in a communal act of worship.

These Versicles and Responses are then followed by the Venite, Exultemus Domino. Knox should have had no problem with this as it is clearly written under the heading that this is Psalm 95 i.e. entirely scriptural. Nor should he have had any problem with the Psalms that followed, said or subsequently sung. Nor, one imagines, despite what has been said about the Public Reading of Scripture having no place in the Calvinist Scheme of Public Worship would he have objected to the reading of the first Lesson from the Old Testament that followed.<sup>101</sup> However, the Old Testament lesson is followed by the Te Deum Laudamus or, another canticle, Benedicite Omnia Opera. Here there is clearly a problem for, according to the Prayer book, neither is scriptural i.e. there is no biblical reference against them. These are followed by the second lesson, taken from the New Testament, which should again have provided no problem for Knox, nor should the Benedictus (St Luke 1.68) or its alternative Jubilate Deo (Psalm 100) which followed, both of which are clearly listed as scriptural in the Prayer Book. After this comes the Creed, three versicles and responses and the Lord's Prayer, and further versicles and responses. The service moves to a conclusion with three collects, the first of the day, the second for Peace and the third for Grace, (all devised by Thomas Cranmer) followed by four prayers: For the King's majesty, for the Royal Family, for the Clergy and People, culminating with a Prayer of John Chrysostom - a father of the early church held in particularly high regard by Calvin. However, The Order of Morning Prayer records that these prayers are to be read, except when the Litany is read; and then only the last two are to be read.<sup>102</sup> The Litany has no scriptural reference against it in the Prayer Book and was particularly obnoxious to Knox. The service ends with the Grace, taken from 2. Corinthians 13.

We might present this analysis as follows, though the term *Acceptable* used here is problematic. Clearly there were parts of Morning Prayer of which Knox would have thoroughly approved, The General confession being an obvious case in point; and others about which he would have felt uneasy but which he was ready to tolerate. Given it is the latter which is of concern to us here, the word *Acceptable* has been used in the tabulation below.

---

<sup>99</sup> See above, page.14. - footnote no.64

<sup>100</sup> See above, page.14.

<sup>101</sup> See above, page.10.

<sup>102</sup> *Book of Common Prayer*, p.8.

We should remember, in this context, that John Knox had been a chaplain to Edward VI, as well as a minister in the Edwardian Church of England, at Berwick upon Tweed and later in Newcastle.

*Book of Common Prayer: Morning Prayer*, as seen by John Knox.

<i>Morning Prayer</i>	<i>Acceptable/not Acceptable</i>
• Invocation	Acceptable
• General Confession	Acceptable
• Absolution	Possibly Acceptable
• Lord's Prayer	Acceptable
• Versicles/Responses	Not acceptable
• Venite (Psalm 95)	Acceptable
• Psalm/s	Acceptable
• First Lesson - Old Testament	Acceptable
• Te Deum/Benedicite	Not Acceptable
• Second Lesson – New Testament	Acceptable
• Benedictus (Luke 1.68)/ Jubilate (Psalm 100)	Acceptable
• Apostles Creed	Acceptable
• Responses	Not acceptable
• Lord's Prayer	Acceptable
• Responses	Not Acceptable
• Three Collects	Acceptable
• Five Prayers	Acceptable
• The Litany - where replacing three Prayers	Not acceptable

The acceptables certainly win the day, but total capitulation was required by the Exclusivists, though the irenic comments of Knox mentioned earlier need to be remembered in this context.

This was the background to the tumultuous events that followed at Frankfurt. The *Discourse* records that the agreement (The "Liturgy of Compromise") that was put in writing on 6 February 1555 and which was the cause of great rejoicing, was of a very short life. For into this happy atmosphere appeared a new group of exiles in Frankfurt on Wednesday 13 March 1555. They were led by Richard Cox. Cox was formidable, disputatious and a bully. In an earlier life he had been headmaster of Eton, one of the tutors to Edward VI, Chancellor of Oxford University and Dean of Westminster. In his Eton days he had acquired the reputation of being a good teacher but also the greatest beater in the school.<sup>103</sup> Knappen observes that it is unfortunate that the Anglican<sup>104</sup> cause at this time could not have found a better tempered leader, who would have reflected more credit on it."<sup>105</sup> But it may have been just this character that had led to Cox being drafted in by Strasbourg to oppose Knox. If such a plan had been put afoot by Strasbourg, it would have probably been done by John Ponet, former

<sup>103</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.127.

<sup>104</sup> The word Anglican, as Patrick Collinson and Diarmaid MacCulloch have reminded us, is an unfortunate or inappropriate term to use in the context of the XVI century Church of England. Conformist or Prayer Book supporter would be more appropriate.

<sup>105</sup> Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.127.

bishop of Winchester and highest ranking Edwardian ecclesiastic in exile. Ponet could justifiably have concluded that Cox was a better fighter to oppose Knox than the eirenic Grindal.

Cox was regarded as an energetic supporter of the Reformed cause. As chancellor of Oxford University - where he was known as the 'cancellor' - he had been a vigorous pursuer of Papists. More than any other figure he had been closely involved with preparation of the two Edwardian Prayer Books. Knappen records that during the Hooper – Ridley controversy, Cox had written to Bullinger:

I embrace your sound and wholesome counsel respecting the reformation of the church of God with the greater readiness, inasmuch as you so entirely coincide with me in that belief which a merciful God has given me in these things. For I am of the opinion that all things in the church should be pure, simple, and removed as far as possible from the element and pomps of this world. But in our church what can I do, who am so deficient both in learning and authority? I can only endeavour to persuade our bishops to be of the same mind and opinion with myself, and in the meantime commit to God the care and conduct of his own work.<sup>106</sup>

Cox had clearly forgotten his earlier statement for in the words of Dickens "as befitted a former Prayer book commissioner he had but one thought - to smash the Knox-Whittingham ascendancy at Frankfurt.<sup>107</sup> He had also forgotten what he would say later in his life, if such a feat were possible, when he drafted a letter to Queen Elizabeth, "offering reasons why I dare not minister in your grace's chapel, the lights and cross remaining."<sup>108</sup> But, perhaps this judgement is too harsh. For Cox had been a Marian exile at Duisburg before appearing at Frankfurt. In Duisburg he had militated, successfully, for the removal of a wooden statue of Christ from the parish church.<sup>109</sup>

On arrival at Frankfurt Cox and his colleagues moved fast. At the first service after their arrival they interjected responses to the officiating minister, leading to a clash with the elders of the church which led to the reply "that they would do as they had done in England and have the face of an English church."<sup>110</sup> The following Sunday "one of Cox's company, without the consent and knowledge of the Congregation, got up suddenly into the pulpit, read the litany; and doctor Cox with his company answered aloud: whereby the determination of the church was broken"<sup>111</sup>

It was Knox's turn to preach that Sunday afternoon and, not surprisingly, given the behaviour of his opponents he rebuked them fiercely. Having first denounced the behaviour of the newcomers, who had broken the agreed order of the Frankfurt church, he then went on to denounce the short-comings of the Edwardian church: its want of discipline, John Hooper's defeat over clerical dress in 1550-51 and pluralist clergy.<sup>112</sup> Knox suggests, in his own account of his banishment from Frankfurt, that it

---

<sup>106</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.127.

<sup>107</sup> A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, p.396.

<sup>108</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.97.

<sup>109</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.239.

<sup>110</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.54.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, p.54.

<sup>112</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, pp.178-9. *Brief Discourse*, p.55.

was this sermon<sup>113</sup> that so angered his opponents and subsequently led them to denounce him to the magistrates.

The following Tuesday, 19 March 1555, the two sides met to discuss their differences. Cox and his company requested admission to the church which was refused them, both on account of the controversy of recent days as well as the fact that they had not signed the Discipline of the church which, as we have seen, all new members were obliged to sign. The Discourse also records “and father it was greatly suspected that they had been, some of them, at Mass in England; and that others had subscribed to wicked Articles (as one of them, shortly after, even in the pulpit, sorrowfully confessed)” - a reference to John Jewel.<sup>114</sup>

The congregation having refused entry to the Cox Company, Knox then urged their admission, a testimony to his search for an agreement between the exiles and for the eventual achievement of a truly national reformed church. It also reflected his confidence in his ability to defeat his opponents - as he records in his own account of his banishment from Frankfurt - and, indeed, in his initial debates with Cox, the latter agreed to abandon private baptism, saints’ days, kneeling at communion, surplices, crosses and other features that he agreed to be not papistical but by their nature indifferent.”<sup>115</sup> However, Cox refused to abolish the Litany, the responses and the Te Deum and though Knox had done well in debate with his adversary, he and his sympathisers were now in a minority.

The following day - Wednesday March 20 1555 - Whittingham went to see the church’s original sponsor among the magistrates, John à Glauberg and explained the situation to him. À Glauberg sent for Valérand Poullain, who had first introduced him to the English exiles, commanding him that two learned men should be appointed; and that he and they should consult and agree upon some good Order and to make report unto him accordingly. Poullain, who had begun to have problems within his own church at this time,<sup>116</sup> was unsuccessful. The committee of Cox, Lever, Knox and Whittingham, over which Poullain was acting as arbiter “could be of no agreement among them: and so they brake off.”<sup>117</sup>

The Congregation<sup>118</sup> then drew up a Supplication that they asked John à Glauberg to present to his fellow senators. This covers the events at Frankfurt since the arrival of the English exiles in June 1554, including the agreement reached at the church on 6 February 1555 - before the arrival of Cox and his party - when communion had been administered, a celebration in which Valérand Poullain had participated. The supplication recounts how this agreement had been broken by the new arrivals. Rather tactlessly, however, it also says to the senators that the affairs of the English church “toucheth

---

<sup>113</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse* (ed Arber), pp. 65 and 67.

<sup>114</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.55.

<sup>115</sup> A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, pp.396-7.

<sup>116</sup> Andrew Pettegree, ‘The London Exile Community,’ *Marian Protestantism*, p.70.

<sup>117</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.56.

<sup>118</sup> Though not mentioned in the *Discourse*, it may be assumed that this did not include the new arrivals who, though the principle of admission had been conceded to them, would not yet have signed the Discipline that was a condition of membership of the Church.

you very much, for if these men armed by your authority, shall do what they list, this evil shall be in time established by you; never to be redressed.”<sup>119</sup>

No doubt the Frankfurt senators did not appreciate being addressed in this way and it should come as no surprise to find that the patience of the Senate was fast running out. For, it was before the end of the same week, on Friday March 22 1555, that à Glauberg visited the English church and reminded them that the original agreement had been that the English church was to follow the French church both in doctrine and ceremonies, and if they did not keep to this agreement, the church would be closed down. Remarkably, the Discourse then records: “Doctor Cox then spake to the Congregation in this wise. I have, said he, ‘read the French Order and do think it to be godly in all points’ and therefore wished them to obey the Magistrate’s commandment. Whereupon the whole congregation gave consent. At the next meeting of the Congregation, that Order was put in practice; to the comfort and rejoicing of the most part.”<sup>120</sup>

Cox’s words appear to be startling, not only because of the events which followed, but because one could justifiably say that the dispute at Frankfurt had been one between the liturgy of the second Edwardian Prayer Book and that of Poullain’s *Liturgia Sacra*, the French Order, which, as has already been mentioned, Whittingham described as according to the Order of Geneva, the purest Reformed Church in Christendom.<sup>121</sup> How then, could Cox, the preeminent Prayer Book supporter, heap on the *Liturgia Sacra* such praise?

The speed of events at Frankfurt, hardly gave time to answer this question. Whether or not the Cox party, in spite of this agreement, had already planned their master coup, which was to denounce Knox to the Frankfurt authorities as a subvertor of established order, we do not know. However, it seems likely. In his own account of his banishment from Frankfurt Knox records - though he does not give any date - that at about this time, he was visited by Edward Isaac<sup>122</sup> who, with a veiled threat, requested him to relent from his hostility to the Prayer Book. The *Discourse* itself simply recounts “Nevertheless, such as would so fain have had the Book of England, left not the matter thus.”<sup>123</sup>

The book of Knox that his opponents now presented to the magistrates was his: *A faithful admonition unto the Professors of God’s truth in England* which had been published in 1554 and in which Charles V had been described as no less an enemy to Christ than was Nero. With the Emperor sitting in Council nearby at Augsburg, this was something that the local authorities could not overlook, given the imperial attacks on the free cities’ status mounted after 1548. They thus summoned Whittingham and told him that some of his countrymen had accused Knox of high treason against the Emperor, his son Philip and the Queen of England. The magistrates then requested a translation of certain passages of the book into Latin, to be presented to them the same day.

---

<sup>119</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.58.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid*, p.59.

<sup>121</sup> See page 8.

<sup>122</sup> Said by Garrett to have been a purchaser of chantry lands in seven counties and early associated with the Reformation as an intimate friend of Latimer and servant of Cranmer. Regarded, from the first, as one of the leaders of the Prayer Book party, he was one of the richest Englishmen at Frankfurt, where he remained until the end of the exile. *Marian Exiles*, pp.195-196.

<sup>123</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.59.

Their first action, having seen the Latin translation, was to ban Knox from further preaching. The magistrates then summoned Williams and Whittingham and told them that Knox must leave Frankfurt “for otherwise, as they said, they should be forced to deliver him, if the Emperor’s council, which then lay at Augsburg, should upon like information send for him.”<sup>124</sup>

Senator John à Glauberg had witnessed an agreement with the English church in Frankfurt on Friday 22 March 1555. Only four days later, on Tuesday 26 March 1555, Knox left Frankfurt banished and deposed as the church’s minister.

The Senator, although a good friend to the exiles, was now, undoubtedly, tired and irritated with the disputes of the English refugees, to whom he and his fellow senators had granted shelter in their city. For, the *Discourse* records that he handed over responsibility for the English Church to his nephew Adolphus, a doctor of law, who appears to have had less sympathy for the English visitors. The very same day, 26 March 1555, the younger man summoned Whittingham and told him that the magistrates had received a delegation - presumably of Cox supporters - and “at their suits” had decided to grant them the full use of the English book. Whittingham, who was told to no more meddle in the matter, answered that “if it were so concluded, he would willingly obey: not doubting but that it might be lawful for him and others to join themselves to another church, but Doctor Cox besought the lawyer that it should not be so suffered.”<sup>125</sup> Whittingham, in reply, requested that the matter in question might be disputed before the magistrates to which Adolphus Glauberg tartly replied “that disputation there should be none”<sup>126</sup> again ordering Whittingham to no more meddle in the matter. An approach, on this occasion led by Anthony Gilby, was then made to the young man’s uncle, John à Glauberg; but to no avail. The *Discourse* nevertheless records that à Glauberg asked to see Whittingham. However tiresome the English exiles had become, one senses that the senator had sympathy for the younger man and would have liked to be of help to him and his colleagues. When asked by the senator who had commanded him to meddle in the matter no further, Whittingham replied that it was the senator’s nephew, Adolphus. John à Glauberg then told the assembled gathering that they should be contented but “he would see that nothing should be used but that which should be tolerable.”<sup>127</sup>

Cox was now triumphant. On 28 March 1555, two days after Knox’s departure, Cox “assembled all such as had been Priests and ministers in England to his lodging”<sup>128</sup> announced to them that the Magistrates had agreed to the use of the Edwardian Prayer Book and that they should now elect church officials. Christopher Goodman, recently arrived from Strasbourg and who makes his appearance in the *Discourse* for the first time, stated that the church should first agree upon a godly Order with the agreement of the whole Congregation while the election of the officials ought not to be attempted without the consent of the whole Church. Cox replied that the godly Order decided upon was the Book of England. The *Discourse* records that “the persuasions of Goodman nothing at all prevailed neither in the one thing or the other.”<sup>129</sup> However, the latter part of this statement appears untrue, for Cox lost out on the second point - which Arber refers to as an Election of the Clergy by the

---

<sup>124</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.61.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, p.70.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, p.70.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, p.71.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, p.72.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, p.72.

Clergy; in which the laity had practically no part<sup>130</sup> - when the local magistrates intervened and insisted on lay balloting after the Reformed pattern.<sup>131</sup>

It is the Liturgy and Order, drawn up by Cox and his colleagues that are of particular interest to us. The speed of developments at Frankfurt, to which reference has already been made, was such that, only a few days later Cox wrote to Calvin, outlining to him the events that had taken place at the English church. This letter is not part of the original *Discourse* and was introduced by Arber. The letter is characterised by its polite, civilized tone and records that the church had abandoned the parts of the Edwardian liturgy that Cox had already conceded to Knox and appointed one pastor, two preachers, four elders and two deacons, following election by the congregation who, before becoming members of the church - and thus eligible to vote - were obliged to sign the forty two articles of religion of Edwardian England. This has prompted Euan Cameron to observe that “ideological differences between Knox and his Frankfurt adversaries were really fewer and slighter than the rhetoric employed suggests.”<sup>132</sup> Cox’s letter also records that “we freely relinquished all those ceremonies which were regarded by our brethren as offensive and inconvenient”<sup>133</sup> and listed them as follows – see also page 20:

- Private Baptisms
- Confirmation of Children
- Saints Days
- Kneeling at the Holy Communion
- The Linen surplices of the Ministers
- Crosses
- and other things of the like character

The letter is careful to record, however, that: “we gave them up, not as being impure and Papistical, which certain of our brethren often charged them with being: but, where as they were in their own nature indifferent, and either ordained, or allowed, by godly Fathers for the edification of our people; we, notwithstanding, chose rather to lay them aside, than to offend the minds, or alienate the affections, of the brethren.”<sup>134</sup>

The letter nevertheless continues by saying that “we retain, however, the remainder of the Form of Prayer and of the Administration of the Sacraments, which is prescribed in our Book: and this with the consent of almost the whole church, the judgement of which, in matters of this sort we did not think should be disregarded.”<sup>135</sup> A touch of democracy appears to be entering into Cox’s thinking in these last words!

This letter sent to Calvin was signed, apart from Cox, by nine other people: David Whitehead, then pastor of the church who remained in Frankfurt throughout the exile, Edmund Grindal, whom we

---

<sup>130</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.72 - footnote.

<sup>131</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.130.

<sup>132</sup> Euan Cameron, ‘Frankfurt and Geneva: The European Context of John Knox’s Reformation’ in Roger A.Mason ed *John Knox and the British Reformations*, pp.67-68.

<sup>133</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.77.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*, p.77.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, p.77.



have already met, Thomas Lever, one of the (previous) ministers at the church, Edwin Sandys, from Strasbourg and a future Archbishop of York as well as Robert Horne, a former Dean of Durham and future bishop of Winchester, from Zurich. To these signatories should be added that of John Bale, former Bishop of Ossory, Thomas Becon, one time chaplain to Cranmer, from Strasbourg and Richard Alvey, the least well known of the signatories, who remained in Frankfurt throughout the exile. Finally we should mention the most interesting of all the signatories to Cox's letter to Calvin, Thomas Sampson. Given that Sampson later became a notable non conformist within the Elizabethan church, his signature to Cox's letter to Calvin appears surprising. One would not normally associate the name of Thomas Sampson with that of Richard Cox. This is but one example of the shifting currents of opinion of the English exiles. Some started out as Prayer Book supporter and subsequently moved to a 'non-conformist' position (Thomas Sampson and Christopher Goodman) others moved, albeit on return to England, from a position of hostility to the Prayer Book to a conformist one (William Whittingham and Robert Beaumont).

It was among some papers in the hand of Thomas Sampson that a Liturgy of the Frankfurt church was discovered in Leicester in 1870, to which reference has already been made. As Sampson signed the letter to Calvin in which changes made to the liturgy of the English church at Frankfurt were outlined, and he also died in Leicester, there must be a strong presupposition that this liturgy was not the earlier "Liturgy of Compromise" drawn up by Knox and Lever but "what amounts to a third revision of the Prayer Book"<sup>136</sup> drawn up by Cox and his allies following Knox's banishment from Frankfurt. Leaver's justification of this presupposition is simply that the discovered liturgy contains too many things which Knox would have never accepted, such as the canticles and versicles and the responses at Morning and Evening Prayer and especially the litany.<sup>137</sup> Indeed, Knox himself suggests, in the account of his banishment from Frankfurt, that the litany was not part of the "Liturgy of Compromise" when he records that it was Lever, at a subsequent date, who suggested that it might, after all, be used.<sup>138</sup> It therefore seems reasonable to state that on this issue, Garrett and Leaver are right and Martin and Danner are wrong.

Leaver records the order for Morning Prayer in the 1555 Liturgy of the Frankfurt exiles as follows:

*The order of comon Praier at Mornynge*

First a Psalme song bye the whole congregation, then this foloweinge.

*The Minister*

At what tyme soev(er) a sinner dothe repet him of his synnes from the bottom of his harte, I will no more remember etc

*An Exhortation*

Dearlye beloved breterne, the scripture moveth us in sundry places to acknowledge and confess our manifold sins and wickedness etc

---

<sup>136</sup> Robin Leaver, *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*, p.3.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3.

<sup>138</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse* (ed Arber) p.63.

*A gen(er)all confession*

Almighty and most mercifull Ffather

*The absolucon*

Allmighti god the Ffather of our Lord Jesus Christ, whiche desirete not

*Then shall the Minister begyn the lords praier all the people saieing wit him*

Our father which art in heaven

*Then shall be saied*

O lorde open thowe our lypes etc

*Then shall be saide the psalms after the order of the boke and a chapter of tholde testament, and thys psalme of thanks geveinge:*

We praise the o god etc or O all ye works etc

*Then the Crede*

I believe in god the Ffather etc. *with the suffrages and praieris foloweinge, or sometime in stead of this the Letanye*

For Eveninge prayer, the Frankfurt liturgy simply says:

*Eveninge praier shall be used accordeinge to thorder of the boke wit one lesson etc*

As one lesson was stipulated for Morning Prayer and that was one from the Old Testament, the lesson for Evening Prayer was probably from the New Testament. It should be noted that, unlike at morning Prayer, the canticles at Evening Prayer: the Magnificat (St Luke 1) or Cantate Domino (Psalm 98) and the Nunc Dimittis (St Luke 2.29) or Deus Miseratur (Psalm 67) are biblical, thus causing no offence to Knox, unlike the Te Deum or Benedicite at Morning Prayer.

If we therefore undertake a checklist of the Frankfurt liturgy of 1555 for Morning and Evening Prayer against our earlier table (page 22) of the acceptable and non acceptable for the Knox party it is clear that what remains offensive for them in the 1555 liturgy is the responses, the Te Deum and/or Benedicite and the Litany. Leaver is undoubtedly right when he says that the 1555 liturgy contains too many things which Knox would never have accepted.<sup>139</sup>

The discovered manuscript incorporating the 1555 Liturgy has three main parts: the liturgy, catechism and the order of discipline. Leaver points out that all three are related to Poullain's *Liturgia Sacra*, the order of the French church in Frankfurt, to which reference has already been made as well as to the liturgy adopted by the exiles from Frankfurt who subsequently went to Geneva: the *Forme of the Common Prayers*.

---

<sup>139</sup> Robin Leaver, *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*, p.3.

Leaver sets out the three orders as follows:

<i>Liturgia Sacra</i>	<i>Frankfurt Liturgy 1555</i>	<i>Geneva 1556</i>
Prayer	Preface	Preface
		Confession of Faith
		Discipline
		(Ministers, Elders and Deacons)
Sunday Morning Service	Common Prayer	Sunday Morning Service
Lords Supper	Communion	
Baptism	Baptism	Baptism
		Lord's Supper
Marriage	Marriage	Marriage
Visitation of the Sick	Visitation of the Sick	Visitation of the Sick
Burial directions	Burial directons	Burial Directions
Confession of Faith		
	Catechism <sup>140</sup>	
Discipline (Ministers etc)	Discipline (Congregation)	Discipline (Congregation)
Discipline (Congregation)	Discipline (Ministers)	
		Metrical Psalms
		Catechism
	Prayers	Prayers

He goes on to suggest that Poullain's influence in the 1555 Frankfurt liturgy is central when he says of it: "The manuscript was therefore a liturgy of compromise, but the compromise was not so much between the opposing ideals of two liturgical factions among the English exiles. It was rather a compromise involving the content of the English 1552 Prayer book and the form of the liturgy of the French congregation in Frankfurt, whose church the exiles shared."<sup>141</sup>

This analysis perhaps put another light on the comments of Richard Cox regarding the French Order that it "be good and godly in all points" to which we have already referred.<sup>142</sup> We need to remember

<sup>140</sup> While there is no separate chapter devoted to Catechism in the *Liturgia Sacra*, this is incorporated in the section: 'L'Ordre de la Confession de Foy.'

<sup>141</sup> Robin Leaver, *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*, p.5.

<sup>142</sup> See above page 25.

the crucial point already made on page six of this study, namely that the dispute at Frankfurt was about liturgy not doctrine. Cox and his friends, as outlined in their letter to Calvin, had, as has been mentioned, also appointed “one pastor, two preachers, four elders, two deacons, the greatest care being taken that every one should be at perfect liberty to vote,”<sup>143</sup> arrangements akin to those of Poullain’s church outlined in the *Liturgia Sacra*. Like the French church, the 1555 order of the English church in Frankfurt also incorporated discipline.<sup>144</sup> Points of resistance appeared to come down to those at Morning Prayer already mentioned. For the Coxians, Poullain’s order may indeed have been “good and godly” in all points but so was the 1552 Prayer Book, albeit suitably adjusted. The one did not exclude the other. For the inclusivists there was no perfect church order laid down in Scripture. This would be the position of John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury in the Elizabethan church later in the century and it was no doubt in this spirit that Cox and his supporters were bent on persuading the Magistrates that the English church be allowed to use the English Prayer Book.

M.M. Knappen is, therefore, perhaps right to refer to the troubles at Frankfurt as a case of Nationalism versus Internationalism.<sup>145</sup> There is no need to question Cox’s desire to have a godly order, even one understood to be godly by the Godly themselves, but he wanted it, at the same time, to have an English gloss. Hence his oft reported comment recounted in the *Discourse* “that they would do as they had done in England; and that they would have the face of an English Church.”<sup>146</sup> Unfortunately, Knox’s famous put down for Cox, “The Lord grant it to have the face of Christ’s Church”<sup>147</sup> only came sometime afterwards which, as MacCulloch wryly observes, “is always the way of such exchanges”<sup>148</sup> Nevertheless, an equally damning comment for Cox was Knox’s later observation in the account of his banishment “that though we had changed countries, God had not changed his nature.”<sup>149</sup> Yet, whatever each side may have said, they were both, in their own way, exclusivists. Cox wished to put a barrier of England round the Frankfurt church, Knox that of the Godly. Admittedly his church would have included the Godly of all countries, all nations, but it would have excluded the non-godly or, rather, those of the non-godly who were ‘not prepared to turn to the Lord.’ In this sense it was as exclusive a concept as that of Cox, though with other parameters.

For Whittingham and his supporters the following three months prior to their departure from Frankfurt in September 1555, could hardly have been pleasant. As we have seen, their opponents endeavoured to prevent their departure to form a church elsewhere which, given the way the Whittingham group had already been treated, seems incomprehensively cruel behaviour from one reformed Christian to another, unless seen in a sixteenth century context that laid inordinate importance - not least in Reformed circles - on the unity of the church. However, Whittingham, who

---

<sup>143</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.77.

<sup>144</sup> The discipline outlined in *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555* is exactly the same as that outlined in the Old Discipline in the *Brief Discourse*, with one exception: the paragraph regarding those who had communicated with the Popish mass is removed.

<sup>145</sup> M.M. Knappen *Tudor Puritanism*, p.118.

<sup>146</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.54.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, p.62.

<sup>148</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, p.179.

<sup>149</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.64.

was delegated by his supporters to find another city of refuge, reports in a letter<sup>150</sup> to a friend in England, of the warm response to his request received from the cities of Basle and Geneva.

But to the end that we might be delivered from this unsupportable yoke, GOD, of his mercy, hath provided better for us; and for this incommodity hath granted us a double benefit: insomuch that, contrary to their hope, he hath not only at Basle moved the Magistrates' hearts towards us in granting us a Church; but also at Geneva, where as GOD's Word is truly preached, manners best reformed, and in earth the chiefest place of true comfort.<sup>151</sup>

Whittingham, while on his travels to find a place for a new church, also received comfort from Bullinger who told him, of the Surplice, Private Baptism, Churching of Women, the ring in Marriage with such like which he alloweth not and that "he neither could, if he would, neither would, if he might; use the same in his Church, whatsoever had been reported."<sup>152</sup> Whittingham also visited Geneva, where he met Calvin who showed him the letter that he had received from Richard Cox and his fellow signatories at Frankfurt.

Calvin's reply, that forms part of the original *Discourse*, while standing firmly in favour of reformed practices is, once again, conciliatory: "Neither do I see what purpose it is, to burden the church with trifling and unprofitable Ceremonies, or as I may term them with their proper name, hurtful and ostensible Ceremonies; when there is liberty to have a simple and pure Order. But I keep in, and refrain myself; lest I should seem to begin and move a new contention of that matter which, as you report, is well ended."<sup>153</sup>

Calvin nevertheless continues that "this one thing I cannot keep secret. That Master Knox was, in my judgement, neither godly or brotherly dealt withal."<sup>154</sup> Calvin does not appear to have particularly favoured the separation that eventually occurred at the Frankfurt church, "when I heard that the one party was minded to depart from thence; I earnestly admonished them, as it became me, that if they could not well remain there, that the distance of place should not dissipate, or rent in sunder their brotherly agreement; for I feared much, lest that some privy grudge of the former Contention remained."<sup>155</sup> Calvin terminates his letter with the wish that the new agreement reached at Frankfurt should be firm and stable, "that if it chance the one part to go to another place; yet that you being so sundered by distance of places, may keep sure the holy bond of amity."<sup>156</sup>

In the three months that followed, before Whittingham's departure from Frankfurt, there was very little amity, for him, together with his sympathisers, who came to be labelled as schismatics by their opponents. Whittingham's letter of farewell to the Frankfurt congregation contains the suggestion to hold a debate "at which time, we will undertake our departure to be lawful; contrary to the slanderous reports of some which unlearnedly call it a Schism."<sup>157</sup> The discourse recounts that Friday 30 and Saturday 31 August 1555 were given over to discussions of the justification of the proposed

---

<sup>150</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.74.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, p.74.

<sup>152</sup> *Ibid.*, p.75.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, p.79.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, p.79.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 79-80.

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, p.80.

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid.*, p.81.

departure but broke up unresolved, with Cox's words: "if Arbiters should pronounce it to be none, yet mens' opinions will be divers - - as for Arbiters we will appoint none!"<sup>158</sup>

The minister Whitehead, Cox, Parry and Ashley then sent for Whittingham, Thomas Cole, Fox, Kethe, Roger Hart and John Hilton demanding them of the cause of their departure.<sup>159</sup> Of the seven reasons that the *Discourse* cites in their reply, six relate to the behaviour of Cox and his allies: of their breach of promise - with John à Glauberg on 22 March - of their subverting of all rules of the church and in their treatment of Knox. Only one point, the seventh, related to liturgical questions: the bringing in of "Papistical superstitions and unprofitable ceremonies."<sup>160</sup> This is certainly ironic, given that the "Troubles at Frankfurt" were supposed to be centered on the question of Ceremonies. There were clearly other factors in dispute, those of behaviour.

Not many days after, the *Discourse* recounts, the oppressed Church<sup>161</sup> departed from Frankfurt to Basle and Geneva; some staying at Basle, as Master Fox with others. The rest came to Geneva; where they were received with great favour and much courtesy; both of the Magistrates and the people.<sup>162</sup>

The original *Discourse* then closes with a letter from Thomas Cole - a Whittingham supporter though, from his entry in the DNB (Dictionary of National Biography), a strangely maverick one - to a friend in England, which recounts subsequent dissension in the Frankfurt church centered on Whitehead. Thus the *Discourse* concludes: "From which time forward the troubles and contentions were so sore among them, that whoso shall weigh it with due consideration, I ween he shall think it to be the just judgement of our righteous GOD, that fell upon them for supplanting a Church there before them in great quietness and of much sincerity."<sup>163</sup>

As Collinson observes "the secession of Knox had not brought peace but a sword to the Frankfurt church."<sup>164</sup> This may be the reason for the extraordinarily impolite - even abusive - letter, not a part of the original *Discourse* but published in Arber's edition, which was headed by Whitehead but also signed by Cox, which was sent to Calvin, soon after the departure of Whittingham and his friends, on 20 September 1555. There is no record, in Arber, of a reply from Calvin - a workaholic who managed to find time among all his other activities to write, for a large part of his life, an average of over three letters a day<sup>165</sup> - to this particular letter. It deserved none. Calvin had better things to do with his time.

Whittingham's farewell letter of 27 August addressed to the Frankfurt church was signed, in addition to himself, by seventeen other church members. Not all of these men - indeed less than half of them -

---

<sup>158</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.82.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, p.85. Whitehead and Ashley subsequently appear as central figures in arguments at the Frankfurt church. But, ironically, they appear on the other side of the debate; on what might be called the side of the non-conformists against the conformists.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, p.85.

<sup>161</sup> It is interesting to note that the author of the *Discourse* uses the word Church. Were those exiles who stayed in Frankfurt also regarded by the author as a Church? Perhaps the use of the word *Church* here is related to the accusation of Schism, made against those departing by their opponents.

<sup>162</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.86.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, p.96.

<sup>164</sup> Patrick Collinson, 'The authorship of a Brief Discours off the Troublesbegonne at Frackford 'Godly People -' Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism', p.193.

<sup>165</sup> *Calvin Handbook*, ed Herman J. Selderhuis, Letters, p.215.

followed him immediately to Geneva. Four of them: Thomas Cole, John Kelke, John Escott, and William Walton stayed in Frankfurt. John Foxe and Christopher Soothous went to Basle. Anthony Carier, Laurence Kent and William Kethe all went to Geneva, but at a later stage. Of Nicholas Purfoot we have no further trace.

Thus, of the eighteen signatories to Whittingham's farewell letter, only John Hilton, John Hollingham, and Thomas Crofton went with him and his close colleagues: William Williams, Thomas Wood (with whom Whittingham had first come to Frankfurt) Anthony Gilby and Christopher Goodman, straight away to Geneva.

It is astonishing to realise how small this group was - given the noise that they made. N.M. Sutherland estimates the English church in Frankfurt, in its early days, at 200, including families and dependents. Using the same ratio already applied to Garrett's 472 exiles - though in the other direction i.e. excluding families and dependents - brings this number to 120 and it may be assumed that the church was growing during its fifteen month life before Whittingham and his associates left for Geneva. On these numbers, Prayer Book opponents account for less than one fifth of the church.

As the story of the origins of the English church in Geneva draws to its conclusion, with the departure of some of the exiles from Frankfurt, it is an appropriate moment to look at the question posed at the beginning of this study. What do we learn of how the English exiles in Frankfurt in the early 1550's thought of themselves, their relationship with each other and to God, from their adopted liturgies and orders? Not much, a cynical observer might reply. Be that as it may, liturgy was certainly at the centre of the life of the English church in Frankfurt in its initial period. But, instead of being a uniting force, the expression of a community at one with itself and with God, it was a divisive one. Certainly the two sides of the Prayer Book dispute felt that their respective point of view was right and acceptable before God. But there was little sign of Christian charity in their behaviour one to another. Calvin was certainly correct when he said to the English church in Frankfurt that "Master Knox was, in my judgement, neither godly nor brotherly dealt withal."<sup>166</sup> Indeed, at some stages the story at Frankfurt sounds like a piece of cloak and dagger fiction, one between individuals with no sense of right and wrong, let alone of one between Christians.

On what might be called the other side of the dispute, the question of liturgy had been transformed into a means of self expression, which was not something, one would have thought, for which it had been primarily devised. The endless wrangling over liturgies at the English church appears to have become no more than a substitute of communal self indulgence. Each time the congregation set on devising a new liturgy they appear to have come back to that with which they had started, which was more or less the liturgy of the Reformed church in Geneva. If Frankfurt - or rather some of its members - were doing this because they saw themselves as God ordained leaders of further reformation, there were, perhaps, better ways of achieving their objectives. What about prayer and the invocation of the assistance of the Holy Spirit? Liturgy, in short, appears to have brought out the worst, not the best, in the English exiles at Frankfurt.

What of what were referred to as the three underlying questions, posed at the beginning of this study?

---

<sup>166</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.79.

Firstly, were the English exiles at Frankfurt Scarisbrick's protestants of the hotter sort - -hot gospeller as opposed to cold statute protestant?<sup>167</sup> Clearly they were not all of the "hotter sort" though the question deserves a fuller answer than one simply based on the differences between Prayer Book supporter and Prayer Book opponent. For, as already mentioned, the Godly could be found as much among Prayer Book supporters as among Prayer Book opponents, the most notable example being that of Edmund Grindal, who, as Archbishop of Canterbury, defied Queen Elizabeth over her wish to suppress Prophesying. Grindal stood up to his sovereign over the word of God, not over ceremonies. However, it would nevertheless probably be reasonable to assume that there were more Godly in the camp of the Prayer Book opponents than in that of the Prayer book supporters. These latter almost certainly included some, albeit a minority, of people with more latitudinarian views or even what Scarisbrick has called the "cold statute protestant."

John Guy illustrates some of the complexities met in defining the word Puritan when he says: "It could be defined in a religious sense - i.e. a puritan is a "church rebel" or "hotter sort" of Protestant; in a moral sense - i.e. a puritan is "censorious" or "narrow-minded" or in a social sense - i.e. no gentleman, none but mean persons are puritans."<sup>168</sup> Or, one might add, in a political sense, as when, looking into the next century, Richard Baxter observed, of the second parliament of Charles I, that it was made up of two groups "Good commonwealth men who defended English liberties and the rights of Parliament against arbitrary government and the more religious men troubled by recent innovations in the church."<sup>169</sup>

Given these problems of definition, do we have any other clues to establishing the religious profile of the English exiles from Marian England then resident at Frankfurt? As has already been mentioned, one of the fascinating aspects of the *Discourse* is the signatories to letters sent from and received by the Frankfurt church. There are a total of eighteen in Arber's edition of the *Discourse*. Some of them are of no help to us in this particular quest, because they are signed by one man. An example of these would be Calvin's two letters to the Frankfurt church. Some letters also have no signatures but bear the reference *as in the letter before*. An example of this would be the second reply from Zurich to Frankfurt's letter of invitation (or admonition) of 2 August 1554. Here one presumes that the same people who signed the first letter also signed the second. Nevertheless, with all the various exceptions, we still have twelve letters with signatories. They make interesting reading.

The first observation to be made from these is that the English exiles from Marian England were, by the standards of the time, remarkably mobile. Indeed, if one was to trace the journeys of many of them between the various centres of Europe, their movements would come to look like a densely occupied flight map of a modern airline. Garrett puts the point concisely when she says: "each colony---continued to change its membership so constantly that the component parts of any one community are found, in different combinations, to have formed the component parts of nearly every other community at some time during its existence."<sup>170</sup> Whittingham deplored this tendency of the exiles to travel, which he defined as "a pleasant progress or recreation"<sup>171</sup> words written in the

---

<sup>167</sup> See page 2.

<sup>168</sup> John Guy, *Tudor England*, p.305.

<sup>169</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.395.

<sup>170</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.53.

<sup>171</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.86.



aftermath of the Frankfurt debacle when Cox had brought in fellow sympathizers from other locations with a view to defeating Knox. Whittingham himself was a notable exception to this tendency, though he had travelled quite extensively in Europe in his earlier years.

But what about, to take an example, one of the ministers at the Frankfurt church, Thomas Lever?

Lever had been master of St John's College Cambridge and associated with the cause of Lady Jane Grey, prior to his flight to the continent. He took with him a group of students and went first to Strasbourg and then to Zurich where he made arrangements for the accommodation of the group. Lever then left for Geneva where he stayed for some months, but seems to have returned to Zurich at a later stage, as he signed Zurich's reply to Frankfurt's letter of admonition on 18 October 1554. He then again left Zurich, to return to Geneva, before moving to Frankfurt the following January to take up the job of minister at the church there. This would be for a relatively short period because, by October 1555, he is again in Geneva, listed in the *Livre d'Anglois* as a resident of the city, before the arrival of Whittingham and his associates from Frankfurt. Once again Lever's stay in Geneva would be short. For, in January 1556 he moved to Wesel, to take up the job of minister there in succession to Miles Coverdale. He remained in Wesel for a year, until the exiles were expelled from the town by the local 'Lutheran' authorities. Whereupon Lever "shepherded his flock to a new asylum at Aarau"<sup>172</sup> in the canton of Berne in Switzerland, where he remained for the rest of his exile.

Lever's experience of travel is not at all untypical and one might add that his latter moves were undertaken with serious intent of which even Whittingham would not have disapproved. However this does not appear to be the case with all the exiles, as we shall see later.

The second observation to be made from the signatories of the letters is that to think of homogenous groups with rigid, distinct ideologies in different locations would be mistaken. Views were fluid and shifting, as already mentioned in the case of Thomas Sampson (page 28). Collinson has observed, "refugee politics - - are as full of exaggerations as they are volatile."<sup>173</sup> Zurich, was regarded as a centre of Prayer Book supporters, yet, among signatories to its first letter to Frankfurt, occur the names of Laurence Humphrey and Thomas Bentham, along with that of Lever. In Elizabethan England Humphrey, then president of Magdalen College Oxford, was at the centre of the Vestiarian controversy with his opposition to the wearing of the surplice. Bentham returned to England before the death of Mary Tudor and became pastor of the underground Protestant congregation in Marian London.<sup>174</sup> Lever, himself, like Humphrey, was at the centre of the Vestiarian controversy. He objected to the wearing of the surplice and, as Southerden Burn has suggested, he might have had the highest preferment in the church but for his being so rigid a non-conformist.<sup>175</sup> (N.M. Sutherland actually

---

<sup>172</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.221.

<sup>173</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal 1519-1583*, p.78.

<sup>174</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant* pp. 196-197. MacCulloch records that already in the 1560's, former members of the underground church in Marian London began meeting again outside the parish system, outraged by the renewal of official requirements on clerical dress. Nevertheless, Knappen (*Tudor Puritanism*, p.160), quoting Foxe, says that "the Edwardian service was used" by the underground church during the Marian period.

<sup>175</sup> J Southerden Burn, *History of Parish Registers 1862*, Appendix: 'Livre des Anglois,' p.276.

states that Lever and Knox were leaders of the anti-Prayer Book party!)<sup>176</sup> These men, Zurich exiles, appear to be muted, rather than enthusiastic, Prayer Book supporters.

The signatories of the letter that Grindal brought from Strasbourg - the center of support for the Prayer Book - make equally interesting reading. It includes that of Christopher Goodman,<sup>177</sup> not normally regarded as a supporter of liturgical conformity! It also includes the name of Thomas Eaten, a merchant, who throughout the exile remained in Strasbourg. Yet, Eaten's views may have been more Puritan in sympathy than his sojourn in Strasbourg might suggest. According to Collinson, Eaten subsequently became closely associated with the French stranger church in Elizabethan London where "on the occasion of the election of the elders in the newly reorganised French church on 7 July 1560, Thomas Heton, an English merchant newly arrived from Strasbourg, and two other English brethren fresh from Geneva, were employed to sit at a table and count the votes."<sup>178</sup> What the *Discourse* describes as the "sixteen hands" that signed the Strasbourg letter do not look as if they were all unflinching Prayer Book supporters.

One further letter should also be mentioned, in the context of Whittingham's comments about "a pleasant progress or recreation" and that is the letter sent by the Frankfurt congregation to John Knox, on 24 September 1554, inviting him to come to Frankfurt as their minister. The letter has twenty one signatories. Among these appear the names of Thomas Steward and John Geoffrey.

Having signed this letter of invitation to Knox at Frankfurt, Steward then appears two months later at Strasbourg where, on 23 November, he did a volte-face and signed that city's critical letter sent to Frankfurt, a city to which he nevertheless returned during 1555! He then followed Whittingham to Geneva, albeit with a delay, subsequently moving to Basle.

Geoffrey is less peripatetic, but not much less inconsistent ecclesiastically than Steward. For, having also signed the letter of invitation to Knox, Geoffrey also subsequently moved to Strasbourg where, on 23 November 1554, he too signed that city's critical letter sent to Frankfurt, a city to which he also returned, albeit later than Steward, in 1557. Geoffrey and Steward are listed by Garrett as students, people who may, therefore, be forgiven their ecclesiastical inconsistencies because of their youth; but one is nevertheless forced to say: are these people really serious?

Certainly the Frankfurt exiles can not all be regarded as what the imperial ambassador to England, Renan, once described as hardened members of that sect.<sup>179</sup> They were not all 'godly.' On the other hand, with Cox having put an "English" cordon around the church in Frankfurt (page 31) there is clearly something of the "tennis club model," evoked in the introduction to this study, about the English church in Frankfurt.

In the second underlying question posed at the beginning of this thesis, it was asked whether there was any identifiable type or character of Refugee Church. Was there a natural tendency towards disputation and fraction or to one of unity? Easier to answer than the first underlying question, there was clearly a tendency towards disputation and fraction. Exaggerated and ingrown feuds - Collinson

---

<sup>176</sup> N.M. Sutherland, 'The English refugees at Geneva 1555-1560', *History Today* December 1977, p.780.

<sup>177</sup> With Goodman we enter straight into the complexities of the definition of Puritan - see page 35.

<sup>178</sup> Patrick Collinson, 'The Elizabethan Puritans and the Foreign Reformed Churches in London' *Godly People*, p.267.

<sup>179</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.328.

tells us - "are a normal consequence of that paradoxical combination of liberty and restriction which conditions the life of the refugee"<sup>180</sup> while Garrett has drawn our attention to the crowded living conditions of the exiles in the cities of the Rhine valley. "They had literally to be herded together, sometimes five families to a house, in quarters far too small for them. And they experienced all the evils of overcrowding from exacerbated tempers to the plague."<sup>181</sup> Clearly such conditions encouraged disputation and fraction.

What of our third underlying question: did the Refugee churches exercise any influence on the course of church history as well as on the history of the countries of origin of their members? Here, in the case of Frankfurt, the answer must be in the affirmative, though not in the way the exiles themselves hoped or imagined. Their effect on the "settlement" of religion in Elizabethan England was, from the point of view of the exiles, a negative one, driving it in a more conservative and static direction than might otherwise have been the case had their behaviour been less aggressive and more diplomatic. Looking beyond the period we are considering, Garrett sees a clear connection between the exiles and the political and religious events of mid XVII century England and later, of events in North America.

The answers to these questions must be taken up again when we have examined the English church in Geneva, to which we now turn.

---

<sup>180</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.73.

<sup>181</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, pp.19-20. John Kelke's house in Frankfurt housed five families or twenty two persons, Thomas Sandes house only three families but twenty eight persons. Garrett suggests that in Frankfurt John Ponet, Sir Richard Harrison and James Haddon died of plague.

## Chapter 3: The life of the English Church in Geneva

### 3.1 *The Geneva Background*

On 21 September 1555, Whittingham had written to Calvin: "Supposing that this letter will scarcely reach you much sooner than I shall arrive myself," and Whittingham and his party did indeed arrive in Geneva a few weeks later.<sup>182</sup> Four months earlier, on 10 June, Calvin had approached the town council, on behalf of the English departing exiles at Frankfurt, asking permission for them to reside in the city and requesting a church for their own use.<sup>183</sup> On 13 October, Whittingham and his colleagues: William Williams, Thomas Wood, Anthony Gilby, Christopher Goodman, John Hilton, John Hollingham and Thomas Crofton duly arrived in Geneva. Some days later, on 24 October, Calvin appeared before the city council requesting the use of the church St Germain or that of Ste Marie la neuve by the English arrivals. On the 11th of November, the city council granted them use of Ste Marie la neuve "et le 25 du même mois cet usage fut ainsi réglé"<sup>184</sup>

The city into which the Frankfurt exiles arrived in the autumn of 1555 had undergone dramatic changes in the previous half century. Ruled throughout the middle ages by a Prince Bishop, Geneva ultimately owed its allegiance to the House of Savoy, of whom the bishop was normally a member. The key to the dramatic changes referred to above, appears to have been economic. Geneva had long been an international crossroads, the junction of several major trade routes: its city fairs had played an important part in regional trade since the thirteenth century. The first fair is recorded in 1262. However, the city's economic success had aroused the jealousy of the King's of France, who made great efforts to promote Lyon as an alternative centre for trade and finance. In this they were successful, for Geneva's fairs peaked around the mid fifteenth century with both bankers and merchants subsequently moving away from Geneva to neighbouring Lyon.

In 1500, Geneva thus looked less well placed economically than it had done fifty years earlier. Its relative economic decline gave rise to a movement to link the city closer to the cities of Switzerland and in 1519 a *combourgeoisie* - an alliance - was formed with Fribourg (and later with Berne) doing just this, thus gaining both political, military and, later, financial support.

Under Savoyard pressure the alliance with Fribourg was later annulled, giving rise within Geneva to an anti-Savoyard and pro-Savoyard grouping. The latter, who tended to come from families of old wealth and who often staffed positions in the ducal and Episcopal courts, wished to be ruled by the Duke of Savoy, while the former, who tended to be wholesale merchants from families of new wealth, wished to have closer ties with the cities of the Swiss Confederation, but with this freedom protected by the Prince Bishop. By 1527 this former group had effectively overcome their opponents and was able to break direct Savoyard control - though not the possibility of re-conquest - over Geneva. The problem with this situation was the Prince Bishop who, though technically independent of Savoy, was ultimately dependent on the Duchy. Inevitably, therefore, resentment of the Duchy of Savoy led eventually to resentment of the church.

---

<sup>182</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.93.

<sup>183</sup> N.M. Sutherland 'The English Refugees at Geneva 1555-1559' *History Today* (December 1977), p.782.

<sup>184</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin 1555-1560*, p.39.

In 1528 the canton of Berne - with whom Geneva had signed a *combourgeoisie* in 1526 - accepted the Reformation. As William Naphy says: "Under the circumstances it appears highly probable that those preaching the Reform in Geneva must have found a sympathetic ear among those members of the Genevan ruling elite who already had reason to resent the position of the Church. The only means of breaking the Church was to cut off its money, but it was necessary to have a reasonable excuse to move against the Church's holdings."<sup>185</sup>

In October 1534, the Prince Bishop was deposed by a vote of Geneva's highest governing body the Petit Conseil. The bishop responded by excommunicating 250 Genevans, an act more likely to have united the people against the Bishop than to have gathered support for him. It was not therefore surprising that military revolt - supported by Berne - had freed Geneva from Savoyard control by 1535. By August of the same year the mass had been suspended and nine months later, in May 1536, the citizens of Geneva voted to establish the Reformation in their city.

Preceding events had been neither straight nor clear. Indeed Geneva came to live with a sort of paranoia of fear: on the one hand of military attack from Savoy, and, on the other, of loss of independence through submission to Berne. The former fear led to the levelling of the suburbs outside the city walls in 1531, making Geneva easier to defend from attack. It has been estimated that as many as 1,300 persons - more than ten per cent of the population - were at this time forced into the city from the suburbs alone. But, there was also an exodus; for, a few years later, the acceptance of the Reformation resulted in the forced departure from the city of up to ninety men and their families, well over 500 people, as well as the clergy and associated officers of the traditional church. "This left Geneva full of refugees from its suburbs and, at the same time, bereft of many of the members of its former ruling class and much of their wealth and expertise."<sup>186</sup>

The latter fear, loss of the jealously guarded independence of Geneva to the power of Berne, played a part in Calvin's first conflict in Geneva, following his arrival in 1536.

Calvin first arrived in Geneva in July of that year, en route to Strasbourg. He was persuaded to stay in Geneva by Guillaume Farel who had been striving to implement the Reformation in the city, aided by his young colleague, Pierre Viret from Orbe in the Vaud. The two men had met with only modest success. On his second visit to Geneva, Farel barely escaped with his life.<sup>187</sup> A Frenchman from the Alps, Farel had been an associate and disciple of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, first at Paris and then at Meaux. He lived for a while with Oecolampadius in Basle, subsequently becoming a roving preacher in communities ranging from Switzerland to Lorraine. From 1526 - 1529 his chief base was at Aigle, in the canton of Bern, where he opened a school under a pseudonym and, after the Berne disputation, took charge of implementing the Reformation that made this tiny town the first Protestant city in French-speaking Europe. He continued his work as roving preacher with growing success and was instrumental in the abolition of the mass in the city of Neuchâtel in 1530. The Bernese annexation of the Pays de Vaud in 1536 was followed by the triumph of the Reformation in the city of Lausanne, where Farel had previously encountered substantial opposition.<sup>188</sup> But Geneva proved a harder nut to

---

<sup>185</sup> William Naphy, *Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation*, p.19.

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, p.24.

<sup>187</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.80.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*, p.78.

crack and Farel realised that he needed the help of the younger Calvin. Of fiery temperament and lacking in diplomacy, Farel was also keenly aware of his intellectual limitations.

But Calvin himself was hardly more successful in dealing with the city authorities in his initial phase in Geneva. In 1537 he presented the city councillors with a set of articles for the organisation of the church. These included a confession of faith that Calvin and his fellow ministers stipulated that all citizens should sign on pain of excommunication, which meant exclusion from communion. A number of citizens initially refused to make the necessary confession of faith and although they were eventually persuaded to do so, the effort involved persuaded the city council that nobody should be excommunicated i.e. denied communion, in this context.<sup>189</sup> This went to the basis of Calvin's struggle in Geneva. Who should determine church practice, the city council or the church? What might appear the obvious answer to someone living in the twenty first century was not so obvious to someone living in the sixteenth. Calvin thought that it was the church that should make such decisions, whether it was over the all important question of excommunication or of one of less importance that surfaced at this stage, namely the use of leavened or unleavened bread at communion.

It is of vital importance to remember that Calvin's view on this issue, which was central to his battles with his opponents throughout his time in Geneva, was at odds with that of Zwingli and, subsequently, Bullinger in Zurich. These reformers saw the church as co-terminous with the city and one, therefore, where decisions on matters such as excommunication should be taken by the city council. The Calvin view, for similar reasons, also ran contrary to that of Wolfgang Musculus in Berne. Lest it be thought that the Zurich/Berne position implied an easy going attitude towards behaviour from their clerics, it is worth remembering that Wolfgang Musculus, the austere preacher from Augsburg who, after the Interim, moved to Berne, is on record as saying that "he would rather see his daughter join a whorehouse than attend a dance."<sup>190</sup>

The dispute between the ministers and council in Geneva also involved Berne. This was a very sensitive factor because there would have been many people in Geneva who would not wish to upset Berne on whose military support the city was dependent. In 1538 the council in Geneva ordered the clergy to reintroduce certain features of worship still used in Berne but abolished in Geneva, notably the use of special communion wafers (unleavened bread) for communion and the observation of four traditional (ecclesiastical) holidays. The ministers refused and, after further provocation, were dismissed by the council and ordered to leave the city.

Calvin spent most of the next three years in Strasbourg where, at Bucer's invitation, he ministered to the local French church, the first refugee church to which reference was made in the introduction to this study. Here, this church attained the independent system of church discipline run by a consistory of ministers and elders and the autonomous administration of ecclesiastical poor relief by deacons that had become Calvin and Bucer's ideal.<sup>191</sup> Calvin was ultimately able to obtain something like an

---

<sup>189</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.94.

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*, p.44 and p.62 "Musculus left Augsburg during the Interim crisis, arriving in Berne just as the church of its recently conquered French-speaking territory of the Pays de Vaud, was being divided between partisans of a Geneva style church with an autonomous system of consistorial discipline and defenders of a Zurich style church under magisterial control."

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, p.95.

independent system of discipline in Geneva,<sup>192</sup> something, however, that was denied Bucer in Strasbourg. For, as Benedict says, although Strasbourg's magistrates "thought it fine if immigrants regulated their own behaviour and ran their own charities - they were not prepared to give the civic church the authority to bar people from communion."<sup>193</sup>

Towards the end of 1541, Calvin returned to Geneva following entreaties seeking his return that had begun in September 1540. An outsider to the scene might wonder why the council in Geneva, having expelled Calvin from their city, should want to invite him, nay implore him, to come back three years later? The answer to this question lies in the fact that we are talking here about the sixteenth century and not the twenty first. At the time of Calvin, even the most latitudinarian, sceptical, irreligious of people did not think that it was possible to organise society in Europe independently of the Christian church. Without the church there was likely to be social chaos. And in Calvin's absence there had been something like social chaos - at least in the Church. The city council in Geneva came to realise that they needed Calvin. They had realised this during his absence when the bishop of Carpentras, Jacopo Sadoletto, wrote an appeal to the people of Geneva to return to the traditional church. Who could write a reply to Sadoletto? The city council might not like Calvin but nor did they want to return to the traditional church. So, they called upon Calvin in Strasbourg to write the reply to Sadoletto, something that the remaining ministers in Geneva were unable or unwilling to do.

Undoubtedly the council had a secret, sneaking respect for Calvin. He was, after all, all that they were not: cultivated, albeit austere, intellectual and a lawyer. And, he was gaining prestige far beyond the city of Geneva, something of which the local councillors were no doubt proud. Furthermore, they needed him for more than to preach the word of God. With the demise of the traditional church, and departure of Geneva's cultured elite who had been associated with it, the city was left, as has been mentioned earlier, bereft of its former professional class. When, therefore, it came to drafting legal agreements, who was going to do it for the undoubtedly shrewd and intelligent, but formally uneducated, city councillors? The answer was Calvin, who assumed the role of the city's lawyer. He not only drafted the city's constitution, but was actively involved in drafting the various memoranda covering the city's relationship with Berne and other Swiss entities. So, perhaps, it no surprise to find that while Calvin was recalled to Geneva, Farel, who remained in Neuchatel, was not.

While he may have been recalled, the path was difficult, for the reformer spent the next fourteen years struggling to impose his vision of a Christian society on a recalcitrant populace. On return to Geneva Calvin endeavoured to establish a system that would avoid the pitfalls that he had met in his initial period in the city. He also drew on his pastoral experience in Strasbourg.

---

<sup>192</sup> This is now disputed. William Naphy-Calvin Handbook ed H.Selderhuis Stations *Geneva II*, pp.49-50, states that the *Ordinances* had left vague the question of where lay the power to excommunicate. "Both the ministers (and their political allies on the Consistory) and the senators (the Petit conseil) were convinced that each held supreme power in excommunication. Indeed, until 1555, the Senate consistently ruled that the consistory could only admonish sinners and recommend their excommunication. Calvin (a foreign employee of the state) and the other ministers were as firm in asserting their absolute right to excommunicate." Naphy cites one case of discipline concerning a Genevan cutler, Claude Clément, which, over a period of years bounced backwards and forwards between the Petit Conseil and the Consistory.

<sup>193</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.95.

The ecclesiastical ordinances drawn up specifically invoked the four ministries that God was said to have established for his church: ministers, doctors,<sup>194</sup> elders and deacons. While the Ordinances placed the power to test and nominate candidates for pastoral positions in the hands of the sitting ministers, their choice was to be reviewed by the city government and finally put before the congregation for approval.<sup>195</sup> More important, for our purposes, were the arrangements put in place for elders, who together with the ministers, were responsible for discipline.

“Elders were to be chosen by the city officials from the members of the various councils that made up the city government.”<sup>196</sup> As Elders and Ministers sat together on the consistory, Calvin was clearly involving the secular authorities in what might be called ‘his own dirty work,’ which obviously enhanced the possibilities of the consistory’s effective operation. This may not have been a Zurich style church under magisterial control - footnote page 41 - but Benedict is surely right when he says: “on this score the Genevan ordinances linked the consistory more tightly to the city government than would many later Reformed church orders.”<sup>197</sup>

In spite of what may be called the above protections, the original ambiguity over responsibility for excommunication did not disappear, as already mentioned. Who had the power to admit people to communion, the ministers or the Petit Conseil? Although this question had, theoretically at least, been settled following Calvin’s return in 1541, in practice it festered on with supporters of magisterial control, largely from long established families, opposed by those, often immigrants, who supported the ministers. The flow of immigration into Geneva was such that, by the 1550’s immigrants, who were largely French, made up more than half of the population of the city. Inevitably resentment came to be felt for the newcomers, particularly the clergy who were entirely French. Not until 1594 would a native born Genevois become a pastor in the city’s reformed church. Thus, as Benedict says: “Not everybody in Geneva appreciated the flood of immigrants, harsher laws, and new consistorial oversight of their lives, especially since the ministers who promoted these measures were themselves outsiders who drew much of their support from the immigrants. To many native Genevans it began to appear as if their reformation had been hijacked by foreigners.”<sup>198</sup>

Only *Bourgeois* had the right to vote in local elections but this was a status that an immigrant could acquire but for which he had to pay. Geneva may not have liked its newcomers but it needed their money. Tracing the flow of admissions of people into *bourgeois* status seems to suggest that there existed a link between this flow and the state of the city’s finances. Admissions of new *bourgeois* - whose children automatically became citizen and thus eligible to sit on the ruling Petit Conseil - appear to have been a crucial factor in the success of the party sympathetic to Calvin in the 1555 elections, which is regarded as the turning point for Calvin. It was also crucial in their subsequent consolidation of power.

When, therefore, the exiles from Frankfurt arrived in Geneva in October 1555, it may well have been at a time when, as the secondary literature of the period says, Calvin had emerged triumphant, but this had happened only five months previously and been obtained after a long period of struggle.

---

<sup>194</sup> See footnote page 10.

<sup>195</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ’s Churches Purely Reformed*, p.96.

<sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*, p.96.

<sup>197</sup> *Ibid.*, p.96.

<sup>198</sup> *Ibid.*, p.99.



And, as Knappen reminds us, speaking of Calvin “not until 1555 did he gain anything like a free hand in Geneva, so that his real power lasted only ten years. Even then it was by no means absolute. He was frequently forced to compromise with the Council, and might even be outvoted by his fellow ministers.”<sup>199</sup> However, it is undoubtedly true that Calvin was in a better position to help the Frankfurt exiles in the autumn of 1555 than he would have been a few years earlier.

With the grant of the church Ste Marie la neuve the Genevan authorities also provided the exiles with benches and a bell. The church, which was already equipped with a pulpit, was shared with the Italian Protestant exile community. The English had use of the church on Mondays, Tuesdays and Wednesdays, the Italians having access to the church for the rest of the week. Both communities had access to the church on Sunday, with the English holding their service at nine in the morning and the Italians later in the day.

On the 29 November 1555, Christopher Goodman and Anthony Gilby - who in the absence of John Knox, had been chosen by their fellow exiles as ministers of the church - swore an oath of allegiance to the city before the local magistrates. Thus began the life of the English church in Geneva whose existence would terminate less than four years later when the exiles returned to their home in England on the accession of Elizabeth to the throne of England.

### ***3.2 The English church in Geneva - Its beginnings and its nature***

Charles Martin tells us that, of the various sources of information on the members of the English church, “la plus importante est sans contredit celle qui se trouve dans un cahier manuscrit déposé dans les archives de l’Etat de Genève, par les membres de la communauté au moment de dissoudre ce corps. »<sup>200</sup> Indeed it was William Whittingham, one of the last exiles to leave Geneva, who presented the Geneva city council with the *Livre des Anglois*, a list of members, officials, baptisms, marriages and burials at the church, when he left the city in 1560.

The original of the *Livre des Anglois* remains in the Geneva city archives but was transcribed in 1831 by J. Southerden Burn, on the basis of an authenticated copy given to him by Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges. This was later published in the second edition of Burn’s *History of Parish registers* in 1862.<sup>201</sup> Broadly faithful to the original, there nevertheless appears the occasional error of transmission in this transcription as well as three omissions.

Apart from the *Livre des Anglois*, the city archives in Geneva also furnish us with two additional sources of information on the English exiles: the *Livre des Bourgeois* and the *Livre des Habitants* and it is interesting to see how these two documents interact with the *Livre des Anglois*, as we shall see later.

There were already English people established in Geneva before the arrival of Whittingham and his company, as we have seen in the movements, already described, of Thomas Lever. He appears to have been a frequent visitor to Geneva in the pre-Whittingham period. But, at that time there was no “English” church in the city. The English, therefore, had the option of worshipping with the local population, for which knowledge of French, or a local patois, would have been of help, or, not at all. There is, thus, the possibility that these people were not particularly godly; happy to join a church if it

---

<sup>199</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.137.

<sup>200</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin 1555-1560*, p.44.

<sup>201</sup> John Southerden Burn, *History of Parish Registers*, ‘Livre des Anglois’ Appendix, pp. 271-288.

appeared, but content to be without one if none existed. This could have been the case with one of the prominent early English settlers in the city, Sir William Stafford. Sir William, a former courtier of Henry VIII, established himself in Geneva, together with his household of up to ten people, before October 1555.

Martin himself divides membership of the English church in Geneva into three categories: those who came to Geneva in October 1555 “pour profiter des privilèges qui venait d’être accordés à l’église,” those who lived in Geneva prior to October 1555 and who joined the church on its formation and, finally, people who came to Geneva and joined the church after it was founded in November 1555.

It is worth examining this second group in some detail. According to the *Livre* it comprised:

*Sir Willm Stafford* plus wife, sister in law, cousin, son, daughter, three servants and one maid. Sir William’s wife Dorothy - who, according to Martin, “ne semble pas avoir partagé les convictions strictement réformées de son mari, ni s’être acclimatisée dans le milieu puritain de Genève,”<sup>202</sup> - attempted to leave Geneva, following her husband’s death, in 1556. Sir William had married his second wife Dorothy in 1545 moving to Geneva in 1555. Godly people marry into the Godly, which suggests that Sir William was not of this party (unless he underwent a conversion after his marriage to his second wife) whatever Martin says about William Stafford being “un partisan décidé de la Réforme.”

*Thomas Lever* - see earlier comments.

*John Prettie* - he subsequently moved to Aarau.

*John Pigeon* - Garrett assumes that he returned to England during the reign of Mary Tudor.

*Nicholas Harvy* – nothing significant is known about Harvy but he is assumed to have stayed in Geneva.

*Michael Gill* - had been at Frankfurt from the early days of the church. He is said by Garrett to have been a member of Whittingham’s party, but left Frankfurt for Geneva before him, possibly following John Knox.

*William Beauvoir* – a merchant from Guernsey who played an important part in the life of the church. He was elected deacon in December 1556, 1557 and 1558. He signed the letter from Geneva sent out to other exile centres, urging a common front when the exiles returned to England on the death of Mary Tudor.

*Harry Dunce* or *John Harrydunce* - clearly a member of the Godly, a bricklayer from Whitechapel, who during the reign of Henry VIII “used to preche the gospelle in his gardene every holydaye.” Forced to recant, he later bore a fagot at St Paul’s Cross. He stayed in Geneva throughout the exile.

*Richard Amondesham* and his son or younger brother *William* - little is known of these two people before their arrival in Geneva - or afterwards – see subsequent comment pages 52-53.

---

<sup>202</sup> Charles Martin, *La famille Stafford à Genève - son conflit avec Calvin*, p.5.

Taking this group as a whole there seems no overriding reason to think of them as members of the Godly with the exception of Harry Dunce and Thomas Lever who, himself, was not often in residence. It would therefore be reasonable to assume that the group was less zealous in their Christian belief than the refugees from Frankfurt, thus diluting somewhat the fervor of the new church and making it in some way not totally dissimilar to the cross section of the type of church, albeit with Puritan tendencies, that later emerged in Elizabethan England.

What about the first group who came to Geneva with Whittingham?

The *Livre des Anglois* lists them as follows:

*William Williams and Jane his wife*

*Thomas Wood, Anne his wife and Debora their daughter*

*Anthony Gilby, Elizabeth his wife, and Goddred their sonne.*

*Willm Jackson, Parnel his wife, Willm and Andrew his sonnes, and Margery and Judith his daughters.*

*John Holingham, Elene his wife and Daniel his sonne.*

*Thomas Knolles and Johan his wife.*

*Christopher Goodman.*

*William Whittingham.*

*John Stanton – John Hilton – Christopher Seburne – Richard Potter – John Ponce – John Matson – Thomas Crofton.*

Twenty seven people thus arrived with Whittingham when he came to Geneva. On the assumption - undoubtedly dubious - that wives and children have the same views as their husbands and fathers, we might say that the hard core: Whittingham, Wood, Gilby, Williams, and Goodman are quite well known to us. But what about the others? They were, after all, a part of a minority group who, at the cost of what must have been considerable disruption, had left one place of exile for another. One would have expected that there would be something distinctive about them. Unfortunately this does not seem to have been the case.

John Hilton, John Poyntz, John Matson and Thomas Crofton left no further trace of their life in exile while Richard Potter subsequently returned to Frankfurt. Only John Stanton and Christopher Seburne subsequently played an active part in the life of the church. Both men were elected deacons in December 1555 and, while Seburne only served one year, Staunton was re-elected deacon in December 1556.

Among the families who arrived in 1555, apart from those of Williams, Wood and Gilby; Thomas Knolles and his wife subsequently returned to Frankfurt. Of the other two families, of whom little is known, Garrett suggests that the Jackson's, unlike the Hollinghams, did not come from Frankfurt at all.

The picture of this first group, like the second group already mentioned above, is, once again, not clearly Godly. Though they may have followed their godly leaders, there is no reason to think that the views of the members of this group were entirely the same as theirs.

It would thus be reasonable to conclude that the members of the English church at inception were much more latitudinarian in view than the secondary literature suggests. They certainly were not, in the whole, what N.M Sutherland has described as “religious extremists”.<sup>203</sup>

Martin’s third group covers people who arrived in Geneva after the foundation of the church in November 1555 and before its demise in May 1560, the date of departure of the last English exiles from Geneva. There were no less than 168 of them. There were also losses to the church through fifteen deaths but, more important, and something of which we already have had a taste, movements of people elsewhere.

The list of subsequent arrivals, the bulk of whom arrived in 1556 and 1557, as recorded in the *Livre d’Anglois*, is as follows:

A° 1556

James Pilkington\* Robert Beaumont, Peter - - - , John Stubbes, Peter Willyes.  
Thomas Knolles, John Scorye\* Thoms Sampson\*John Fferrar, Rowland Hall\*, Gualter Williams,  
Thomas Langley, Anthony Miere, James Yonge and Anne his wife, John Burtwick- Knight,  
and John Kellye his page.  
12 July 1556 William Fuller\* Joice his wife, Peter Lange and Richard Gawton his servants  
and Marie Gawton his maide.  
13 September. John Knox\*Margery his wife, Elizabeth her mother, James - - ,  
his servant and Patrick his puple.  
5 November 1556. Frauncis Withers, - - - - his wife, John Houghton his svant,  
and Ales Broughton his maide.  
Nicholas Ffolgeham, Lawrence Argall, Richard Chrispe, Theodore Newton his wife and Gedion  
his sonne, James Knolles, John Bolton, Thomas Spenser, Adam Holiday, John Yonge, Harry  
Withers and Stephen Withers bretherne to the said Francis Withers. Willm Keth\*and his wife,  
Thomas Stewarde.  
8 May 1557. Anne Locke\*, Harrie her sonne and Ann her daughter and Katherine her maide  
William Samuel and - - -his wife, Roger Dransfeld.  
Thomas Knolles the eldest- - - -his wife, Michael and Nicholas his - - - -  
Thomas Jhones.  
May 1557 John Bodleigh\* - - - - his wife, Thomas, John and Lawrence his sonnes, Prothese his  
daughter, John Boggens and Richard Vivian his servants and Eleanor his maide. Nicholas, brother  
to the said John Bodleghe, Nicholas Hilliarde, Augustin Brodebreche, Percival Wiburne.  
John James  
Mary Rowlandson children of - - - -  
5 June 1557. James U - - - -

---

<sup>203</sup> N.M. Sutherland, ‘The English Refugees at Geneva 1555-1559’, *History Today* December 1977, p.779.

Water Richardson, John Baker, Peter Hawkes, Richard Gibbens, Barnard Hurderson, John Pullein  
- - - - his wife and Faith his daughter. Ales Agar widowe, Johan and Priscilla her daughters and  
Thomas her sonne, Willm Cole.\*

20 November 1557. Thomas Bentham\* Mawde Ffawcon, Thomas Mosgrave, John Daniel - - - -  
his wife and his sonnes Mawdes - - - - -, Gibson - - - - his wife and - - - - his daughter.

Richard East, James Tailor, Thomas Johns, Willm Chambres.

26 November 1557 Robert Ffielde and Rose his wife, Ales Salmon widowe, Thomas Knell, Harrye  
Lelande, Harrye Smith, John Pellam, William Morley.

2 Decemb: 1557 Anthony Caryer, John Mansfielde.

A° 1558

Ffebruary, 17. John Collyn, being a very aged man.

28 of April. Lawrence Kent and Willm his sonne and Elene his daughter.

Robt Blackman of Aprill last past

Lawrence Humphrey\*of April last past.

June 2. Willm Johnson came to Geneva the 5 January 1558.

Nicholas Arbott the 29 of Marche.

Willm Cotes- - - - of Aprill last past.

Richard Proctour - - - - Aprill last past

August 13. Charles Williams, borne in Bristow, made his confession of faith  
and was admitted to the church.

Setemb 15 David Linsey, a Scottisman was received.

\*The more prominent members of the church

The writing in the original of the *Livre d'Anglois* is often indecipherable and leaves gaps e.g. of first names of people or precise dates which is reflected in the records of the *Livre* in both the record of Southerden Burn and that of Charles Martin where the *Livre* appears as an appendix to his *Les Protestants Anglais*.

The original <sup>204</sup> of the *Livre des Anglois* is, for the most part, written in one hand writing. It could be said that the details of the entries become somewhat more slapdash as time goes on, but the most interesting point within them occurs when the handwriting changes, and that is for the last two entries, namely that for Charles Williams on August 13 1558 and that for David Linsey on September 15 of the same year.

The entry for Charles Williams, as can be seen above, is the only one where there is mention of a confession of faith. Did this reference reflect something about the new scribe? Who was the new scribe anyway? While it is now generally agreed that Wood, not Whittingham, was the author of the

---

<sup>204</sup> The original manuscript of the *Livre des Anglois* - to be found in the city archives in Geneva - has 180 pages of which 149 are marked out, in different sections. Pages one to six cover members of the church with pages seven to 48 left blank. Clearly the English church in Geneva was optimistic about its future growth or, pessimistic about the length of the reign of Mary Tudor. Pages 73 and 74 cover baptisms, while pages 75-104 are blank. Marriages cover but one page, 105, while pages 106-128 are blank. Readers with an arithmetical disposition might amuse themselves by calculating how many births per family these figures implied!

*Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort* – page 8 - it may reasonably be assumed that Whittingham was the 'primary author' or leading light behind the *Livre des Anglois*. The *Livre* after all was Whittingham's 'baby'; it was Whittingham who had contact with the Geneva council and it was Whittingham who handed in the *Livre* to the council when he left the city in May 1560. Wood was, undoubtedly, Whittingham's 'back-up' making entries into the *Livre* as necessary. Wood, described by Collinson as a "puritan of the puritans, fearless and contentious" (Elizabethan Puritan Movement p.133 ) may be regarded as more 'fanatical' than Whittingham - page 8 - so when he took on as scribe he may have decided to mention the confession of faith that Whittingham had not thought necessary. A not dissimilar observation may be made in the case of baptisms, where the new scribe takes on responsibility for entries at the same time - in 1558. It is at this stage that we first see reference to the word *witnesse* rather than the word *godfather*. Given the controversy surrounding godfathers in the Reformed churches at the time it could be that Wood, more fanatical than Whittingham, decided to use the word *witnesse* in the entries that he made in the *Livre*, rather than *godfather*. A 'fanatical' man is often a consistent or precise one. If this is the case why did the new scribe not make mention of a confession of faith in the case of David Linsey having the previous month made such a reference in the case of Charles Williams? Perhaps, making a confession of faith was optional? This may be regarded as pure supposition and unlikely in the context of the time but the point is nevertheless of enormous importance as we shall stress again later.

Trawling through the names, from Garrett's *Marian Exiles*, of those people who joined the church after November 1555, does not suggest a substantially different group of people from the existing members of the church. To utter a tautology, those of whom little is known, little is known. However, an analysis undertaken by the writer, which is inevitably far from objective and indeed, quite probably, highly subjective, suggests that less than two fifth's of the church were 'godly.' There may, however, be evidence of a more stable community in Geneva than that in Frankfurt; less comings and goings appear to be recorded by Garrett and, where they have occurred, it quite often appears to be the case that Geneva was the last port of call in the exile.

Reference has already been made – page 44 - to two other official documents, namely the *Livre des Habitants* and the *Livre des Bourgeois*. The former - where all English residents should have been recorded - is of particular interest for our purposes for the implied implication from Garrett's own data is that some of the English exiles in Geneva were not members of the English church at all. This is a rather startling fact given that these people were supposed to have fled England on behalf of their Christian faith. As if to whet our appetite, Garrett, when commenting on a Genevan exile in her compendium, sometimes mentions that he or she became a member of the English church, sometimes she does not. Equally, sometimes an exile is recorded as being mentioned in the *Livre des Habitants* sometimes he, or she, is not.

Although it is not immediately clear why, in some cases listed in her compendium, Garrett fails to mention whether a particular Genevan exile was a member of the English church, the fact remains that of the 130 exiles that she lists as at some stage resident in Geneva, only eighty - less than two thirds of her 130 total - are listed by her as members of the English church. In some cases this lack of mention may be because membership is so obvious, or the stay in Geneva so short, as for example with Robert Horne, former Dean of Durham and later minister of the English church in Frankfurt, that it is thought to be not worth mentioning. In other cases omission may simply be a question of oversight.

It is, of course, primary sources that matter in these circumstances, and here Martin picks up the same point, when, talking of the data in the *Livre des Anglois* he correctly states “mais ces chiffres sont quelque peu modifiés par le *Registre des Habitants* dans le quel nous trouvons 26 Anglais ayant reçu les droits à l’habitation dont le *Livre des Anglois* ne fait aucune mention.»<sup>205</sup> The figures are therefore different from Garrett’s, but the conclusions are the same.

Martin continues by saying of these people “il est bien peu probable, cependant, qu’ils soient restés en dehors de l’action de l’église.»<sup>206</sup> If Martin’s comment that such people are unlikely to have lived outside the influence of the church is to be accepted, it is also reasonable to suggest that this was not a one way process and that such people may also have had some influence on the church. Martin’s further comment: “nous n’avons pas à beaucoup nous étonner de cette omission dans un registre d’église dans les colonnes du quel nul ne devait être forcé de se faire inscrire »<sup>207</sup> points to a group of people on the fringes of the church whose constituent parts begin to look less like a compact of godly believers and more like those of a church than a conventicle.<sup>208</sup>

---

<sup>205</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin*, p.47.

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid.*, p.47.

<sup>207</sup> *Ibid.*, p.47.

<sup>208</sup> I take as an illustrative example, two Anglican churches known to me in England in my childhood. The first, Emmanuel church South Croydon, where Henry Chadwick served as curate during the Second World war, was one of two “rock solid” evangelical churches (the other was the Baptist church in West Croydon) in Croydon at the time. Its congregation was entirely made up of ‘born again’ Christians apart, perhaps, from friends of members taken along to the church with a view to their conversion. Church members attended, en masse, the Billy Graham conventions held in Harringey in London in the early nineteen fifties, several members of the church probably acting as counsellors there. I was told that the vicar at the church would have been very happy to officiate at services in his braces, an introduction for me, albeit going backward in time, to the Vestarian controversy.

The other church is St Nicholas at Sevenoaks in Kent. At some stage patronage to the church passed into the hands of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, an Evangelical pressure group, who installed a curate, a man of great personal magnetism, in the early 1950’s. A year or two later an Evangelical rector arrived. He once explained to me, during a confirmation class, why the choir in the church was no longer turning to the East to recite the creed, because “they had come to know Christ in their heart” rather than as someone out of the window in some far away place. One imagines that, at some stage, a number of recently converted Godly believers in the choir persuaded their fellow choristers not to turn eastwards, thus avoiding the spectacle of some turning eastwards and some not (something that would not have been appreciated by Elizabeth 1’s third Archbishop Whitgift who wanted discipline in the church) or, perhaps, the decision was reached by majority vote. This was not, perhaps, Archbishop Whitgift’s invisible church of believers within the visible church for the Godly at St Nicholas were becoming all too visible. Nevertheless, as the Parish church in Sevenoaks, the doors of St Nicholas were open - people would more naturally go through them - to a wider world, in a way that those of Emmanuel church in South Croydon were not. It is in this sense that I suggest that, in spite of the differences of order and liturgy, the English church in Geneva in the 1550’s, like St Nicholas in Sevenoaks four hundred years later, was a church (how in the Geneva of the 1550’s could it have been otherwise) whereas Emmanuel church in South Croydon exuded the atmosphere of a conventicle.

It should be remembered, in this context, that it is nowhere recorded that church members were obliged to sign the confession of faith drawn up for the English church and it has already been suggested above - page 49 - that making a confession of faith may have been optional.

Martin himself finds the omission strange: "Bien qu'il n'en soit fait mention nulle part, il est à peu près certain que cette confession de foi était imposé à l'acceptation de tous ceux qui devenaient membres de la congrégation Anglaise réunie à Genève. »<sup>209</sup> But was it so certain? The same author has already told us of the church register, which is, presumably, the same as, or the basis of, the *Livre d'Anglois*, that "dans les colonnes du quel nul ne devait être force de se faire inscrire." This points to a rather loose organisation that has as much in common with a mainstream church in twentieth century Europe as a Reformed one in the sixteenth. Thus, if people were not forced to sign the church register, maybe they were not forced to sign a confession of faith.

The overall picture that begins to emerge is, thus, far from that with which one might have started out, namely that of a broad church as opposed to a compact one of godly believers. This is indeed a point of enormous importance and weighs on our overall assessment given to the English church in Geneva in a later chapter.

### ***3.3 Activities of the English exiles in Geneva***

The *Livre d'Anglois* provides little information on what might be called the extra-curricular activities of the English church, with one notable exception: at first sight it seems strange that the *Livre* does not begin with a list of those people who became members of the church but rather with names of those who became *bourgeois* of the city. On reflection this is, perhaps, not so strange as this became the city of Calvin, if such it may be designated, and it was Calvin who, more than any other reformer, placed so much emphasis on the hallowing of secular life when its activities were devoted to God.

We have already mentioned *bourgeois* status in the context of Calvin's 'early' life in Geneva- page 43 - and, as was mentioned there, *bourgeois* status gave the right to vote in local elections, but it was something for which one had to be accepted and for which one had to pay. The highest elected post, that of the *Petit Conseil*, Geneva's highest governing council, was, as has also already been mentioned, only open to Geneva born citizens, though Geneva born children of bourgeois automatically acquired citizenship. Acquisition of *bourgeois* status would thus suggest that the person concerned intended to put down roots in the city.

The first English exile to gain this status, at the end of June 1557, was, appropriately, William Whittingham. As has already been mentioned - pages 8-9 - he was widely travelled, spoke French and German and, in addition to Oxford, had studied at the universities of Lyon and Orleans. Earlier in his life he had acted as interpreter for the English ambassador to France, Sir John Mason, father in law to Sir John Cheeke, himself an exile. During his stay in Geneva Whittingham was to marry Katheryne Jaquemayne, whom Garrett suggests he may have met while at university in Orleans. William Naphy lists a financial transaction between the Whittinghams and Francois Bernier, a native of Orleans and Katheryne's brother-in law - with whom she had been lodging - as one of the ten major financial transactions that took place in Geneva between 1549 and 1557.<sup>210</sup> It was, indeed, entirely appropriate

---

<sup>209</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.93.

<sup>210</sup> William G.Naphy, *Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation*, p.249.



that Whittingham should acquire bourgeois status, because he was regarded, not least by Calvin, as the leader of the English exiles and someone who was able to negotiate with local authorities, town councils and similar entities.

Eleven months later, at the end of May 1558, John Bodley followed Whittingham and became a *bourgeois* of the city, while, according to the *Livre des Bourgeois* the next month, on 21 June, *bourgeois* status was acquired by John Knox, Christopher Goodman, John Baron, William Williams, and Richard Amondesham.<sup>211</sup>

What motivated these men to seek *bourgeois* status is unclear. Bodley had arrived in Geneva in May 1557. He was a wealthy merchant from the west country of England. Danner states that his wife was heiress to both fame and fortune.<sup>212</sup> In 1549 Bodley had financed the suppression of the rebellion in Devon against the introduction of the first Edwardian Prayer Book. On leaving England, he went first, together with his family, to Wesel and, when obliged to leave, moved for a brief period to Frankfurt before going to Geneva. He was probably influenced by business considerations in seeking *bourgeois* status for, in 1558, he established a printing office in Geneva with the help of William Williams.

William Williams would have been influenced by similar factors. Reckoned by Garrett<sup>213</sup> to have been assay master of the mint in Dublin, he was a staunch supporter of William Whittingham throughout the exile. As he arrived in Frankfurt with him, so he left Geneva with him; one of the last exiles to do so at the end of May 1560. Williams had become a burger in Frankfurt in July 1554, the first English exile to do so. One might say that having done it once in Frankfurt it was, perhaps, easy to do again in Geneva, though business considerations must have been uppermost in his decision.

John Knox's motive in becoming a *bourgeois* could simply have been regarded by him as a way of expressing his loyalty to Geneva, a city from which, however, he was often absent. It could hardly have been done out of loyalty to Calvin, who only received *bourgeois* status after Knox, in December 1559!

Only speculation can provide an answer to Goodman's motivations. Perhaps he simply followed Knox. At all events, Théophile Heyer records that both men were admitted *bourgeois* for free "au respect de leur ministère de la parole de Dieu"<sup>214</sup>

Of the last two people in the list, it is not easy to discern what could have motivated Richard Amondesham to seek *bourgeois* status. It is possible that he simply wanted to put down roots in the city. In January 1558 he got married and he had, after all, been in Geneva before the arrival of Whittingham and company in the autumn of 1555. For John Baron, the motive is somewhat easier to discern, as he was involved with the various printing and publication projects of the Genevan exiles, including that of the Geneva Bible. In this sense he could be seen to be following Bodley and Williams.

---

<sup>211</sup> *Livre des Bourgeois de l'ancienne république de Genève*, p.261.

<sup>212</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, p.80.

<sup>213</sup> Christina Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, pp. 335-336.

<sup>214</sup> Théophile Heyer, 'Notice sur la colonie Anglaise établie à Genève de 1555-1560', *Mémoires de la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève*, Vol IX, 1855., p.346.

These last two men are of particular interest, however, because of the light that they throw on the quality of our sources, a point that was alluded to earlier when discussing members of the church. The *Livre des Anglois* records that Richard Amondesham, together with William Amondesham, probably a younger brother, possibly a son, arrived in Geneva before Whittingham and his party in October 1555. The *Livre* further records that on 30 January 1558 Richard Amondesham was married and that on 20 September of the same year, he died. There is, however, no record in the *Livre des Anglois* that he became a *bourgeois*. The omission is strange. A similarity - though with different implications - may be observed in the case of John Baron. For while Baron is listed as a *bourgeois* in the *Livre des Anglois* and the baptism and burial of his daughter is recorded there; in no place in the *Livre* is Baron listed as a member of the church, a rather startling fact. We shall return to these points at a subsequent stage.

Only a tiny percentage of the English church in Geneva became *bourgeois*. This was not a professional activity but it nevertheless prompts one to ask what the exiles in Geneva were doing with their time.

Within the generally privileged structure of the English exiles from the England of Mary Tudor there were nevertheless certain socio-economic differences that were discernible in the different locations of exile. For instance, not much more than ten percent of the English exiles - as mentioned at the beginning of this study - were of working class origin but artisans/workers were nevertheless more prominent in some locations than others.

Looking at the exiles as a whole and producing his own analysis of Garrett's data, A.G. Dickens says: "Of 472 men whose status is known, 166 were gentry, sixty seven clergy, forty merchants and 119 young men classed as students and mainly intended for the ministry. The known working-class element consists only of thirty two artisans and thirteen servants. The lawyers and physicians are not heavily represented among these names (there were in fact six of them) but there appear at least seven printers."<sup>215</sup>

An examination of the figures for Geneva, but confining ourselves to the major occupational categories, shows that, whereas the percentage of clergy and students among the Genevan exiles was broadly the same as for the English exiles in total, that for gentry is lower (26% vs 38%) and higher (12% vs 8%) for merchants and substantially higher (21% vs 12%) for artisans/workers than for the totality of exiles. Garrett herself felt unable to classify nineteen exiles yet, in spite of the manifold problems of definition and classification - an example of which was mentioned at the outset on page five - it appears reasonable to conclude that Geneva had a higher artisan/working class and merchant representation than the English exile communities elsewhere.

At first sight this picture seems to run counter to that drawn by Garrett who saw the community settled in Aarau as the most "working class" of the exile communities when she says of Aarau "it is the only one where the majority were of humble origin, the only one which was predominantly industrial; and the only one, we believe, which was officially permitted to pursue a gainful calling while abroad."<sup>216</sup> Yet, according to her own figures, artisans represented only 37% of the exiles at

---

<sup>215</sup> A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, p.386.

<sup>216</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.51.

Aarau, versus 21% for Geneva, while the latter representation is spread across a range of trades and activities, unlike that in Aarau where, apart from one brewer,<sup>217</sup> the artisans were entirely weavers.

Much discussion has been held as to the existence of guilds, or absence of them, in the centres of refuge of the English exiles. An intriguing footnote on page 21 to Garrett's work<sup>218</sup> states that: Only at Aarau (possibly also at Geneva, though that situation has yet to be investigated) were English artisans permitted to exercise their trade." Garrett was writing in 1937 since when, or so it would appear, an investigation has taken place. Sutherland informs us, of the exiles in general, that "they were not normally suffered to pursue their trades."<sup>219</sup> But he adds, of the exiles (English and others) in Geneva that "the overall majority were artisans, bringing with them a fund of skills previously lacking in the city - - it was the French exile printers who gave Geneva its first export trade"<sup>220</sup> further commenting "like the printers, the other artisans were probably able to pursue their trades in Geneva, there being no restrictive guilds or regulations before 1560"<sup>221</sup>

Alister McGrath is quite clear about the liberal attitude towards trade and finance in Geneva at this period when he says: "The abolition of the old seigneurial ecclesiastical and guild system - in effect the final secular obstacle to 'modern capitalism'- meant that such new-comers could set up in business and begin manufacturing and trading without serious restrictions."<sup>222</sup> The word ecclesiastical is significant in this context for the implication is that as the traditional church went down, the guild system went down with it.

Reference has already been made, on many occasions, to the predominantly privileged nature of the English exiles. This stands in contrast to the French exiles who, as we have seen from Sutherland's comment, were predominantly artisans. This does not mean, of course, that every English exile in Geneva was a "gent" or that every French immigrant in Geneva was a skilled worker; indeed the recorded comment of Pierre de Bourdeille Brantôme is some evidence of this. On visiting Geneva he expressed shock at seeing the former nobleman Francois d'Aubterre earning his living as a *faiseur de boutons*. Why, he asked, should someone from a noble family have to degrade himself by making buttons?<sup>223</sup> Clearly Pierre de Bourdeille Brantôme had little understanding of the social implications of the Reformed faith.

So, it should come as no surprise to know that it was the predominantly French refugees who were able to take advantage of the temporary break down in medieval regulations governing finance and trade in Geneva and establish industries in the city which, hitherto, had not existed. They were behind the clock and watch industry as well as the printing and publishing industry and related activities such as paper-making and the production of type. The immigration of French families associated with the cloth and drapery trades - such as the *Bordiers* and *Mallets* - are another example of the establishment of business activities where none existed before. The Italians also played their

---

<sup>217</sup> It is not clear whether this man, Anthony Robson, was a worker in, or owner of, a brewery. *Marian Exiles*, p.271.

<sup>218</sup> Christina Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, p.21- footnote.

<sup>219</sup> N.M. Sutherland, 'The English Refugees at Geneva', *History Today* December 1977, p.779.

<sup>220</sup> *Ibid.*, p.784.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, p.784.

<sup>222</sup> Alister E. McGrath, *A life of John Calvin*, p.229.

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 232-233.

part with immigrants fleeing the rigours of the Counter Reformation in Italy<sup>224</sup> which were felt to be deleterious to the development of the silk industry. The atmosphere of Geneva was thought to be more congenial to the development of their business than that of Luca.

Immigrants to Geneva, in spite of periodic outbursts of xenophobia, thus provided a vital spur to economic development in the city at this time. Though undoubtedly small, the English exiles played their part in this development. Martin mentions<sup>225</sup> weavers, tailors and a tanner, who established themselves in the St Gervais quarter of Geneva, while Garrett, in her own compendium, cites, dyers, carpenters, cobblers and painters among other trades of English exiles in Geneva. The English exiles also started a printing business, financed by John Bodley and William Williams and managed by Rowland Hall, which was to put into fruition the main work of the English exiles in the city, namely a literary one. While this literary activity may have been a natural outcome of the socio-cultural make up of the English exiles in Geneva, its intensity was not. Their output was phenomenal and it is something that will be considered in a subsequent chapter.

At this stage, however, it raises an important question. To what extent does activity give rise to a unified and contented community and lack of activity give rise to a non-unified and discontented one?

Garrett says of the exiles in Aarau, "Largely no doubt because its members had work to do, Aarau has the enviable distinction of being the least quarrelsome of colonies."<sup>226</sup> Jane Dawson says something similar of Geneva when she tells us: "the English congregation in Geneva managed to escape the usual contentious consequences of being an exile church - - -the probable secret of their tranquility was the employment of the congregation's energies in several projects rather than channeling them into external strife."<sup>227</sup>

Is work therefore the reason for the different behaviour of the exiles in Geneva compared to their previous (for some of them) behaviour in Frankfurt? It is worth observing, in this context, that, of the refugees who settled in Frankfurt - the major<sup>228</sup> and most disputatious centre of Marian exile - not one is classified by Garrett as belonging to the Artisan/Worker category, in sharp contrast to Geneva and Aarau. Unless, as Garrett says in her comment on one of the Frankfurt exiles, Thomas Baxter, "he has the distinction of being the only artisan at Frankfurt, if his claim to being a book-binder is an honest

---

<sup>224</sup> Hugh Trevor-Roper, *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: Religion, the Reformation and Social Change*, pp. 20-21.

<sup>225</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève - -*, p.65. Martin notes that, among the English, there was no « mass immigration" into Geneva of people linked to a particular trade as, for example, with Poullain's weavers at Glastonbury in Edwardian England, only individuals or families.

<sup>226</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.52.

<sup>227</sup> Jane E.A. Dawson, 'Trumpeting Resistance: Christopher Goodman and John Knox' in Roger A Mason (ed) *John Knox and the British reformations*, p.133.

<sup>228</sup> Of Garrett's listed 472 exiles, among the major centres 173 (37%) are shown as at one stage having an association with Frankfurt, versus 130 (28%) for Geneva, 54 (11%) for Strasbourg, 51 (11%) for Basle and 30 (6%) for Zurich.

one."<sup>229</sup> The words of Jane Dawson should undoubtedly be borne in mind and will be considered again in the concluding section on the English Church in Geneva.

What else do we know of the extra curricular activities of the English church in Geneva? Sutherland, who states that we know very little about the social and working lives of the English exiles "except what may be gleaned from their register, which recorded births, deaths and marriages" suggests "this gives the impression of a rather introverted little community, in touch with the Italians and the ubiquitous French, but rather isolated from the Genevans."<sup>230</sup> Martin who, quoting the *Livre d'Anglois*, lists nineteen baptisms, nine marriages, and sixteen burials during the life of the English church, appears to agree with Sutherland when he says that we have received a picture of the English church as "très intellectuelle, très vivante, très active," but adds that "l'église Italienne plongeait ses racines beaucoup plus profondes dans le pays et survécut à son émule."<sup>231</sup>

Certainly an examination of godparents at baptisms suggests intense inter (English) community friendship but of the nine marriages at the church, four were, nevertheless, between English men or women and non English partners one of which, Sutherland tells us, was with Jane Stafford, the sister in law of Sir William Stafford, "who may have created a sensation by marrying the Italian pastor Martinengo."<sup>232</sup>

Why Jane Stafford's marriage to Martinengo should have created a sensation, Sutherland does not say. These two persons were, after all, associated with or wedded to the Reformed faith. So where lay the problem? Perhaps it was social? For, after all, the sister of Sir William Stafford was, undoubtedly, of a superior social class to that of the Italian pastor Martinengo. No doubt such factors ought not to have weighed heavily in the minds of the Godly, but even Calvin fell into the trap of using the phrase "bonne famille" in a social, rather than a moral, sense when he talked of Nicolas des Gallars and the suitability of his becoming minister at the French church in London. But perhaps the sensation mentioned by Sutherland was not caused by social factors at all but by theological ones?

Philip Benedict has said, of what he describes as Servetus's highly idiosyncratic vision of the restoration of Christianity, that the Aragonese doctor inspired few direct disciples, "but others were especially prone to do so, for many had studied in Padua, and when the strong rationalizing tendencies of Paduan Aristotelianism encountered the reformed imperative to winnow out all doctrines and practices unsupported by Scripture, the effect could be corrosive."<sup>233</sup>

Benedict continues: "between 1555 and 1558 several Italians living in or near Geneva, most notably the Piedmontese doctor Giorgio Biandrata, an elder of Geneva's Italian church, approached Calvin with questions about the Trinity. Had the Father not preceded the Son and delegated power to him? Weren't words like Trinity, person and essence papist inventions? In the eyes of those who raised these issues, the questioning of the doctrines codified at the fourth century councils that had declared

---

<sup>229</sup> Christina Garrett, *Marian Exiles*, p.83. Garrett, herself, appears to doubt this for, she subsequently adds, of Baxter, that his "subsequent acquisition of wealth and his association with Sir Anthony Cooke both suggest that the man was a spy."

<sup>230</sup> N.M. Sutherland, 'The English Refugees at Geneva, 1555-1559', *History Today*, December 1977, p.786.

<sup>231</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.78.

<sup>232</sup> Sutherland, 'The English Refugees at Geneva', *History Today*, December 1977. p.786.

<sup>233</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.107.

Christ coequal with the Father and at once both human and divine was just another step in shucking off unwarranted traditions on the voyage back to the apostolic age. In the eyes of Calvin and the other leading Swiss theologians, however, any suggestion that Christ was not at once both human and divine made his role in salvation incomprehensible"<sup>234</sup>

Well aware of the implications of such questioning, Calvin proposed to nip it in the bud by ensuring that all members of Geneva's Italian church were made to sign a confession of faith proclaiming the essential and eternal unity of all three persons of the Trinity. Such protective measures were, however, not always successful for one member of the Italian church in Geneva, Valentino Gentile, quickly repented of signing the confession and even wrote a statement denying that Father and son were a single essence. For this he was imprisoned and forced to burn his written statement in public. He subsequently moved to Eastern Europe, a favoured haven for anti-trinitarians, later returning to Berne, where his views led to his decapitation in 1566.<sup>235</sup>

It is unlikely that all this passed the pastor of the Italian church in Geneva by, and could well have caused the sensation, of which Sutherland speaks, when he married Jane Stafford. The English exiles were, after all, sharing the same church, Ste Marie la neuve, with the Italians, and heretical doctrines are infectious. Yet, there is no record of Calvin ever becoming involved with the affairs of the English church in Geneva, once it was established, although he was, very much against his will, forced to become involved with the storm that followed the publication of one of Knox's pamphlets, a topic which will be discussed in a later section. It would appear that Calvin felt that the English church, with Whittingham, Knox, Gilby and Goodman in charge, was in safe hands.

It is fashionable nowadays to look at micro history, at the lives of ordinary people, rather than at those of the privileged and famous. In our case this is rather difficult, but not always impossible, to do, but, as already indicated, where we have records of people, to risk stating the obvious, they tend to be of the most prominent. But, these are important to recount nonetheless.

Jane Stafford's marriage to Martinengo - referred to as Maximilian Celsus the Italian preacher, in the *Livre D'Anglois* - was the first to take place at the English church on 24 February 1556. If this marriage broke somewhat the image of "a rather introverted little community" so, albeit in a different way, did the third marriage at the church, that of William Whittingham to Katheryne Jaquemayne "of Orleance in Fraunce", as the *Livre* records this event, which took place on 15 November 1556. Whittingham, the austere and godly, yet urbane sophisticate can hardly be regarded as typical of an "introverted little community" from what has already been recorded of his life earlier in this study.

Between these two marriages the *Livre* records that of Sir John Burtwick, Knight and Jane Bonespoir of Britagne. Burtwick, a Scot, had, at one time, been in the service of the King of France. Like Whittingham he also spoke French and had served in various (English) diplomatic missions during the reign of Edward VI.

The fourth, and last, marriage that occurred at the English church, outside of what might be called an English circle and also outside of a privileged one, is, in some respects, the most interesting one. It took place, as recorded in the *Livre d'Anglois*, between John Dawes of Tunbridge in the county of Kent

---

<sup>234</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed* p.107.

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid*, pp.107-108.

and Marie Malet of Diepe in Normandie, on 10 April 1558. John Dawes was a hat maker, who had arrived in Geneva after the church's foundation in 1555. He is an example, like John Baron, of someone who, though mentioned in the *Livre des Anglois* in another context, is not listed there as a member of the church. If he had been so listed we would know whether or not he arrived in Geneva with a wife. Unfortunately, as the entries in the *Livre des Habitants* are by head of 'family,' there is no mention there that Dawes arrived in Geneva with a wife either. There must be a presupposition, however, that he met his wife outside of England.

One would have assumed that working class members of the church would be more godly than the average member, because, for the former, to move from England to the continent of Europe must have been far more difficult, far more expensive, in short, the sacrifice far greater than for the average privileged member of the church, such that they must indeed 'have loved the Lord.' But here we find that John Dawes, hat maker, was not a member of the church at all! Equally, social theory leads one to assume that working class people are, *ceteris paribus*, more xenophobic than their more socially privileged counter-parts. Not at all. For here we also find that John Dawes, a hat maker, married a French woman. Interesting man, Mr. Dawes.

We began this piece by asking what the exiles in Geneva were doing with their time. If they were indeed godly, they should, of course, have been studying the Word of God! However, at the other end of the social spectrum from John Dawes, Sir William Stafford found time to socialise, despite the departure from Geneva, with the fall of the traditional church, of the former privileged elite. Sir William appears to have been caught up in inter-Genevois fighting following the victory of the Articulants in the elections of 1555. Martin tells us of Sir William: "Il entra évidemment en relations suivies avec quelques hommes importants de Genève. Peu de temps après l'émeute du 15 Mai 1555, comme il revenait avec les sieurs de Vérace et de Maillane<sup>236</sup> d'une maison de campagne située au-delà du Pont d'Arve, ils furent insultés et attaqués près de ce pont par dix ou douze séditionnaires fugitifs qui, non seulement les chargèrent d'injures, mais aussi leur donnèrent des coups de plat d'épée ; l'un même de la troupe lâcha contre Stafford un coup de pistolet, qui heureusement ne prit pas feu. »<sup>237</sup> It was a short while later that the Genevan authorities gave special permission to Sir William Stafford to carry a sword!

What Martin fails to say of this particular event was that the "hommes importants de Genève" the sieurs de Verace et de Maillane were both French. What, thus, observers of the local scene often overlook - and this could apply to the comment of Sutherland above - is that the Geneva of the time was a Geneva dominated by foreigners (mainly French) who represented over half the population. This therefore raises the question, when reference is made to an introverted community, with whom were the English supposed to integrate? The local Genevois, who had become a minority of the population, or the immigrants (essentially) French who had become a majority in the city?

The definition of a Genevois is also unclear. Even Théophile Heyer, who wrote his essay<sup>238</sup> in 1853, with a view to showing the close links that existed between the English and Geneva, appears

---

<sup>236</sup> Charles Martin *La famille Stafford à Genève et son conflit avec Calvin* – Both the sieurs de Vérace et Maillane were French.

<sup>237</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais*, p.56 (quoting Jean - Antoine Gautier, *Histoire de Genève*.)

<sup>238</sup> Théophile Heyer 'Notice sur la colonie anglaise établie à Genève de 1555 à 1560', *Mémoires de la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève*, Vol IX, 1855.

confused over the issue when he says: “Mais pour juger de l’intimité plus ou moins grande qui s’était établie entre les Genevois et les anciens réfugiés Anglais, le meilleur moyen serait de connaître les lettres qu’ils échangeaient.”<sup>239</sup> Heyer then goes on to tell his readers that, unfortunately, he has only one such letter, that from Christopher Goodman, writing from St Andrews in 1561 to Calvin. Yet, Calvin was a Frenchman who only became a bourgeois himself in 1559, one year after Goodman acquired this status; thus though recently bourgeois,<sup>240</sup> neither man was Genevois, or *citoyen*.

It would undoubtedly be sensible to forget such “technicalities” and think of the inhabitants of Geneva as a whole, albeit recognising that, apart from contact with members of the City council (all Genevois) where Whittingham would have held the central role, contact of the English exiles with the other major institution in the city would have been with the local church whose pastorate was entirely made up of immigrant Frenchmen. Thus, in spite of the examples given above, to Genevois, French immigrant or other immigrant, to the people living around them, the English exiles, as a whole, could well have portrayed a rather introverted image, for the simple reason of language.

For the English, language posed a near insuperable barrier. Englishmen, with some notable exceptions, did not speak French and as the English language had not yet entered into its golden era - propelled there in part by the Geneva bible - and was, at the time, regarded as a primitive language ‘as yet a tongue unknown’ its speakers were naturally somewhat isolated. As Garrett says “Thus the peculiar segregation of the English - - - was in even greater part the result of sheer inability to hold speech with their neighbours or their neighbours with them.”<sup>241</sup> At certain levels of society conversation would no doubt have been in Latin but, for the English, the possibilities of such discourse had largely disappeared with the exodus from the city of the major part of the professional classes at the time of the introduction of the Reformation into Geneva in 1536. It was French that mattered and no doubt the Italian refugees in Geneva had far greater abilities in the French language than their English counterparts.<sup>242</sup>

The English lack of linguistic skills produced, what Garrett has called, some serio-comic situations. One of these, which occurred at Strasbourg, provides a humorous commentary upon the protestant demand for religious services in the vernacular. Pierre Alexandre, a prebendary of Canterbury

---

<sup>239</sup> Théophile Heyer ‘Notice sur la colonie anglaise établie à Genève de 1555 à 1560’, *Mémoires de la société d’histoire et d’archéologie de Genève*, Vol IX, 1855. p.346.

<sup>240</sup> Heyer provides one clue (*ibid.*, p.346) to the apparent confusion when he says: “Pour ces Anglais devenus Genevois;” here Heyer appears, temporarily at least, to be treating a bourgeois as a Genevois, an assumption that makes no sense at all in the context of the letter he cites between Calvin and Goodman which would then become a letter from a Genevois to a Genevois!

<sup>241</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.21.

<sup>242</sup> An interesting example of the English and language usage at the time is given by the four sworn testimonies, taken from English exiles, by the consultative commission, appointed by the Petit Conseil, to examine the dispute between Calvin and the Stafford family. See page 60-61 below. Thomas Lever and Christopher Goodman made their deposition in Latin. William Whittingham, the well travelled linguist, made his deposition in French. Thomas Wood, described by Garrett as a mercer and servant to Henry Locke, made his deposition in English which was then translated into French for the consultative commission and the Petit Conseil. It may be assumed that Wood knew neither Latin nor French. The testimonies of the four exiles related to the wish - given by William Stafford on his death bed - that his younger son remain in Geneva and be brought up in the faith of the Protestant religion.



Cathedral during the reign of Edward VI, subsequently became minister to the refugee church in Strasbourg with whom the English worshipped and where Calvin himself had formerly served as pastor. It came to Calvin's ears that Alexandre was beginning to mingle Latin phrases with his French in the liturgy at the church, and a sharp reprimand came from Geneva.

Alexandre promptly defended himself. It was not from any attachment to popery that he introduced his Latin periods, but because he numbered among his flock so many English lords who could not understand French that without these interpolations they would have been unable to follow the prayers.<sup>243</sup>

So we have a picture of a somewhat introverted community, because of the barrier of language, but with some notable exceptions. We also have a picture of a broad rather than a godly church, for which, as this chapter on the life of the church draws to a close, there is one further example. It also gives some insight into the institutional workings of the city of Geneva.

Sir William Stafford had arrived in Geneva sometime before March 1555, for on 29 March of the same year, he is recorded <sup>244</sup> as being received as *habitant*. He had previously been married to Mary Boleyn, sister of Anne Boleyn and was thus uncle by marriage of the Princess Elizabeth. He married his second wife Dorothy Stafford, great grand daughter of George, Duke of Clarence, in 1545. At a time of disputed succession, the Stafford's were, according to Garrett, dangerously near the throne.<sup>245</sup>

Martin suggests that Sir William was "un partisan décidé de la Réforme"<sup>246</sup> He, together with his entourage, certainly joined the church at its inception and may have helped finance its activities. He appears to have been on friendly terms with Calvin, and even wanted to name his son after him. The reformer agreed to become godfather to Sir William's son, but on condition that he was christened with another name than Calvin. In the event the boy, christened Jehan or John, was baptised at the church on 4 January 1556 with Calvin as godfather.

The feelings of Sir William for Calvin were not, as we have noted - page 45 -, shared by his wife Dorothy, of whom Martin says, following the death of Sir William only a few months later at the beginning of May 1556, "la jeune veuve ne semble pas avoir partagé les convictions strictement réformées de son mari ni s'être acclimatée dans le milieu puritain de Genève."<sup>247</sup> Neither were they shared by Dorothy Stafford's brother Robert, whom she summoned from Paris following her husband's death. Their conflict with Calvin arose over the wish of Dorothy Stafford to leave Geneva together with her children: Edward, Elizabeth and the young John, then only four months old, and return to England. As godfather to the young child, Calvin held that he had a duty to ensure that the boy was brought up in an atmosphere of godliness and not one of "papisterie." He therefore opposed

---

<sup>243</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, pp. 20-21. Only towards the end of their exile were the English refugees in Strasbourg permitted to have their own church with services in English. These were held in the French church in the early afternoon. Before this period the English worshipped together with the rest of the congregation at the French (refugee) church - see Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.85.

<sup>244</sup> *Livre des Habitants de Genève* Tome 1 1549-1560., p.47.

<sup>245</sup> Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.295.

<sup>246</sup> Charles Martin, *La famille Stafford à Genève - son conflit avec Calvin 1556*, p.5. See also page 45.

<sup>247</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8.

Dorothy Stafford in her wish to return to England, under threats from her brother, Robert Stafford, that he would invoke the help of the King of France in aid of his sister.

The dispute was brought before the Petit Conseil who appointed an investigatory commission made up of six ministers, two municipal officials, and four lawyers, to advise on the issue. The commission's recommendation, accepted by the Petit Conseil, went in favour of Calvin. However, Dorothy Stafford, aided by her brother Robert, won the second battle with the Petit Conseil who, while having prevented her leaving Geneva for France or England, agreed to her wish to move to Basle, a city dedicated to Protestant reform. Lady Stafford subsequently became a bourgeois of the city of Basle - something that neither she nor her husband had become in Geneva - in November 1557, later returning to England on the death of Mary Tudor. Southerden Burn records that Dorothy Stafford "continued a true widow from the age of 27 till her death and served Queen Elizabeth 40 years, lying in her bedchamber. She died on 22 September 1604 at 78."<sup>248</sup> No Anne Lock she!<sup>249</sup>

What has this initial chapter on the English exiles in Geneva led us to understand in the context of the questions posed at the beginning of this thesis? Perhaps, most important of all, it somewhat weakens the fundamental assumption made at the outset, namely that liturgy expresses what people both thought about God as well as their relation to one another. In terms of their relation to one another, it seems that there are factors other than liturgy that play a role, a question that we will consider in our final chapter on the English church in Geneva.

What of our three underlying questions? Were the members of the English church in Geneva Scarisbrick's Protestants of the "hotter" sort?

The answer is clearly in the negative. The English congregation in Geneva showed aspects of a broad church or, what we referred to as the atmosphere of a church rather than a conventicle.

On the subsequent two underlying questions, namely was there a natural tendency towards disputation or faction in the community of a refugee church or to one of unity, the evidence from Geneva goes sharply against that of Frankfurt. The congregation at the English church in Geneva gives no evidence of being a fractured community but rather that of a unified one. On the third question - the ultimate influence of a refugee church on church history and on the history of the country of origin of the exiles themselves, we must leave to the conclusions at the end of the next chapter.

In giving provisional or tentative answers to these questions, it should, in conclusion, be mentioned once again that we have, in this chapter, come up against the problem of the quality of our sources. Should the *Livre d'Anglois* be regarded as authoritative? If the answer to this question is to be in the affirmative, one can only say that this is a strange document to have been produced by precisionists,

---

<sup>248</sup> J. Southerden Burn, 'History of Parish Registers 1862' (appendix, 'Livre d'Anglois', footnote, p.276.)

<sup>249</sup> Anne Locke, well known member of the "Godly" who, at Knox's behest, came to Geneva with her son and daughter and is recorded in the *Livre d'Anglois* as becoming a member of the church on 8 May 1557. Garrett, who seems to have had an aversion to her own sex in the context of Marian exiles, does not list her in her own compendium. Anne Locke was originally married to the merchant Henry Locke. On his death she married the "godly preacher" Edward Deering. She was subsequently married to Richard Prowse.

as Puritans were sometimes called. The examples of Messrs Baron and Amondesham as well as of John Dawes, the hat maker from Tunbridge, have already been cited. There are others.

Why was Edward Rawlins, whose death is recorded in the *Livre*, nor Cornelius Stephenson, whose two children's death at birth are recorded in the *Livre*, nor Thomas Durwick, whose daughter's baptism is recorded in the *Livre*, not listed there as members of the church? Perhaps they were able to use the facilities of the church without becoming members? On the other hand, the fact that Miles Coverdale, listed as an elder, is also not recorded as being received as a church member might suggest that the reason for this lacuna lies in the poor preparation of the *Livre*. On at least one occasion a name appears to have been mentioned twice, sometimes dates, as well as year, are mentioned against admission of members to the church and baptisms, sometimes they are not; Whittingham's daughter is called Susannah at her birth and Susan at her death; in listing the death of Anne Locke's daughter, reference is made to Harry Locke, her husband, implying, incorrectly, his presence in Geneva<sup>250</sup> and so on. Clearly, the importance given to the authority of the *Livre des Anglois* affects the answer we give to one of our principal questions, namely the nature of the Protestantism of the English exiles in Geneva, of the "hotter sort" or not.

What of the official Genevan sources? It would, perhaps, be naive to suggest that they are inevitably superior to the *Livre des Anglois* for the entries in the *Livre des Habitants* also raise questions. The two *Livres* are not co-terminous, for here we have problems in the other direction, in that nearly one quarter of the persons mentioned in the *Livre d'Anglois* are not mentioned in the *Livre des Habitants*. Martin suggests that this is in no small part due to the upheaval that reigned in Genevan politics and administration after the events of 1555. He says, "et cependant on était très sévère à Genève à cet égard ; mais il est probable qu'immédiatement après le triomphe de Calvin et du parti Réfugiés sur celui des Libertins essentiellement autochtones, on n'y regarda pas de très près vis-à-vis de ceux qui étaient réfugiés pour cause de religion, et l'on s'abstint d'inscrire immédiatement comme habitants beaucoup de ces immigrants dont on ne savait pas s'ils s'établiraient pour un certain temps à Genève." »<sup>251</sup> Martin takes the example of Richard Amondesham who is listed in the *Livre des Anglois* as having arrived in Geneva before the establishment of the English church in 1555, yet was only registered as habitant in the *Livre des Habitants* in October 1557.

One must clearly tread carefully through the thickets!

---

<sup>250</sup> Patrick Collinson, 'The role of women in the English Reformation illustrated by the life and friendships of Anne Locke', *Godly People*, p.280.

<sup>251</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin*, p.48.

## Chapter 4: The Liturgy and Order of the English church in Geneva

Following the oath of allegiance to the city of Geneva that Gilby and Goodman swore before the magistrates at the end of November 1555, the exiles got to work with speed in drawing up a constitution and liturgy for the church.

### 4.1 'Forme of the Common Prayers' - *Confession of Faith - Prayers*

Martin records that "ils s'y appliquèrent avec zèle <sup>252</sup> for, as early as February 1556 there emerged from the printing press of Jean Crespin in Geneva, a confession of faith, constitution and liturgy of the church, together with a collection of fifty one psalms and an English translation of the catechism of Calvin.

This volume was preceded by a preface - generally attributed to Whittingham, although written in the name of the whole congregation. It was addressed to their co-religionists in England whom it exhorted to keep to the reformed faith, emphasising the biblical basis of the worship of the church in Geneva which, according to the exiles there, was the sole basis of worship, with the suggestion that the failure to reach a more fully biblical form of worship in England during the reign of Edward VI had been the cause of God's wrath and the consequent current distress of the true church in England. There is the underlying suggestion that these co-religionists should flee England - as had the exiles in Geneva - or suffer martyrdom. The admonitory tone of the Frankfurt August 1554 letter is still apparent. Some observers would undoubtedly say that, in terms of approach to other people, Whittingham and his close associates had not learnt much in the meantime.

The preface placed considerable emphasis on an opposition to ceremonies, which had, after all, been the central issue at stake between the Prayer Book supporters and the Prayer Book opponents - or, as A.G. Dickens subsequently describes them: Prayer Book Puritans and Geneva Puritans<sup>253</sup> - in the disputes at Frankfurt. The Genevan exiles, Martin says, "déclarent que de telles cérémonies inventées par les hommes doivent être abolies, du moment qu'elles ont occasionné des abus, ou sont regardées comme obligatoire, ou font obstacle à la parole de Dieu, ou facilitent des superstitions - - ils présentent comme exemple la destruction par Ezéchias du serpent d'airain que Moïse, sur l'ordre de Dieu, avait conservé dans le sanctuaire.»<sup>254</sup>

These words raise questions that have already been discussed before. But the qualifications in them are interesting. Does "du moment qu'elles ont occasionné des abus" mean that the ceremony concerned was acceptable until that moment? Does "du moment qu'elles sont regardées comme obligatoire" mean that the ceremony concerned was acceptable until that moment? The latter example, of course, goes to the heart of the point made by Peter Martyr about adiophara, namely that the problem with things indifferent was that they tended to become entrenched over time and that what began as a thing indifferent could eventually become a thing central - page 14.

Knappen, amusingly observes that "with a curious, but not uncommon, lack of logic the writer (of the preface), who has just appealed to the Scriptures as the only guide, further illustrates this point by

---

<sup>252</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.79.

<sup>253</sup> A.G. Dickens *The English Reformation*, p.398.

<sup>254</sup> Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais*, p.83.

showing that the church, in the time of Augustine, dropped the practice of feet-washing which was instituted by Christ himself”<sup>255</sup> but which had mistakenly been introduced into the sacraments. Lack of logic or not, the writer is sure of his position further citing “l’opposition faite par St Paul aux agapes que les Corinthiens avaient mises à la suite de la celebration de la Cène, dans le but, louable cependant, de soulager les pauvres et d’augmenter l’affection réciproque des membres de l’église. Voilà pourquoi, disent ils, nous avons voulu nous en tenir à la sagesse que nous avons apprise dans le Livre de Dieu.»<sup>256</sup>

The rapidity with which the constitution and liturgy of the church appeared is explained by the fact that it was, largely, already written. Martin states that it was the liturgy drawn up by Messrs Knox, Whittingham, Gilby, Foxe and Cole in 1556 – page 19. We do not know the details of this liturgy though the Discourse describes it as “being the same order as Geneva.”<sup>257</sup>

The liturgy and order drawn up as “*The Service, Discipline and Forme of the Common Prayers and Administration of the Sacraments used in the English Church of Geneva*” is the first part of the volume that appeared from the press of John Crespin in Geneva to which reference has already been made. In other words it does not include Calvin’s catechism nor the collection of fifty one metered psalms.

The structure of the *Forme of the Common Prayers* is, as follows – also page 30.

- Confession of Faith
- Of the Ministers and their Election – including comments on the Consistory
- The Weekly Assembly of the Ministers, Elders and Deacons
- The Weekly Assembly of the congregation for Bible study and discussion
- The service of Morning Prayer (Sunday Morning Service)<sup>258</sup>
- Alternative prayers
- The order of Baptism
- The manner of the Lord’s Supper
- The Forme of Marriage
- The visitation of the Sicke
- Of burial
- The Order of the Ecclesiastical Discipline

At this stage it would be worth while to look at the service of Morning Prayer (words not actually used in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* which, instead, simply says: “when the Congregation is assembled at the heure appointed”)<sup>259</sup> in some detail.

---

<sup>255</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.140.

<sup>256</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais*, p.84.

<sup>257</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.52.

<sup>258</sup> As described by Robin Leaver *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*, p.4.

<sup>259</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.12

The order is as follows:

- Confession of Sins
- (Alternative Confessions)
- Psalm – which the Congregation sing altogether in a plain tune
- Prayer for the assistance of God’s Holy Spirit
- Sermon
- Prayer for the whole state of Christ’s Church
- The Lord’s Prayer
- Creed – I believe in God - -
- Psalm
- Blessing

Apart from the introduction of the Lord’s Prayer, the above is an exact replica of the first order of morning service used by the English exiles when they arrived at Frankfurt in 1554 - page 10.

It also makes sense to compare these orders of Sunday Morning Service, as Leaver calls them, with that set out in Poullain’s *Liturgia Sacra*, that the Frankfurt magistrates had ordered the English exiles to follow when they first arrived in Frankfurt .

#### *Liturgia Sacra*- Sunday Morning Service

- Exhortation – Minister – Chorister and congregation
- Recitation of First table of the law – our duties towards God
- Confession
- Absolution
- Recitation of Second table of the law – our duties towards our neighbour
- Prayers
- Prayer for the reception of the Holy Spirit
- Sermon
- Prayers for the Church, the ill and infirm
- Announcement of forthcoming marriages - where necessary
- Collection
- Prayers
- Apostles Creed – Je croy en Dieu - -
- Psalm sung by Congregation
- Benediction

With the two additions - that of a “choriste” and mention of absolution after the confession of sins - which differentiate the *Liturgia Sacra* from the *Forme of the Common Prayers* in this rite of Morning Prayer, one wonders what had been the basis to the troubles at Frankfurt (given that the *Discourse* concentrates on the dispute over the order of Sunday Morning Prayer rather than on other parts of the liturgy). For, these two additions would make this part of Poullain’s liturgy appear somewhat closer to that of the *Book of Common Prayer* than the *Forme of the Common Prayers*. Yet, Whittingham had, as previously mentioned, described the *Liturgia Sacra* as “according to the Order of Geneva, the

purest Reformed Church in Christendom”<sup>260</sup> while Cox, himself, had said of the same liturgy that he thought it “to be good and godly in all points.”<sup>261</sup> Here was the basis for compromise. What, then, as we look back at the events in Frankfurt were the troubles at Frankfurt *really* all about? They were about the efforts of one party to put down another party who had presumed to be the party who should determine the destiny of the Church of England in exile. The arrogance of one party led to a corresponding arrogance and ruthlessness in the other party in attempting to suppress them.

It is not clear from the *Liturgia Sacra* what part is played by the “choriste” unless he is to be seen as a sort of ‘master of ceremonies.’ He helped move the service along. But why should there have been no mention of Absolution in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* after the ‘Confession of our Sinnes’? Perhaps, in the first place, because the absolution is promised in the confession: God’s promise of absolution to those who truly repent. Here are the concluding two sentences of the ‘Confession of our Sinnes’:

For thy spirit doth assure our consciences, that thou art our merciful Father, and so lovest us thy children through him, that nothing is able to remove thine heavenly grace and favour from us. To thee therefore, O Father, with the Sonne and Holy Ghost be all honour and glory, World without end, So be it.<sup>262</sup>

On the other hand, the fact that a minister is involved in, or associated with, absolution, even if this action is clearly confined to the recitation of Scripture, could be misconstrued as endowing some form of sacerdotal power in the minister and thus smacking of the traditional church. Looking, for a moment, elsewhere, a glance at the *Book of Common Prayer* illustrates the potential, and characteristically Anglican (if one dare use this word in the XVI century) ambiguity on the subject. Here is the Absolution that follows the general Confession in the *Book of Common Prayer* - to be read by the Priest alone standing; the people still kneeling.

Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness and live; and hath given power and commandment to his Ministers, to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the Absolution and remission of their sins: He pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel. Wherefore let us beseech him to grant us true repentance and his Holy Spirit, that those things may please him that we do at this present, and that the rest of our life hereafter may be pure and holy; so that at the last we may come to his eternal joy; through Jesus Christ our Lord.<sup>263</sup>

The people shall answer here, and at the end of all other prayers, Amen.

There is nothing in the above prayer which does not conform to the Reformed tradition, with the words: ‘to grant *us* true repentance’ and ‘that *we* do at this present’ or again ‘that the rest of *our* life’. These words are those of a minister. However, the introduction to the Absolution in the *Book of Common Prayer* gives the game away with the use of the word Priest.

---

<sup>260</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfurt*, p.74.

<sup>261</sup> *Ibid.*, p.59.

<sup>262</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.12.

<sup>263</sup> *Book of Common Prayer*, p.2.

John Guy states that the “Act of Uniformity of 1559 required that every Cathedral and parish ‘minister’ - a significant word for ‘priest’ now smacked of popery”<sup>264</sup> - should say and use the Matins, Evensong, celebration of the Lord’s supper and each of the sacraments according to the revised Prayer Book.”<sup>265</sup> Yet, in ‘The order for Morning Prayer’ in the Prayer Book, the use of the word Priest occurs on three occasions, the use of the word Minister on six. The ministers have it but it is interesting to note that the word Priest occurs before parts of the liturgy that would or should have been obnoxious to Knox: the responses and the Absolution. How the Absolution in the Prayer Book escaped the wrath of Knox in the *Brief Discourse* is difficult to explain. Perhaps it did not escape it! For the word Priest smacked of sacrifice - the repetition of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross - and magic - the miracle of transubstantiation performed by the Priest in the mass - whereas the word Minister smacked of a preacher, someone who expounded the word of God.

Eamon Duffy states that the death of Christ was “once and for all.”<sup>266</sup> If this is the case one wonders what priests are supposed to be doing in the celebration of the Mass.<sup>267</sup> Undoubtedly the involvement of the minister in the Absolution could easily have been misconstrued.

What about the *Liturgia Sacra*, whose confession of faith, it should again be remembered, the original English exiles had signed when they arrived in Frankfurt – page 8. Poullain had devised his liturgy for the community of weavers in Glastonbury in Somerset in 1551, before the appearance of the second Edwardian Prayer Book and, quite possibly, independent of it. However, it does include the Absolution, after the Confession, and is as follows:

Après ceste confession, ledit Superintendent ou pasteur, recite hors la Sainte escripture quelque sentence de la remission des pêchez : et puis prononce l’Absolution des pêchez à tous croians et pénitent, Au nom du père et du filz et du saint esprit.

Et pendant tout le temps de ceste confession et absolution, tout le peuple se tient en grande reverence à genoulx.

Cela fait, ledit Choriste reprend la deuxieme table a haulte voix, et l’assemblée paracheve iusques a la fin. Alors ledit Superintendent ou pasteur faicte une priere et dict.

Le seigneur soit avecques nous, et faisons prieres au Seigneur tous de cueur et de bouche.

---

<sup>264</sup> John Guy, *Tudor England*, p.290.

<sup>265</sup> Ibid., p.290.

<sup>266</sup> Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, p.91.

<sup>267</sup> Ibid., p.91 The full sentence reads: “In the Mass the redemption of the world on Good Friday once and for all, was renewed and made fruitful for all who believed.” A reference to the peculiar situation of the Church of England - with a liturgy and order akin to the traditional church yet a doctrine of the reformed one - is appropriate in this context. Article XXX1 of the Articles of Religion of the Church of England - ‘Of the One oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross’ states “the Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.” *Book of Common Prayer* pp.355-356.



The use of the word *nous* rather than *vous* in the last sentence is significant. The minister is not above the people but a part of them. Thus, in this sense, the Absolution becomes a natural part of a Reformed rite.

A fuller title of the *Forme of the Common Prayers* is, in fact, *The Service, Discipline and Forme of the Common Prayers and Administarion of the Sacraments used in the English Church of Geneva: as it was approved by that most reverend divine M. John Calvin*. This suggests an almost obsequious deference on behalf of the English exiles towards the Genevan reformer but, however that may be, Martin, throughout his comments on the liturgy of the English church appears at pains to emphasise the differences that the English congregation established in their own liturgy vis à vis that of the Genevan church. As he says of the liturgy that the exiles put to use: "il répondait entièrement à leur désir de se rapprocher beaucoup, dans leur culte, de la forme réformée calviniste, tout en lui conservant quelques particularités qui le rendissent plus acceptable aux protestants Anglais."<sup>268</sup>

This touches on a fundamental point for, as Martin reminds us, within Christian communities "du type réformé" there is a very different conception of liturgy, not only when compared to the Roman Catholic but also to the Anglican and Lutheran churches. The latter "attachent une importance très grande à l'unité du culte et du rite."<sup>269</sup> In contrast, « les réformés ont tenu, avant tout à en assurer la simplicité et la caractère essentiellement biblique de leur liturgie »<sup>270</sup> and while, Martin continues, « on peut presque dire par la force des choses, ils ont suivi à peu près le même ordre pour leur culte - ils ont déclaré eux-mêmes, à plusieurs reprises, qu'ils ne tenaient pas à l'uniformité du rite et de la liturgie, et qu'ils voyaient même un avantage à certaines diversités. »<sup>271</sup> Poullain reflects this tendency when in the *Liturgia Sacra* it is stated:

"Et s'il y a quelqu'un qui s'offense de veoir ici, peut estre quelque chose autrement descrite qu'il n'est observé en d'autres Eglises reformées : Cestuy la sache, que la Foy de l'Eglise n'est point violée par diversité de ceremonies : (supposé qu'elles ne soyant telles, qu'elles engendrent superstition) ains recommandée et confirmée davantage comme respondit très bien Irénée à l'Evesque de Rome. »<sup>272</sup>

It is in this same spirit that the *Forme of the Common Prayers* left considerable freedom to their ministers, as illustrated in the 'rubric' introducing the Prayer for the assistance of God's Holy Spirit:

"The minister prayeth - -as the same shall move his heart"<sup>273</sup>

or later "or else prayeth as the Spirit of God shall move his heart"<sup>274</sup>

The freedom of prayer eventually became a topic of some importance and controversy within the Reformed tradition. Benedict reports that in the next century, when theology in the Netherlands was

---

<sup>268</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.87.

<sup>269</sup> Ibid., p.87.

<sup>270</sup> Ibid., p.87.

<sup>271</sup> Ibid., p.87.

<sup>272</sup> Valérand Poullain, *Liturgia Sacra*, p.45.

<sup>273</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.16.

<sup>274</sup> Ibid., p.19.

already moving in a more 'liberal' direction one Jacobus Koelman "was removed from his ministry at Slius in 1675 for his outspoken opposition to formulary prayers and Christmas church services."<sup>275</sup>

This liberty of culte leads Martin to say of the confession of faith at the English church in Geneva that it was "plus courte, plus nerveuse, plus claire et certainement plus accessible à l'intelligence et à la mémoire des simples membres de l'église que celle de Poulain et à bien plus forte raison que celle d'à Lasco." <sup>276</sup> If any community needed to have a confession « plus accessible à l'intelligence et à la mémoire des simples membres de l'église » it was what Pettegree describes as « the well meaning but barely literate Glastonbury elders" and one might add fellow workers. For it was for them that the confession, within the *Liturgia Sacra*, had been designed at Glastonbury and it was this same confession that the first English exiles signed on arrival at Frankfurt in the summer of 1554.

The confession of the English church in Geneva was certainly shorter than that of the *Liturgia Sacra*, more tightly organised and less rambling. Whittingham, who was undoubtedly the driving force behind the confession, no doubt felt that he was writing for a fellow elite. For, in spite of what is said by Martin, it is by no means clear that the confession of the *Forme of Common Prayers* would have been more comprehensible to the "well meaning but barely literate" weavers from Glastonbury than that of the *Liturgia Sacra*, any more than that the *Wall Street Journal* would be more comprehensible than the *Sun*. The style of the two confessions is different, as is their presentation, albeit that both were built around the Apostles Creed which gives both confessions "un caractère ecclésiastique et pédagogique plutôt que doctrinal et systématique."<sup>277</sup> But, there is something more 'humanistic' about Poullain's confession - perhaps, just because it is a bit rambling. The reference to human happiness occurs right at the outset to this confession:

« Comme ainsi soit qu'il n'y ait rien plus excellent, ou vraiment heureux, que le seul vray Chrestien le quel est seul capable du souverain bien et félicité humaine »<sup>278</sup> is not a bad way to introduce the Christian faith, though not often used. Also striking to the reader, as Martin himself admits, is the declaration at the outset "Or il est notoire par les escriptures que nous ne naissons point, ains sommes faitz Chrestiens" <sup>279</sup> that we are not originally Christian "mais que nous devons le devenir ou, si on le préfère, renaître et être engendrés à nouveau." <sup>280</sup> It is also of interest to note that the word TRINITY occurs three times in the confession of the *Liturgia Sacra*; in the confession of the *Forme of the Common*

---

<sup>275</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, pp. 523-524 Koelman subsequently became an itinerant preacher who organized and defended conventicles, even while spurring those who joined in these gatherings to remain in the communion of the established Reformed church, a practice that will not be totally unfamiliar to those acquainted with the XX century religious landscape, at the evangelical end. Yet, when this writer once compared the free form of prayer in the non-conformist churches in England to the formal prayers of the Anglican Church to a curate in the Church of England; this gentleman replied that this was to prevent the prayers from going on for too long. And this man was an Evangelical!

<sup>276</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.90.

<sup>277</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

<sup>278</sup> Valérand Poullain, *Liturgia Sacra*, p.173.

<sup>279</sup> *Ibid.*, p.173.

<sup>280</sup> Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais*, p.90.

*Prayers* it does not occur once. Martin states quite boldly: “on peut regretter que Knox et ses compagnons n’aient fait aucun emprunt au préambule de la confession de Poullain.”<sup>281</sup>

One of the most striking aspects of the confession of the *Forme of the Common Prayers* is the inclusion of discipline as the third mark of the church. This would be the most important example of where the English exiles in Geneva departed from their mentor, Calvin, who held that there were but two marks of the church: the preaching of the Word of God and the correct administration of the sacraments. There is therefore, in the confession of faith within the *Forme of the Common Prayers* the following phrase:

The third marke of this church is Ecclesiastical discipline, which standeth in admonition and correction of faults. The final end whereof is excommunication, by the consent of the Church determined, if the offender be obstinate. And besides this Ecclesiastical discipline, I acknowledge to belong to this church a political magistrate: who ministreth to every man justice, defending the good and punishing the evill. To whom we must render honour and obedience in all things, which are not contrary to the Word of God. And as Moses, Ezechias, Josiah and other godly rulers purged the Church of God from superstion and idolatry, so the defence of Christ’s Church appertaineth to the Christian Magistrates against all idolaters and heretikes as Papists, Anabaptists and such like<sup>282</sup>

The involvement of the political magistrate in the confession of the English church went further than many other reformed confessions and is also somewhat surprising as, although the messieurs de Genève <sup>283</sup> retained an over-all supervision of the foreign churches in their midst<sup>284</sup> the English church in Geneva was free of direct state involvement in its affairs and was thus, in some sense, purer than the host church on which it was modelling itself.

The involvement of the political magistrate was also setting up hostages to fortune. For, it was from among these same English exiles in Geneva that were to appear resistance tracts that raised the question of who constituted a Christian magistrate<sup>285</sup> and to what extent he, or she, warranted obedience. Undoubtedly the authors of the *Forme of the Common Prayers* had not envisaged the paths down which they would be lead by some of their fellow exiles, with the publication of political tracts a few years later.

#### **4.2 The Order of the church**

The constitution of the English church in Geneva followed the classical Reformed pattern and following the Confession of Faith there appears in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* a section entitled ‘Of the Ministers and their Election’ devoted to ‘what things are chiefly required in the Ministers’ and ‘Of their office and duty.’ The first part is unexceptional but the second is interesting in that, while it states that the Pastor’s “chiefe office standeth in preaching the Word of God and ministering the

---

<sup>281</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais*, p.90.

<sup>282</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers* p.5.

<sup>283</sup> Also known as the Seigneurie or the Petit Conseil - or Governing council or senate.

<sup>284</sup> N.M. Sutherland, *The English Refugees at Geneva 1555-1559, History Today* (December 1977), p.785.

<sup>285</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, p. 129, quoting Gerry Bowler, ‘Marian Protestants and the Idea of violent Resistance to Tyranny,’ states, in the context of England, that this eventually excluded any but an enthusiastic Calvinist male sitting on the throne.

Sacraments”<sup>286</sup> it is clear that the minister is under the Word not above it: “his counsel rather than authority taketh place.”<sup>287</sup> Equally interesting is the last sentence of this section, covering excommunication: “and if so be the Congregation upon just cause agree to Excommunicate, then it belongeth to the Minister, according to their general determination, to pronounce the sentence, to the end that all things may be done orderly and without confusion.”<sup>288</sup> These last words would have warmed the heart of Thomas Cranmer for it was just this point that was made in the section on Ceremonies, taken from the *Book of Common Prayer* - pages 14-16 - mentioned earlier.

Following the comment on the office and duty of Ministers there appears one on ‘The manner of electing the Pastors or Ministers.’ This was not a direct democratic procedure but one which Martin describes as an “election au second degré.”<sup>289</sup> The words “if there be choice” occur in this section, implying that there might not be a choice and indeed Gilby and Goodman served as ministers, in the absence of Knox in Scotland or Dieppe, throughout the life of the church, being confirmed in their position each year. But had there been a choice, produced by the congregation, the candidates would then be examined for good behaviour and sound doctrine. The examiners - the existing ministers and Elders - would offer a theme or text to the candidate who would then be asked to comment on it to the ‘examiners’ in private. The existing ministers and elders would then make their recommendation to the congregation, who after eight days of reflection - during which it would be possible to raise opposition to the proposed candidate - would be asked to confirm (or not) by vote the recommendation of the existing ministers and elders.

The somewhat authoritarian tone of the election procedure is clear, something that became a feature of the Reformed churches from a relatively early stage. In this it was, however, somewhat different from the procedure set out in John à Lasco’s *Forma ac Ratio* as we shall see in a later chapter. Poullain had a not dissimilar procedure in the *Liturgia Sacra* to that of the *Forme of the Common Prayers* but with a subtle difference. No doubt because we are here dealing with Pettegree’s well meaning but barely literate Glastonbury weavers, the elders of the church made the initial selection of candidates i.e. the initial participation of the congregation was cut out. However, the congregation had a free choice from among the proposed candidates i.e. no one candidate was heavily recommended by the elders.<sup>290</sup> It also appears that the vote was in secret: “Et aussi sont ils adieuzez tous que nul ne doit communiquer à autre, celui qu’il veut nommer. »<sup>291</sup> It could be argued that this was a more popular or democratic procedure in the *Liturgia Sacra* than that outlined in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*.

Perhaps one exaggerates the significance of these differences for Martin says of both the *Forme of the Common Prayers* and the *Liturgia Sacra* and their system of election that “ni les ordonnances de Calvin, ni la constitution de l’Eglise de France de 1559, n’ont accordé une aussi grande part aux membres de l’église dans le choix de leurs pasteurs ou des membres de leurs synodes. »<sup>292</sup> He even suggests that, in spite of the constitutional procedure, universal direct suffrage probably operated at the English church in Geneva.

---

<sup>286</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.7.

<sup>287</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

<sup>288</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7.

<sup>289</sup> Charles Martin, « *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.97.

<sup>290</sup> Valérand Poullain, *Liturgia Sacra*, pp. 221, 223.

<sup>291</sup> *Ibid.*, p.223.

<sup>292</sup> Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais*, p.97.

The election of elders and deacons followed a similar pattern, the difference in function between the elders and ministers being that the elders could neither preach nor administer the sacraments. They were, however, central to the administration of the church, "in counseling, admonishing, correcting and ordering all things appertaining to the fate of the congregation."<sup>293</sup> However, no action could be taken by the elders without the consent of the minister and no action of the minister without the consent of the elders.

Martin takes the view that the "admirable institution des anciens - -a contribué pour sa bonne part à la (l'église réformée) préserver du cléricisme, en initiant les simples fidèles à son gouvernement. »<sup>294</sup> This is a widely held view, offsetting what Scarisbrick sees as a reassertion of clericalism occasioned by Protestantism,<sup>295</sup> with the emergence of the minister as both socially and intellectually superior to the ordinary church member. This was a marked contrast to the priest in the traditional church who, in spite of what was regarded as his sacerdotal powers, was often both socially and intellectually inferior to some of his parishioners.

However, Benedict has questioned the idea that the elder, a layman, was everywhere an offset to the emerging power of the minister, when he says "the exclusion of elders from synods was most pronounced in Scotland. Elders rarely attended presbyterial and synodal meetings in the period 1585-1637 and their presence there ultimately came to be regarded as entirely unsuitable. - - here Presbyterianism indeed appears to have been an ideology that promoted clerical power."<sup>296</sup> However, Benedict accepts that conditions were not everywhere similar, adding that "a milder re-clericalization of the church occurred in France, the Netherlands, and the Rhineland, but here laymen retained considerable power in the highest councils of the church."<sup>297</sup>

Martin's comments were, of course, made of elders within what became known as the presbyterial system in general and not that of the English church in Geneva. However, they are interesting to us because they highlight the fact that the life of the reformed refugee church was a world away from that of large synods. It was inevitably tighter, more intimate than most Reformed churches elsewhere, and gave rise to pressures for alternative ecclesiological arrangements, on which comment will be made in the concluding chapter of this study.

The third category of officer in the church was the deacon, for which election to office followed a similar procedure to that of ministers and elders. The *Forme of the Common Prayers* states that: "Their office is to gather alms diligently, and faithfully to distribute it, with the consent of the ministers and Elders: also to provide for the sick and impotent persons, having ever a diligent care, that the charity of godly men be not wafted upon loyterers and idle vagabonds."<sup>298</sup> An undoubtedly suitably Protestant sting is placed in the tail!

---

<sup>293</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.9.

<sup>294</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais*, pp. 95-96.

<sup>295</sup> J.J. Scarisbrick *The Reformation and the English People*, pp. 39 and 44 and concluding chapter.

See also the observations of Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, pp. 436 - 451 'Reformation of the Ministry.'

<sup>296</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.458.

<sup>297</sup> *Ibid.*, p.458.

<sup>298</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.9.

The *Forme of the Common Prayers* then mentions that the authors of the liturgy are well aware that the Scriptures make mention of a fourth kind of Minister, the Teacher or Doctor - footnote page 10 - with the important qualification, *where time and place do permit*. Clearly neither time nor place did permit for the English church in Geneva, for no member of the church was appointed to the position of Doctor: "Notwithstanding considering the present state of things, we comprehend under this title such meanes, as God hath in his Church, that it should not be left desolate, nor yet his doctrine decay, for fault of ministers thereof."<sup>299</sup> There is then a curious commentary on instruction and schooling in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* and it is true that in the Genevan church the office of doctor was incorporated into the city's educational programme.

For the English church in Geneva, however, it is rather suggested that man can not profit from the word of God unless he be instructed. Listening to the word of God, being moved by the Holy Spirit to understand the word of God is out, instruction is in. This, of course, came to be a hall mark of the Reformed tradition, namely, the importance of instruction and education. Be that as it may, there were no doctors in the English church in Geneva. Nevertheless, the author of the *Forme of the Common Prayers* might well have done better to listen to the voice of one of the members of his own congregation, John Harrydunce, the bricklayer from Whitechapel. He had preached in his own house and garden since the 1530's. Although illiterate, people said that he "declared scripture as well as if he had studied at the universities."<sup>300</sup>

In a similar vein, *the weekly meeting for the Interpretation of the Scriptures* has a similar somewhat authoritarian ring:

Every weeke once the Congregation assemble to heare some place of the scriptures orderly expounded. At which time it is lawful for every man to speake or inquire as God shall move his heart, and the Text minister occasion, so it be without pertinacity or disdain, as one that rather seeketh to profit then to contend. And if so be any contention rife, then such as are appointed Moderators, either satisfie the party, or else if he seeme to cavil, exhort him to keep silence, referring the judgement thereof to the Ministers and Elders, to be determined in their assembly before mentioned (the Consistory).<sup>301</sup>

### 4.3 The Discipline

The assembly of the Ministers, Elders and Deacons, held every Thursday, constituted the Consistory. In the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, unlike in either the *Liturgia Sacra* or the *1555 Liturgy of the Frankfurt exiles* - page 30 - the discipline, as it applied to ministers, is separated from the discipline as it applied to the congregation. The reason for the separation is unclear - discipline, as it applied to the congregation only appears at the end of the *Forme of the Common Prayers* - unless it be to emphasise the overriding importance attached to the example to be set by the minister, to "diligently examine all such faults and suspicions, as may be espied not onely among others, but chiefly among themselves,

---

<sup>299</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.10.

<sup>300</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.177.

<sup>301</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, pp. 11, 12.

lest they seeme to be culpable of that which our Saviour Christ reprov'd in the Pharisees, who could espy a mote in another man's eye, and could not see a beame in their own."<sup>302</sup>

The discipline, as it applied to ministers, was similar to that adopted by the English exiles at Frankfurt - page 10. Heresy, papistry, schism, blasphemy, perjury, fornication, theft, drunkenness, usury, fighting, unlawful games and such like were regarded as cause for deposition of a minister, a list that is also very similar to that applying within the Reformed church in Geneva.<sup>303</sup>

Other faults are said, by the discipline, to be more tolerable. Which, presumably, does not mean that they are more acceptable! The list is very comprehensive: "strange and unprofitable fashion in preaching the Scriptures, curiosity in seeking vaine questions, negligence, as well in his Sermons and in studying the Scriptures, as in all other things concerning his vocation; scurrility, flattering, lying, backbiting, wanton words, deceit, covetousness, taunting, dissolution in apparel,<sup>304</sup> gesture and other his doings."<sup>305</sup>

Although, as previously indicated, the discipline, as it applied to the congregation, is dealt with at the end of the *Forme of the Common Prayers* it makes sense, for our purposes, to consider it at the same time as that of the discipline as it applied to ministers. The discipline, as it applied to the congregation, is a sensible, practical and well reasoned statement. While reminding the reader of the wrath and judgement of God, it also emphasises his love towards us.

It begins with the eminently sensible and practical observation that: "As no City, Towne, House or Family can maintain their estate and prosper, without policy and governance: even so the Church of God, which requireth more purely to be governed, than any City or Family, can not without spiritual policy and Ecclesiastical Discipline continue, increase and flourish."<sup>306</sup> As the word of God is the life and soul of the church, so discipline can be seen as the sinews of the body which "knit and joyne the members together with decent order and comeliness. It is a bridle to flay the wicked from their mischiefs. It is a spur to pricke forward such as be slow and negligent: yea, and for all men, it is the Father's rod, even in a readiness to chastise gently the faults committed, and to cause them afterward to live in more godly feare and reverence."<sup>307</sup>

The discipline continues by saying that there are three reasons for its institution: firstly "that men of evil conversation are not numbered among God's children,"<sup>308</sup> secondly, which could be seen as a repetition or extension of the first reason, "that the good be not infected with companying the evil"<sup>309</sup> quoting St Paul's admonition to the Corinthians "know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole

---

<sup>302</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.11.

<sup>303</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Truly Reformed*, p.439.

<sup>304</sup> Within the Reformed church in Hungary, synod stated that "ministers should not wear fur coats or golden collars, should not keep weapons, hawks, or hunting dogs, and should leave all social gatherings immediately if music and dancing began."Benedict, *Christ's Churches Truly Reformed*, p.440.

<sup>305</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.11.

<sup>306</sup> *Ibid.*, p.61.

<sup>307</sup> *Ibid.*, p.61.

<sup>308</sup> *Ibid.*, p.61.

<sup>309</sup> *Ibid.*, p.61.

lump.”<sup>310</sup> Thirdly, and, perhaps, most important that “a man thus corrected or excommunicated might be ashamed of his fault, and so through repentance come to amendment.”<sup>311</sup>

The procedure of discipline has already been alluded to in the case of the church at Frankfurt - page 10 - and was based on our Lord’s injunction in the gospel: “Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou has gained thy brother. But, if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.”<sup>312</sup>

Hence, the discipline is described as private or public. Three things, we are told, should “be noted as touching private Discipline. First, that our admonitions proceede of a godly zeale and conscience, rather seeking to win our brother than to slander him. Next that we be assured that his fault be reproveable by God’s Word. And finally, that we use such modesty and wisdome, that if we somewhat doubt of the matter whereof we admonish him, yet with godly exhortations he may be brought to the knowledge of his fault.”<sup>313</sup> Where the fault is known to many our admonition should be done in the presence of some of them. If the fault concerns the whole church, then the minister and elders should be informed.

The minister is also to ensure that anything “that might spot the Christian congregation, yea, rather whatsoever is not to edification ought not to escape either admonition or punishment.”<sup>314</sup> The list is long: “anything in the congregation, either evill in example, slanderous in manners, or not beseeming their profession: as if there be any covetous person, any adulterer, or fornicator, forsworne, thiefe, briber, false witness bearer, blasphemmer, drunkard, slanderer, usurer, any person disobedient, seditious or dissolute, any heresie or sect, as Papistical, Anabaptisticall and such like.”

Finally the discipline comes to the question of excommunication. Two factors are important here. Firstly, the decision to excommunicate is taken by the whole church, (though the minister pronounces the sentence - page 71) not by an elite of elders and ministers. Secondly, there is the emphasis placed on repentance, to the overriding importance given to the effort to win back the excommunicated member who, while barred from the sacraments, should not, as was the case with the early church,<sup>315</sup> be barred from the normal morning service where he or she would be exposed to the exposition of the word of God. As the discipline says:

And because it commeth to pass sometime in the Church of Christ, that when other remedies assayed, profit nothing, they must proceed to the Apostolicall rod and correction, as unto Excommunication (which is the greatest and last punishment belonging to the spirituall Ministry) it is ordained, that nothing be attempted in that behalfe, without the determination of the whole Church: wherein also they must beware and take good heed, that they seeme not

---

<sup>310</sup> I. Corinthians 5 v 6.

<sup>311</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.61.

<sup>312</sup> St Matthew Chapter 18, verses 15-17.

<sup>313</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.62.

<sup>314</sup> *Ibid.*, p.62.

<sup>315</sup> Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church*, pp.32 and 33.



more ready to expell from the Congregation, than to receive again those, in whom they perceive worthy fruits of repentence to appeare: neither yet to forbid him the hearing of Sermons, which is excluded from the Sacraments and other duties of the Church, that he may have liberty and occasion to repent: finally that all punishments, corrections, censures and admonitions stretch no further then God's Word with mercy may lawfully beare.<sup>316</sup>

No such record exists, either in the *Livre des Anglois*, or the city of Geneva's *Registre du Conseil* or the records of the consistory of the Genevan church, of any such measure being taken against a member of the English church during its existence in Geneva. In this, the church of the English exiles in what might be called "Calvin's city," gives the image of a peaceable, non - contentious community unlike that of many of the refugee churches elsewhere, a point that will be discussed later on.

#### 4.4 *The Morning Service - Prayers*

A brief comment has already been made on the structure of the morning service, and how it compared, inter alia, to that of the *Liturgia Sacra*. One or two further comments seem appropriate. Leaver's Sunday morning service,<sup>317</sup> perhaps ironically, is referred to as the 'Order for Morning Prayer' in the *Book of Common Prayer*. And, indeed, prayer was at the centre of the Sunday Morning service in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*. There are no less than eleven formal prayers listed there, two of which we are told were used in the Church of Geneva;<sup>318</sup> an interesting fact given what has already been said about the importance of informal prayer in the Reformed tradition.

The *Forme of the Common Prayers*, was, subsequently, adopted by the Reformed Church in Scotland, and, indeed, its full title is: *The Service, Discipline and Forme of the Common Prayers and Administration of the Sacraments, used in the English Church of Geneva: as it was approved by that most reverend divine, M. John Calvin, and the Church of Scotland*. Thus, of the three Confession of Sins at the beginning of the service - two of which are regarded as alternatives - one has the title: 'Another Confession and Prayer commonly used in the Church of Edinborough on the day of common Prayers', and the other 'A confession of Sinnes and petitions made unto God in the time of our extreme troubles, and yet commonly used in the Churches of Scotland before the Sermon'. Further on, among the general Prayers, appears 'Prayers used in the Churches of Scotland, in the time of their persecution by the Frenchmen, but principally when the Lord's Table was to be ministered' and, later on, 'A thanksgiving unto God after our deliverance from the tyranny of the Frenchmen, with Prayers made for the continuance of the peace betwixt the Realms of England and Scotland.' Thus, of the eleven formal prayers, in the Morning Service, in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, four were devised for use outside the confines of the English church in Geneva. Hence of the 63 pages of this "Nabu Public Domain Reprint" of the same document 'Humbly presented to the most High Court of Parliament this present yeare 1641' 29 of them are devoted to a total of seventeen prayers. Prayer was clearly at the centre of the liturgy of the English church in Geneva.

Charles Martin, of whom Danner says: "Comprehensive research on the specific Marian exile community at Geneva is practically synonymous with the seminal work of Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin 1555-1560* - - Nothing of its stature has been

---

<sup>316</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.63.

<sup>317</sup> See page 65. Robin Leaver, *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles*, p.4.

<sup>318</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.19.

published since Martin's book appeared in 1915,"<sup>319</sup> is nevertheless unclear when he makes comments on the Prayers used in the 'Sunday morning service.' Of which prayers is he speaking? "Une confession de nos péchés appropriée à notre temps et empruntée au chapitre 9 de Daniel »<sup>320</sup> does not appear to relate to the first confession; if it had, one would have expected it to be reflected in the well known Genevan trade mark, the marginal notes. Nevertheless, of whatever prayers he is referring, Martin states quite poignantly: "il devait y avoir quelque chose de grande et de tragique à la répétition de cette prière d'humiliation dans cet auditoire qui, de mois en mois, apprenait de nouvelles persécutions de la bouche même de ceux qui, après y avoir échappé, venaient joindre leurs voix à celles de leur compagnons d'exil pour demander la délivrance. »<sup>321</sup>

Martin adds that the prayer has something more clear, more striking than the prayer, however grand and solemn, that is to be found in the 1542 liturgy of the Genevan church for plague, war and other adversities, through which God punishes us for our sins.

What, however, our commentator says can not be surpassed, "ce que les Anglais se sont contentés de reproduire comme 'une confession pour tous les états et tous les temps' »<sup>322</sup> turns out to be the Confession of our sinnes in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, before the two alternative confessions mentioned above. Martin points out that this confession had been taken by Calvin qui a "emprunté les pensées, l'ordre et parfois les termes eux mêmes, à la liturgie allemande qu'il a trouvée à Strasbourg pendant son exil en cette ville de 1538-1541, mais à la quelle il a imprimé en caractères indélébiles la marque de son génie littéraire et religieux. »<sup>323</sup> However, even here, Martin tells us « Knox et ses collègues ne se sont pas contentés d'une traduction servile. Déjà dans le premier paragraphe ils ont intercalé après ces mots 'inutile a tout bien' cette courte explication : 'car la chair se révolte toujours contre l'esprit.' »<sup>324</sup>

In this same confession in which appear the words "but also bring forth such fruits, as may be agreeable to thy most blessed will,"<sup>325</sup> Martin suggests that the English church puts more emphasis than Calvin's liturgy on the redemptive work of Christ. The text is as follows:

not for the worthiness thereof, but for the merits of thy dearly beloved Sonne Jesus Christ our onely Saviour, whom thou hast already given an oblation and offering for our sinnes, and for whose sake we are certainly persuaded, that thou wilt deny us nothing, that wee shall aske in his name according to thy will. For thy spirit doth assure our consciences that thou art our mercifull Father, and so lovest us thy children through him, that nothing is able to remove thine heavenly grace and favour from us. To thee therefore, O father, with the Sonne and the Holy Ghost be all honour and glory, World without end, So be it.<sup>326</sup>

---

<sup>319</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism* p.8.

<sup>320</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.101.

<sup>321</sup> Ibid., p.102.

<sup>322</sup> Ibid., p.102.

<sup>323</sup> Ibid., p.102.

<sup>324</sup> Ibid., p.103.

<sup>325</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.12.

<sup>326</sup> Ibid., p.12.

Of this, our commentator adds “Quelque intéressante que soit cette adjonction à la confession calviniste, on peut se demander si elle a bien su garder le caractère sobre et lapidaire que Calvin avait trouvé dans la liturgie de Strasbourg et qu’il avait si admirablement rendu dans la sienne. »<sup>327</sup>

However our commentator further suggests, and rightly, that « l’indépendance de nos auteurs vis-à-vis de la liturgie de Genève est, peut-être encore plus frappante dans le texte de la prière dite d’intercession, qui était destinée à suivre immédiatement la prédication et qui porte ce titre : Une prière pour tous les états de l’Eglise de Christ. »<sup>328</sup> He notes that, while the style of the prayer is undoubtedly familiar, its content “est exprimé dans un style plus rapide, plus personnel, que dans la liturgie genevoise, et avec des allusions directes aux circonstances spéciales de leur église qui nous transportent d’une manière très vivante au sein de cette petite congrégation des persécutés - - La prière toute entière respire une grande ferveur qui la rend vraiment très intéressante même en comparaison de celles que nous trouvons dans les autres liturgies calvinistes.»<sup>329</sup>

This is compliment indeed and merits quotations from ‘A Prayer for the whole state of Christ’s Church.’ The prayer begins:

Almighty God, and most merciful Father, we humbly submit ourselves and fall downe before thy Majesty, beseeching thee from the botome of our hearts, that this seede of thy word, now sowne among us, may take such deep roote, that neither the burning heate of persecution cause it to wither, neither the thorny cares of this life do choke it, but as seede sown in good ground, it may bring forth thirty, sixty and an hundredfold, as thine Heavenly wisdom hath appointed”<sup>330</sup> and later continues “Furthermore, forasmuch as by thine holy Apostle we be taught to make our Prayers and Supplications for all men, we pray not only for our selves here present, but beseech thee also to reduce all such as be yet ignorant, from the miserable captivity of blindness and error, to the pure understanding of thine heavenly truth, that we all with one content and unity of minds, may worship thee our only God and Saviour: and that all Pastors, shepherds, and Ministers, to whom thou hast committed the dispensation of thine holy word, and charge of thy chosen people, may both in their life and doctrine, be found faithfull, setting only before their eyes thy glory, and that by them all poore sheepe which wander and go astray, may be gathered and brought home to thy fold.”<sup>331</sup>

And drawing towards its conclusion the prayer continues “And for that we be all members of the mysticall body of Christ Jesus, we make our requests unto thee, O Heavenly Father, for all such as are afflicted with any kinde of cross or Tribulation, as Warre, Plague, Famine, Sicknesse, Poverty, Imprisonment, Persecution, Banishment, or any other kinde of thy roddes: whether it be grieffe of body, or unquietnesse of mind, that it would please thee to give them patience and constancy, till thou send the full deliverance out of all their troubles.”<sup>332</sup> And concluding:

---

<sup>327</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais*, p.104.

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.*, p.104.

<sup>329</sup> *Ibid.*, p.105.

<sup>330</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.17.

<sup>331</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17.

<sup>332</sup> *Ibid.*, p.17 and 18.

And finally, O Lord God, most merciful Father, wee most humbly beseech thee, to show thy great mercies upon our brethren, which are persecuted, cast in prison, and daily condemned to death for the testimony of thy truth. And though they be utterly destitute of all mans aid, yet let thy sweete comfort never depart from them, but so inflame their hearts with thine holy Spirit, that they may boldly and chearfully abide such tryall, as thy godly wisdom shall appoint, so that at length as well by their death, as by their life, the Kingdome of thy Son Jesus Christ may increase and shine through all the World. In whose name we make our humble petitions unto thee, as he hath taught us - -<sup>333</sup>

This is, indeed, 'un style qui est rapide et personnel' and would be worthy of Thomas Cranmer.

A note after the "Sunday Service" states "It shall not be necessary for the Minister dayly to repeat all these things before mentioned, but beginning with some manner of confession to proceed to the Sermon, which endeth, he either useth the 'Prayer for all estates' before mentioned or else prayeth, as the Spirit of God shall move his heart, framing the same according to the time and matter which he hath intreated of."<sup>334</sup>

This reminds us of the stark simplicity of the Reformed morning service. Its essence, according to the foregoing, is a confession, a sermon and prayers, albeit that in the order of the English church in Geneva there was added the singing of two psalms, and the recitation of the creed - page 65.

Interesting to note, however, is the comment in the same 'rubric' that in times of "plague, famine, pestilence, war or such like which be evident tokens of God's wrath, as it is our part to acknowledge our sins to be the occasion thereof,"<sup>335</sup> not only are special prayers called for but also mourning and fasting "as the meanes to turn away Gods heavy displeasure."<sup>336</sup>

#### **4.5 The Sacraments and other rites of the church**

##### **4.5.1 The Order of Baptism**

Of the Order of Baptism practiced in the English church Martin states that "il présente vis-à-vis de la liturgie de Calvin les même caractères de fidélité dans le fond, et d'indépendance dans l'ordre et la forme. On sent, he continues, « que le but poursuivi dans les deux cas est quelque peu différent. »"<sup>337</sup> Calvin, Martin suggests, was here primarily concerned in affirming the doctrinal basis of the sacraments as understood within the reformed church and asserting the truth of these over and above the doctrines of the traditional church. Knox, on the other hand, starts out from a different position, one where the doctrinal basis is given and established but where practical aspects of its application come to the forefront. There is, thus, in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* a long introductory piece devoted to the defence of infant baptism, a subject on which Knox wrote a tract while in Geneva; the link between the theological works produced by the English exiles while in Geneva and the liturgy of their church, is a subject that will be touched on later.

---

<sup>333</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.18.

<sup>334</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>335</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>336</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>337</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, pp.105-106.

Be that as it may, the differences between the Geneva church and that of the church of the English exiles in Geneva, may not be so great in this context. For, 'The Order of Baptisme', within the *Forme of the Common Prayers* begins with a resounding declaration of the Reformed understanding of Baptism, which reads as follows:

First note, that forasmuch as it is not permitted by Gods Word, that women should preach or Minister the Sacraments, and it is evident, that the Sacraments are not ordained of God to be used in private corners, as charmes, or sorceries, but left to the Congregation, and necessarily annexed to Gods Word, as seales of the same: therefore the infant which is to be baptised, shall be brought to the Church on the day appointed, to common Prayer and preaching accompanied with the father and godfather.<sup>338</sup>

Three important aspects of Reformed belief are enshrined in the above words; firstly the statement that baptism is not "to be used in private corners, as charmes, or sorceries" is a reminder that emergency baptism by mid-wives and the like was outlawed in the Reformed church given that reformed belief cast doubt on the idea that baptism was essential for salvation. The same comment may be made in the context of the proscription on women ministering the sacraments, of which, of course, Baptism is one, the other being Communion.<sup>339</sup> Secondly the statement that the sacraments are annexed to God's word and not independent of it and thirdly the assertion that baptism is a public rather than a private event, linking parents, godparents, the congregation and the child to be baptised, to the life of the church.

One of the longest parts of the 'Order of Baptisme' in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* is the minister's opening words in defence of the baptism of children, as mentioned above. Thus, ever conscious of the influence of Anabaptists, from whom the Reformed church was fearful of not being distinguished, appear the words "which thing as he confirmed to his people of the Old Testament by the Sacrament of Circumcision"<sup>340</sup> as early as line five in the minister's introductory words. The covenant of God with Abraham, sealed by the ceremony of circumcision, was, of course, the 'fall back position' of Zwingli when he was battling with the Anabaptists in Zurich. As young children had not been excluded from the community of God in the Old Testament, so no more should they be excluded from the community of God in the New Testament: "doing us thereby to wit, that our infants appertaine to him by covenant, and therefore ought not to be defrauded of those holy signs and badges whereby his children are knowne from Infidels and Pagans."<sup>341</sup>

There then follows the interesting comment that "neither is it requisite, that all those that receive this Sacrament, have the use of understanding and faith which thing is most evident by St Paul, who pronounceth the children begotten and borne (either of the parents being faithfull) to be cleane and holy."<sup>342</sup> Then, as if to forestall the argument of the traditional church that Baptism was essential to salvation, the statement continues: "And yet is not this outward action of such necessity, that the lack

---

<sup>338</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.35.

<sup>339</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, pp.503-504 mentions that, before the reformation, cults were formed around saints believed to have the power to revive stillborn babies long enough for them to receive a valid baptism.

<sup>340</sup> Genesis, Chapter 17 verses 10-14 and *Forme of the Common Prayers* pp.35-36.

<sup>341</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.36.

<sup>342</sup> *Ibid.*, p.36.

thereof should be hurtful to their salvation, if that, prevented by death, they may not conveniently be presented to the Church? But we (having respect to that obedience, which Christians owe to the voice and ordinance of Christ Jesus, who commanded to preach and baptise all without exception) do judge them only unworthy of any fellowship with him, who contemptuously refuse such ordinary means, as his wisdom hath appointed to the instruction of our dull senses."<sup>343</sup>

Linked to this is an explanation of the 'sign' within the sacrament of baptism: "Furthermore it is evident, that Baptism was ordained to be ministered in the element of water to teach us, that like as water outwardly doth wash away the filth of the body, so inwardly doth the virtue of Christ's blood purge our soules from that corruption and deadly poison wherewith by nature we were infected - -- not that we thinke any such vertue or power to be included in the visible water or outward action (for many have been baptised, and yet never inwardly purged) but that our Saviour Christ, who commanded Baptism to be ministered, will by the power of his holy spirit effectually worke in the hearts of his elect in time convenient all that is meant and signified by the same. And this the Scripture calleth our regeneration."<sup>344</sup>

Danner stresses the importance given by the English exiles in Geneva to this differentiation between the sign or sacrament and what it signified, suggesting that there is a constant dialectic between the two in their liturgical thought.<sup>345</sup>

The minister then continues with words that address the topic of sanctification. In the continuous battle in this life against sin our Lord:

doth not only give us motions and courage to resist them, but also assurance to overcome and obtaine victory. Whereof, dearly beloved, it is not only of necessity that we be once baptized, but also it much profiteth oft to be present at the ministration thereof, that we (being put in minde of the league and covenant made between God and us, that he will be our God and we his people, he our father and we his children) may have occasion as well to try our lives past, as our present conversation ; and to prove ourselves, whether we stand fast in the faith of Gods Elect, or, contrariwise, have strayed from him through incredulity and ungodly living: whereof if our consciences doe accuse us, yet by hearing the loving promises of our Heavenly Father (who calleth all men to mercy by repentance) we may hence forth walk more warily in our vocation.<sup>346</sup>

This is a reminder of the importance of the participation of the congregation in the sacrament of baptism, such that it reminds them of promises made at their own baptism so encouraging them to continue to strive for holiness of life.

The address of the minister concludes with words of warning and comfort "to see your children, thus received into the bosom of Christ's Congregation, whereby you are dayly admonished, that ye nourish and bring up the children of God's favour and mercy, over whom his fatherly providence watcheth continually, which thing as it ought greatly to rejoyce you, knowing that nothing can come

---

<sup>343</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers* p.36.

<sup>344</sup> *Ibid.*, p.37.

<sup>345</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, pp. 126-127.

<sup>346</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p 37.

unto them without his good pleasure, so ought it to make you diligent and carefull, to nurture and instruct them in the true knowledge and feare of God.”<sup>347</sup> There follows the statement that negligence in this not only does injury to our own children in hiding from them the good will and pleasure of Almighty God their Father: but also to heape damnation upon your selves, in suffering his children, bought with the blood of his deare Sonne, so traiterously for lack of knowledge to turne back from him.”<sup>348</sup>

It is interesting to see the words ‘lack of knowledge’ rather than ‘lack of faith’ in the foregoing, which illustrates, once again, the importance in the Reformed tradition given to instruction and education – page 73. Martin also makes the comment that in the minister’s introductory comments “l’édification joue ici un plus grand rôle que dans la liturgie de Calvin, qui a cependant une grand valeur à cet égard.”<sup>349</sup>

The *Forme of the Common Prayers* continues with the words: Then the father or in his absence, the godfather shall rehearse the Articles of his faith: which done, the Minister explaneth the same as after followeth.<sup>350</sup> Thus follows the Apostles Creed with what might be seen as a reversal of the style of Genevan ‘marginal notes’ in that the Creed appears in the margin and the marginal notes or explanation of the creed as the main text. In this it is similar to the ‘Confession of Faith’ with which the *Forme of the Common Prayers* starts out, though slightly longer. In style it also reflects the structure of the confession of faith in the *Liturgia Sacra* with its division into four parts: God the Father, Jesus Christ our Lord, (Dieu leFilz in the *Liturgia Sacra*), the Holy Ghost and, lastly, the Church.

There then follows what Martin describes as “une prière magnifique” which he explains has its origins in a liturgy of Farel, subsequently developed by Calvin, which the English exiles took, almost “carte blanche,” into their own liturgy. Against this prayer there are no less than eighteen texts listed in the margin. The prayer itself reads as follows:

Almighty and everlasting God, which of thine infinite mercy and goodness, hath promised unto us, that thou will not only be our God, but also the God and Father of our children, we beseech thee, that as thou hast vouchsafed to call us to be partners of this thy great mercy in the fellowship of Faith: so it may please thee to sanctifie with thy Spirit, and to receive into the number of thy children this infant, whom we shall baptise according to thy word , to the end that he coming to perfit age, may confesse thee only the true God, and whom thou has sent, Jesus Christ, and so to serve him, and be profitable unto his Church, in the whole course of his life, that after his life be ended, he may be brought as a lively member of his body unto the full fruition of thy joyes in the Heavens, where thy Sonne our Saviour Christ reigneth without end.<sup>351</sup>

At the conclusion of this prayer follows the Lord’s Prayer after which the Minister “requireth the child’s name, which knowen”<sup>352</sup> would then proceed to the baptism in which “he taketh water in his

---

<sup>347</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.37.

<sup>348</sup> *Ibid.*, p.38

<sup>349</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p106.

<sup>350</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.38.

<sup>351</sup> *Ibid.*, p.44.

<sup>352</sup> *Ibid.*, p.44.

hand and layeth it upon the childes forehead,"<sup>353</sup> while saying: "I baptise thee in the name of the Father, of the Sonne and of the holy Ghost."<sup>354</sup>

In contrast to the prayer which immediately precedes the baptism, with its eighteen texts noted in the margin, the prayer concluding the service, in which supplication is made to God to "take this infant into thy tuition and defence, whom we offer and present unto thee with common supplications, and never suffer him to fall to such unkindnesse, whereby he should lose the force of Baptisme"<sup>355</sup> has only one.

There is no explanation or justification in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* for the existence of godparents, yet this is a subject that deserves brief mention, being a topic of some controversy in the Reformed tradition. Congregationalists (if they may be considered part of this tradition but who feature beyond the period we are examining), for example, had none.

In spite of what the opening words of the minister in the order of baptism within the *Forme of the Common Prayers* say about the scriptural basis of infant baptism, William Naphy states that the whole issue was problematic for a movement intent on basing all behaviour on Scripture. He continues "Scriptural support for infant baptism is extremely tenuous; for godparenting it is entirely lacking."<sup>356</sup> Nevertheless, as Naphy points out, while the practice of godparenting was retained in Geneva, it was radically regendered, for, whereas godmothers, officially, at least, disappeared from the reformed liturgy,<sup>357</sup> godfathers did not. Godparenting became godfathering. Naphy, quoting Karen Spierling ('Infant Baptism in Reformation Geneva') states that "while Reformed theology had almost no interest in the traditional practice and Calvin's liturgy of 1542 simply allowed for its possibility, the reality in Reformed France and Scotland as well as Geneva was that the Protestants had no intention of giving up the practice."<sup>358</sup>

The English exiles were no exception to this 'rule' as we shall see later. Mention has already been made of the case of Calvin, no less, who agreed to act as godfather to the son of the English exile Lady Stafford, and in this role attempted to prevent her from leaving Geneva, lest his godson fell under the influence of the traditional church. The lists of godparents at baptisms in the *Livre des Anglois*, suggests that the English exiles were fully wedded to the practice.

It should nevertheless be noted, as a 'footnote', that the attitude of the Reformed church in Geneva to the issue of godparenting was in marked contrast to 'La Forme d'Administrer le Bapteme' outlined in the *Liturgia Sacra* where godmothers as well as godfathers are mentioned throughout the order. It should also be mentioned that in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, the godfather, while making a confession of faith, makes no commitment or, as Martin puts it "ne prenait aucun engagement"<sup>359</sup> on

---

<sup>353</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers* p.44.

<sup>354</sup> *Ibid.*, p.44.

<sup>355</sup> *Ibid.*, p.45.

<sup>356</sup> William Naphy 'Stations- Geneva II' Herman J. Selderhuis ed, *The Calvin Handbook*, pp. 50-51.

<sup>357</sup> Not from the *Liturgia Sacra* which, one presumes, should be counted as part of the Reformed tradition.

<sup>358</sup> *Ibid.*, p.51.

<sup>359</sup> Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.107.



behalf of the child to be baptised, whereas, in Poullain's *Liturgia Sacra*, there is clearly such a commitment<sup>360</sup> demanded of and made by the godparents.

No doubt it is possible to exaggerate the differences between the two orders for, as already mentioned, Calvin, who stood as godfather to a child of Sir William and Lady Stafford, members of the English church in Geneva, certainly took his duties as godfather seriously, irrespective of whether such a provision was provided for in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*!

Apart from details of baptisms that took place at the English church in Geneva, we also have a record of a dispute over a baptism that took place within the church in Frankfurt. Given that the dispute concerned liturgy it merits, our attention.

Of the eighteen members of the Frankfurt church who signed Whittingham's letter of farewell to the Frankfurt congregation, it is odd to record that no less than one third of them actually stayed on in Frankfurt, at least in the initial period. One of them was Thomas Cole, whom Garrett suggests stayed behind to act as an observer for Whittingham and who continued the narrative of the *Brief Discourse* after Whittingham had left Frankfurt.<sup>361</sup> A letter of Cole's appears in the *Discourse* which recounts the refusal of the minister (David Whitehead) to baptise the child of Laurence Kent according to the Genevan baptismal rite: "For Master Kent, having a child to christen, purposing to have it done simply, without the beautifying of men's traditions, came with his child, according to the French Order, which we once received, and one to hold it there, to profess his faith, if it were required: but the Pastor denied the christening ; unless the two Godmothers were had, after the order of the Book."<sup>362</sup> The Book referred to was, of course, the *Book of Common Prayer*. But Thomas Cole clearly did not know much about the French Order - the *Liturgia Sacra* - to which he refers. The rite of Baptism within the *Liturgia Sacra* provided for the existence of both godmothers and godfathers, as we have already seen. But more important for our purposes is the use of the plural, as opposed to the singular, throughout the order<sup>363</sup> when speaking of 'parreins et marreines.' The plural, after all, includes two. So, the *Liturgia Sacra* - the French Order - did allow for the presence of two godmothers at a baptism. Once again one sees here the irrelevant and unnecessary nature of the liturgical disputes which took place between the English exiles.

Thomas Cole's letter is 'dated', in the *Discourse*, at 6<sup>th</sup> January 1556. This is sometime after the letter of Richard Cox to Calvin, dated 5 April 1555, when Cox stated that the English church in Frankfurt had given up "Private Baptisms, Confirmation of Children, Saints Days, Kneeling at the Holy Communion, the Linen Surplices of the Ministers, Crosses and other things of the like character."<sup>364</sup>

Robin Leaver has shown both the similarities and differences between the 1555 Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles and that of the *Book of Common Prayer*. For the reader it is perhaps the similarities that are, initially, the most striking. But the differences are important. In the 1555 Liturgy there is no private baptism and while there is reference to godfathers and godmothers<sup>365</sup> there is the interesting

---

<sup>360</sup> Valérand Poullain, *Liturgia Sacra* p.139.

<sup>361</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian exiles*, p.122.

<sup>362</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.95.

<sup>363</sup> Poullain, *Liturgia Sacra*, pp.125,139,141,145,

<sup>364</sup> Wood, *Brief Discourse*, p.77.

<sup>365</sup> Robin Leaver, *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*, p.10.

rubric to the exhortation towards the end of the service, which reads: "At the laste ende the minister calling the *father* of the childe shall geve hym some short exhortacon and charge, for the godlye bryngeinge up of the childe wherein also the godfathers and godmothers shall be moved to do their endeavours in this forme."<sup>366</sup> The reintroduction of the *father* into the service is clearly driving the rite in a Protestant direction for, in contrast, the rubric in the *Book of Common Prayer* simply reads: "Then, all standing up, the Priest<sup>367</sup> shall say to the Godfathers and Godmothers this exhortation following."<sup>368</sup>

In the 1555 liturgy of the Frankfurt exiles there is also no sign of the cross in baptism and associated words, while the exhortations and questions to god parents are shorter than in the Prayer Book. Three prayers are also omitted.

What about the *Liturgia Sacra*, the so called French order referred to by Thomas Cole? While the exhortations and prayers bear somewhat more the style of the *Forme of the Common Prayers* than those of the *Book of Common Prayer* it is hard to see what basis of contention existed between the liturgies - as they related to baptism - in the *Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*, the *Liturgia Sacra* and the *Forme of the Common Prayers*.

This point has been laboured at some length because it illustrates, yet once again, the unnecessary nature of the liturgical disputes of the English exiles.

#### 4.5.2 The Manner of the Lord's Supper

In the traditional church, members of a Christian congregation did not so much participate in the mass, they observed it. Indeed, it would probably be wrong to talk about a congregation so much as congregations. For, the Reformers took pleasure in poking fun at the traditional rite where people rushed from church to church to observe the elevation of the host. Participation *in* the Mass was but once a year and for the reformers to insist on a more regular participation in the Reformed communion service meant a sharp break with traditional practice.

At the refugee church in Strasbourg, during Calvin's tenure as pastor, communion had been celebrated monthly, while Calvin himself advocated a weekly celebration. However, for the town council in Geneva neither practice was acceptable and the authorities overrode Calvin's wish for a more frequent celebration and laid down that communion would be celebrated quarterly in the city's reformed church. But, as church services were staggered i.e. they started at different times in different churches, there nevertheless remained the possibility for the churchgoer to participate in monthly communion somewhere in the city. For those with a taste for legal niceties it should be remembered that Reformed Geneva was but one parish, not several.

The *Forme of the Common Prayers*, in contrast to the Genevan church, provided for a monthly celebration. The introduction to the rite states: "The day when the Lord's supper is ministered, which commonly is used once a month, or so oft as the Congregation shall thinke expedient, the Minister useth to say as followeth."<sup>369</sup> There then follows the introductory words of the minister citing St.

---

<sup>366</sup> Robin Leaver, *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*, p.11.

<sup>367</sup> There is the usual see-saw between Priest and Minister in the Order of Baptism. This time the Priests win with ten versus four for the Ministers!

<sup>368</sup> *Book of Common Prayer*, p.152.

<sup>369</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.45.

Paul's own words in the first epistle to the Corinthians, chapter 11, verses 23 to 29. Verses 27 to 29, as they appeared in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* are as follows:

Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread and drinke the Cup of the Lord unworthily, he shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. Then see that every man prove and try himselfe, and so let him eate of this Bread and drinke of this Cup: for whosoever eateth or drinketh unworthily, he eateth and drinketh his own damnation, for not having due regard and consideration for the Lord's body.<sup>370</sup>

These words of St Paul were the basis of the importance placed, throughout much of the Reformed tradition – see Glossary - on the suitability and preparedness of communicants wishing to participate in the Lord's Supper. The exhortation of the minister, which follows his introductory words, illustrates this point clearly. As early as line six of the exhortation appear the words: "For as the benefit is great, if with a truly penitent heart and lively faith, we receive that holy Sacrament (for then we spiritually eate the flesh of Christ, and drinke his blood: then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us: we be one with Christ, and Christ with us ) so is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily: for then we be guilty of the Body, and Blood of Christ our Saviour, we eate and drinke our own damnation, not considering the Lords Body, we kindle Gods wrath against us, and provoke him to plague us with Diverse diseases and sundry kinds of Death."<sup>371</sup> The minister then proceeds to excommunicate from communion:

all blasphemers of God, all Idolaters, all murtherers, all adulterers, all that be in malice and envy, all disobedient persons to father or mother, Princes or Magistrates, Pastors or Preachers, all thieves, and deceivers of their neighbours: and finally, all such as live a life directly fighting against the will of God: charging them as they will answer in the presence of him who is the righteous judge, that they presume not to prophane this most holy Table.<sup>372</sup>

There follows an emphasis on repentance when the exhortation continues: "And yet this I pronounce not to seclude any penitent person, how grievous that ever his sins before have been, so that he feele in his heart unfained repentence for the same: but only such as continue in sin without repentence - - - -we may be now right well assured, that those defaults and manifold imperfections in us, shall be no hindrance at all against us, to cause him not to accept and impute us as worthy to come to his spiritual Table. For the end of our comming thither, is not to make protestation that we are upright or just in our lives, but contrawise, we come to seeke our life and perfection in Jesus Christ, acknowledging in the meane time, that we of ourselves be the children of wrath and damnation."<sup>373</sup>

The exhortation closes with an allusion to the doctrine of the traditional church and the errors therein.

Then to the end that we may be worthy partakers of his merits, and most comfortable benefits (which is the true eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood) let us not suffer our minds to wander about the consideration of these earthly and corruptible things (which we see present to our eyes and feele with our hands) to seeke Christ bodily present in them, as if he were

---

<sup>370</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.46.

<sup>371</sup> *Ibid.*, p.46.

<sup>372</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.46-47.

<sup>373</sup> *Ibid.*, p.47.

inclosed in the Bread or Wine, or as if these elements were turned and changed into the substance of his flesh and blood. For the only way to dispose our soules to receive nourishment, reliefe and quickening of his substance, is to lift up our minds by faith above all things worldly and sensible, and thereby to enter into Heaven, that we may find and receive Christ, where he dwelleth undoubtedly very God, and very man, in the incomprehensible glory of his Father: to whom be all praise, honour and glory, now and ever, Amen.<sup>374</sup>

Martin states that the above exhortation is lifted almost entirely from the text of Calvin in the Genevan liturgy with the exception of two excisions, one at the beginning and the other at the end of the exhortation. He adds, however, that in the liturgy of the English exiles, the pieces suppressed in the exhortation reappear in the prayer which follows it, though with somewhat less felicity.

Communion was celebrated at a table and the minister's exhortation was made from the pulpit. Thus "The exhortation ended, the minister cometh downe from the Pulpit and sitteth at the Table, every man and woman in like wise taking their place as occasion best serveth; then he taketh Bread either in these words following, or like in effect."<sup>375</sup>

In the giving of thanks which follows, the minister states in the middle of the prayer: "O Lord, the blind dullness of our corrupt nature will not suffer us sufficiently to weigh these thy most ample benefits: yet nevertheless at the Commandment of Jesus Christ our Lord, we present ourselves to this his Table (which he hath left to be used in remembrance of his death until his coming again) to declare and witnesse before the World, that by him alone we have received liberty, and life: that by him alone thou dost acknowledge us thy children and heires: that by him alone we have enterance to the Throne of thy grace: that by him alone we are possessed in our spirituall Kingdome, to eate and drinke at his Table, with whom we have conversation presently in Heaven, and by whom our bodies shall be raised up againe from the dust, and shall be placed with him in that endless joy, which thou, O Father of mercy hath prepared for thine elect before the Foundation of the World was layd. And these most inestimable benefits, we acknowledge and confesse to have received by thy free mercy and grace, by thine only beloved Sonne Jesus Christ: for the which therefore we thy Congregation, moved by thine holy Spirit, render all thanks, praise and glory for ever and ever."<sup>376</sup> This prayer of thanks has reference to no less than 49 biblical texts in the margin.

The 'rubric' states that "this done, the Minister breaketh the Bread, and delivereth it to the people, who distribute and divide the same among themselves, according to our Saviour Christ's Commandment, and likewise giveth the Cup. During which time, some place of Scripture is read, which doth lively set forth the death of Christ, to the intent that our eyes and senses may not only be occupied in these outward signes of Bread and Wine, which are called the visible word, but that our hearts and minds may be fully fixed in the contemplation of the Lord's death, which is by this holy sacrament represented"<sup>377</sup> Of this Martin says, "Le but en est ingénieusement indiqué dans la liturgie:

---

<sup>374</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers* pp. 47-48.

<sup>375</sup> *Ibid.*, p.48.

<sup>376</sup> *Ibid.*, p.49.

<sup>377</sup> *Ibid.*, p.49. In Poullain's *Liturgia Sacra* the procedure appears to have been slightly different with communicants filing past the minister and receiving from him the bread at one end of the table and the wine from the deacon at the other end of the table, before returning to their seats in the congregation.

on a voulu empêcher l'esprit des communicants d'être trop occupé des éléments matériels du pain et du vin, et le tourner entièrement vers la contemplation de la mort du Sauveur, représentée par le sacrement. »<sup>378</sup> Put more bluntly it was almost certainly a provision introduced to suppress any lingering belief in transubstantiation, central to the traditional church, in the mind of the communicant. After the Communion, the minister recited a prayer of thanks, following which the people sang a psalm, usually Psalm 103, which then led the Minister to pronounce the blessing.

At the end of 'The manner of the Lords Supper' there is, in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* a footnote 'To the Reader' which is as follows: "If so be that any would marvel why we follow rather this order, then any other in the administration of this Sacrament, let him diligently consider, that first of all we utterly renounce the error of the Papists. Secondly, we restore unto the Sacrament his own substance, and to Christ his proper place. And as for the words of the Lords Supper, we rehearse them, not because they should change the substance of the Bread or Wine, or that the repetition thereof with the intent of the sacrificer should make the Sacrament (as the Papists falsely believe) but they are read and pronounced, to teach us how to behave ourselves in that action, and that Christ might witness unto our Faith, as it were with his own mouth, that he hath ordained these signes for our spirituall use and comfort, we do first therefore examine our selves, according to Saint Paul's rule, and prepare our minds, that wee may be worthy partakers of so high mysteries. Then taking Bread wee give thanks, breake and distribute it, as Christ our Saviour hath taught us. Finally the ministrations ended, we give thanks againe, according to his example, so that without his word and warrant, there is nothing in this holy action attempted."<sup>379</sup>

The Reformers were at one in agreeing that there were only two sacraments: baptism and holy communion, called here the Lords Supper. For the Reformed Church the battle over baptism, or rather infant baptism, was with the Anabaptists rather than with the traditional church. For the Lord's Supper it was not only with the traditional church but with the Lutheran wing of the Protestant Reformation that conflict occurred. Undoubtedly, it was for this reason that with 'The manner of the Lord's Supper', as outlined in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* there occurred an explanatory note both at the beginning and at the end of the order of service.

#### 4.5.3 The Forme of Marriage

The preface to the rite mentions the Banns of Marriage at the outset and its wording reflects, what might be called an admirable feature of the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, namely its bluntness, or plain speaking. In the *Book of Common Prayer*, for example, we see in the Banns of Marriage the words, "if any of you know cause, or just impediment, why these two persons should not be joined together in holy Matrimony, ye are to declare it"<sup>380</sup> In contrast, the liturgy of the English Exiles in Geneva is more robust when it speaks of the 'banes', "to the intent that if any person have interest or title to either of the parties, they may have sufficient time to make their challenge." The *Liturgia Sacra* appears to strike a middle, albeit long winded, way: "Il faut noter, que devant celebrer quelque Marriage, on le publie en l'Eglise par trois Dimanches: a fin que si quelcun y savoit empeschement, qu'il le vint denoncer de bonne heure: ou si aucun y avoit interest, qu'il s'y peust oppose: et aussi afin que toute

<sup>378</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.108.

<sup>379</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, pp. 50-51.

<sup>380</sup> *Book of Common Prayer*, p.170.

l'Eglise prie pour eux."<sup>381</sup> As often with Poullain's liturgy, pastoral, and other, gems spring out from a long winded text. Neither the *Book of Common Prayer* nor the *Forme of the Common Prayers* has any reference to the need for the prayer of the whole church for parties involved in such disputes.<sup>382</sup>

The preface to the service also mentions that the 'Forme of Marriage' should be performed in church "the parties assemble at the beginning of the Sermon"<sup>383</sup> a constant theme of the rites within the liturgy of the English exiles.

There follows the exhortation of the Minister which outlines the reasons for which marriage was ordained. Martin says that the Forme of Marriage was an almost exact translation of that of Calvin which was itself based on an earlier liturgy of Farel. Much of the text is recognisable from liturgies elsewhere, though the reader will recognise<sup>384</sup> the particular mark of Calvin in the piece which follows the statement "they that be thus coupled together by God can not be severed or put apart, unless it be for a season with the assent of both parties, to the end to give themselves the more fervently to fasting and prayer, giving diligent heed in the meane time that their long being apart be not a snare to bring them into the danger of Satan, through incontinency, and therefore to avoid fornication every man ought to have his own wife, and every woman her own husband: so that as many as cannot live chaste, are bound by the commandment of God to marry, that thereby the holy Temple of God which is our bodies, may be kept pure and undefiled."<sup>385</sup>

The participation of the congregation in the ceremony is emphasised in what follows. Following a statement of the minister to 'the parties that shall be married' which follows almost exactly the wording of *The Book of Common Prayer*, the minister says to the Congregation: "I take you to witness that be here present, beseeching you all to have good rememberance hereof: and moreover, if there be any of you, which knoweth that either of these parties be contracted to any other, or knoweth any other lawful impediment, let them now make declaration thereof."<sup>386</sup> In the subsequent questions which the minister addresses to the parties to be married, before they make their respective vows, occur the words 'before God and his holy Congregation' and 'in the presence of his Congregation' and again 'in the presence of this holy Congregation.'

There is no giving away of the woman and no ring. The service draws to a conclusion with a reading of the Minister from chapter 19 of St Matthew's Gospel, a reminder of "how our Lord would have this holy contract kept and observed and how fast a knot it is, which may in no wise be loosed, according as we be taught in the 19 chap, of S. Matthewes Gospell: The Pharisees came unto Christ to tempt him and to grope his mind, saying, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every light cause? He answered, saying, Have ye not read, that he which created man at the beginning made them male and female saying, For this thing shall man leave father and mother, and cleave unto his wife, and they

---

<sup>381</sup> Valérand Poullain, *Liturgia Sacra*, p.147.

<sup>382</sup> Poullain had himself suffered from a matrimonial dispute which no doubt influenced him when he came to compose the *Liturgia Sacra*. See Philippe Denis, *Les Églises D'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, pp. 245-249.

<sup>383</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.51.

<sup>384</sup> John Witte Jr 'Marriage and Family Life' ed Herman .J. Selderhuis, *The Calvin Handbook*, p.460.

<sup>385</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.52.

<sup>386</sup> *Ibid.*, p.53.

twaine shal be one flesh, so that they are no more two, but are one flesh. Let no man therefore put asunder that, which God hath coupled together.”<sup>387</sup>

The minister then says “if ye believe assuredly these words - - - -then you may be certain, that God hath even so knit you together in this holy state of wedlock. Wherefore apply yourselves to live together in godly love, in Christian peace and good example, ever holding fast the band of charity without any breach, keeping faith and trust the one to the other, even as God’s Word doth appoint.”<sup>388</sup>

The minister then commits the couple to God with a blessing following which the congregation sing Psalm 128 ‘or some other appertaining to the same purpose.’

Martin regrets that “le texte anglais ne contient pas l’excellente prière qui termine la cérémonie »<sup>389</sup> from Calvin’s liturgy. Be that as it may the blessing: « The Lord sanctifie and bless you: the Lord powre the riches of his grace upon you, that ye may please him, and live together in holy love to your lives end”<sup>390</sup> strikes a suitably solemn note.

#### 4.5.4 The Visitation of the Sicke

As in the *Liturgia Sacra* as well as *The Book of Common Prayer*, ‘The visitation of The Sicke’ follows upon ‘The forme of Mariage’ in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*. Once again one sees in the introduction that admirable sense of the practical way of things, to which we have already referred, in what may be called the Reformed liturgy. The introduction sets the situation precisely: “Because the visitation of the Sicke is a thing very necessary, and yet notwithstanding it is hard to prescribe all rules appertaining thereto, we refer it to the discretion of the godly and prudent Minister who, according as he seeth the patient afflicted, either may lift him up with the sweet promises of God’s mercy through Christ, if he perceive him much afraid of God’s threatenings: or contrawise, if he be not touched with the feeling of his sins, may beat him down with God’s justice: ever more like a skillful Physician, *framing his medicine according as the disease requireth*.”<sup>391</sup>

In a different, though not totally dissimilar vein, ‘La Visitation des Malades’ in the *Liturgia Sacra* states:

L’office d’un vray et fidèle Ministre est non seulement d’enseigner publiquement le peuple, auquel il est ordonné pour Pasteur, mais en tant que faire se peut, d’admonester, exhorter, reprendre, et consoler un chascun en particulier. Or le plus grand besoing qu’a jamais l’homme de la doctrine spirituelle de nostre seigneur, c’est quand il est visité de nostre seigneur en afflictions, soit de maladies, ou autres maux, principalement à l’heure de la mort : car lors il se sent plusfort qu’en toute sa vie, pressé en la conscience, tant du jugement de Dieu , auquel il se voit presentement estre appellé, que des assaux du Diable, le quel fait adonc tous ses effortz, pour abbatre la paovre personne, et la deietter en confusion. Et pourtant, le devoir d’un Ministre est de visiter les malades, et les consoler par la parole du

---

<sup>387</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.54.

<sup>388</sup> *Ibid.*, p.54.

<sup>389</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.108.

<sup>390</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.55.

<sup>391</sup> *Ibid.*, p.55.

Seigneur : leur remonstrant que tout ce qu'ilz souffrent et endurent, vient de la main de Dieu, et de sa bonne providence, lequel n'envoye rien à ses fideles, sinon pour leur bien et salut. »

Here we see, in the prolix style of Poullain, a mix of 'practical' and 'spiritual' which, in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*<sup>392</sup> is separated, between the practical introduction or 'rubric' and the (spiritual) prayer that follows. It is worth mentioning that in *The Book of Common Prayer* there is no practical or explanatory introduction to the rite at all. The minister, and, in the 'Order for the Visitation of the Sicke' he is referred to as the Minister, plunges, so to speak, straight in.

This can be regarded as a distinctive feature of a Reformed liturgy, namely the attempt to explain clearly in practical terms the rationale of each particular rite. No doubt this also exists in the *Book of Common Prayer* but it is often hidden in formality, albeit a dignified and beautiful one.

The prayer which follows the introduction to 'The Visitation of the Sicke' is the longest of all the prayers in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*. It covers no less than five pages. At first sight it also appears strange to see clear sides to the various pages, it being customary in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* to see the margins covered with references to biblical texts. Against this prayer there is not one. Closer examination, however, of the *Forme of the Common Prayers* shows that the Prayers, unlike, for example, the Exhortations, are often set out without supporting marginal biblical references, though there are notable exceptions, one being the prayer before baptism, a prayer of fifteen lines and eighteen marginal biblical references, no doubt because of the theologically sensitive nature of the subject involved.

'A Prayer to be said in visiting of the sicke' covers several themes. The first, which will undoubtedly be offensive to modern ears' is the link made between sin and illness. It occurs almost at the beginning:

so contrariwise, when we have il-behaved our selves in offending thy Majesty, thou hast acustomed admonish us, and call us unto thee by divers and sundry chastisements, through the which it has pleased thy goodness to subdue and tame our fraile flesh: but especially by the grievous plagues of sickness and diseases, using the same, as a meane, to awake and stir up the great dulnesse and negligence that is in us all, and advertising us of our evill life by such infirmities and dangers, especially when as they threaten the very death, which (as assured messengers of the same,) are all to the flesh full of extreme anguish and torments, although they be not withstanding to the spirit of the elect, as medicines both good and wholesome. For by them thou dost move us to returne unto thee for our salvation, and to call upon thee in our afflictions, to have thine help, which art our deare and loving Father.<sup>392</sup>

The second theme is one of supplication based on the love of God shown through the saving death of his Son: "but that thou wouldest vouchsafe to shew him thy mercy for the love of thy deare Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who, having suffered the most shameful, and extreme, death of the Crosse, bare willingly the fault of this poore patient, to the end that thou mightiest acknowledge him as one

---

<sup>392</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.56.



redeemed with his precious blood, and received into the communion of his body, to be participant of eternall felicity in the company of thy blessed Angels.”<sup>393</sup>

The third theme is one of pastoral support, combined with admonition; “It may please thy goodness, O Lord, to assist him in all his anguishes and troubles - - - and that thou fast roote and settle in his heart, the sweet promises which thou hast made unto us, in Christ Jesus thy Sonne our Saviour, to the intent he may remaine constant against all the assaults and tumults, which the enemies of our salvation may raise up to trouble his conscience - - Receive him, Lord, into thy protection: for he hath his recourse and accesse to thee alone, and make him constant and firme in thy Commandements and Promises, and also pardon all his sinnes both secret, and those which are manifest: by the which he hath most grievously provoked thy wrath and severe judgements against him, so as in place of death (the which both he and all we have justly merited) thou wilt grant unto him that blessed life which we also attend and looke for by thy grace and mercy - - -Let him be under thy protection and governance O heavenly Father, and although he be sick, yet canst thou heale him: Hee is cast downe, but thou canst lift him up: he is sore troubled, but thou canst send redresse: he is weake, thou canst send strength - - -To be short, he is, as it were, utterly lost, and as a strayed sheepe: but thou canst call him home to thee againe. Wherefore, O lord, seeing that this poore creature (thine own workmanship) resigneth him wholly into thy hands, receive him into thy mercifull protection.”<sup>394</sup>

Illness in the XVI century, unlike in the XXI, often led to death and this is recognised in the prayer which turns into a supplication for all people: “Also we poore miserable creatures, which are, as it were, in the field to fight till thou withdrawest us from the same - - - knowing that we must appeare before thy judgement seat when it shall please thee so to appoint.”<sup>395</sup>

Finally, it should be noted that the Prayer, ever practical in the style of a Reformed liturgy, remembers the work of those employed in aiding the sick as well as all other sick persons:

It may also please thee, O Father of comfort and consolation, to strengthen with thy grace these which imploy their travel and diligence to the ayding of this sick person, that they faint not by overmuch and continuall labour, but rather to goe heartily and cheerfully forward in doing their indevours towards him: and if thou take him from them, then of thy goodness to comfort them, so as they may patiently beare such departing and praise thy name in all things. Also, O heavenly Father, vouchsafe to have pity on all other sick persons, and such as be by any other ways or means afflicted, and also on those who as yet are ignorant of thy truth, and appertaine nevertheless unto thy Kingdome.<sup>396</sup>

In the final paragraph of the prayer supplication is also made for those that suffer persecution, tormented in prisons “or otherwise troubled by the enemies of thy verity for bearing testimony to the same”<sup>397</sup> the prayer terminating with the words. “Grant these our requests, O our deare Father, for

---

<sup>393</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.57.

<sup>394</sup> *Ibid.*, p.57-59.

<sup>395</sup> *Ibid.*, p.59.

<sup>396</sup> *Ibid.*, p.60. This could be interpreted as giving a universalism to predestination à la Karl Barth.

<sup>397</sup> *Ibid.*, p.60.

the love of thy deare Sonne our Saviour Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee in unity of the Holy Ghost, true God for evermore, so be it.”<sup>398</sup>

Between the Visitation of the Sick and the Order of Burial in both the *Liturgia Sacra* as well as in the *Book of Common Prayer*, there is a brief note on the Administration of Communion to the Sick, that does not occur in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*. The note in the *Liturgia Sacra* is short and unexceptional, though it is interesting to note that the order suggests that it should be administered at the same time as communion is administered in church, no doubt to emphasise that the sacrament was to be seen as a confirmation and strengthening of faith rather than as a miraculous instrument for creating it.

#### 4.5.5 Of Buriall

Following a prayer of five pages, the order for Burial is but five lines! Ever conscious to distance themselves from the traditional church, the Reformers were intent on banishing all thoughts of Purgatory and prayers for the dead from the minds of Reformed Christians. The obvious corollary of this was the reduction of the ceremony of burial to a bare minimum. Or, alternatively, to abolish it altogether. Here, once again, Martin is at pains to stress the independence of the liturgy of the English exiles over and against that of the Genevan church. The Geneva church had eliminated the burial service entirely, while, “Knox et ses collaborateurs conservèrent la présence du pasteur aux enterrements, mais sans cérémonie religieuse, jusqu’au moment, l’enterrement terminé, le pasteur conduisait les fidèles à l’église où il leur adressait une sérieuse exhortation concernant la mort et la résurrection.”<sup>399</sup>

In fact the note ‘Of burial’ in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* suggests that the presence of the Minister was optional: “The corps is reverently brought to the Grave, accompanied with the Congregation, without any further ceremonies: which being buried, the Minister if hee be present, and required, goeth to the Church, if it be not far of, and maketh some comfortable exhortation to the people, touching Death and Resurrection.”<sup>400</sup>

The *Liturgia Sacra*, as on other occasions, appears here to stand closer to the *Book of Common Prayer* than the *Forme of the Common Prayers*: “Quand quelqu’un est mort le Pasteur à son sermon advertit l’Egliase, et a heure copétente tous se rassemblent en la maison du deffunct: et après avoir consolé les vivans, certains hommes - - - prennent la bière et emportent le mort au Cemetiere. Et tantost après le corps suit le Pasteur, conduisant le plus prochain du deffunct, et après eulx toute la compaignie, tant hommes que femmes, en bon ordre et grande modestie et silence.”<sup>401</sup>

The exhortations and prayers that followed took place at the graveside and not in the church after the burial. Thus, in reverse order, the burial came after the prayers, thus putting the practice closer in line with that of the traditional church, following which the congregation departed having given alms for the poor to the deacons “qui sont là à ces fins.”<sup>402</sup>

---

<sup>398</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.60.

<sup>399</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.110.

<sup>400</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.60.

<sup>401</sup> Valérand Poullain, *Liturgia Sacra* pp., 167-169.

<sup>402</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 167-169.

#### 4.5.6 'Music'

No comment on liturgy is complete without a reference to music. And this is as true of the Liturgy of the English exiles in Geneva as of any other. Indeed, as has been mentioned, annexed to the *Forme of the Common Prayers* was not only the catechism of Calvin but a collection of fifty one Psalms set to music. Thirty seven of these had been put to music by Thomas Sternholde, poet and musician at the court of Henry VIII, seven by John Hopkins, pupil of Clément Marot and a further seven translated and "mis en vers par la plume féconde, mais en somme médiocrement poétique, de Whittingham."<sup>403</sup>

Calvin, while undoubtedly at the head of the list of the major Reformers for literary talent, was rather at the other end of the league in terms of music. Yet, the most accomplished musician among the Reformers, Huldrych Zwingli, a cellist, perhaps just because he understood the power of music, banned it from all church services.<sup>404</sup>

Calvin took a different view. During his first stay in Geneva he had proposed that the liturgy should be enriched by the congregational singing of psalms and as pastor at the refugee church in Strasbourg he obtained a collection of a dozen or so psalms translated into French and versified - so-called metrical psalms - by Clément Marot (1496-1544), court poet to Francis I. Calvin provided eight other versifications of his own and published the first collection of metrical psalms in French in 1539. Some of the melodies for these twenty psalms are taken directly from the German-language Strasbourg psalter.

Certain principles of Calvinist church music emerged at the outset. With the exception of the Apostles Creed, the texts are strictly limited to the versification in French of biblical texts, mainly the Psalms of David, the Ten Commandments, the song of Simeon, and, latterly, the Lord's Prayer. Each text is accompanied by a melody to be sung by the whole congregation. Singing was to be in unison.

By the time of his death in 1544, Marot had completed the versification of 52 of the 150 psalms. Theodore Beza versified the remaining texts and by 1562 the Geneva Psalter was complete.

Various musicians provided the melodies for these psalms with 125 tunes supporting 150 psalms.

In the preface to *La Forme des priers et chantz ecclesiastiques* of 1542, Calvin states that few things have a more profound influence on human emotions than the combined force of words and music. It is therefore essential that the words be comprehensible i.e. in the vernacular and not in Latin. Most important the music must be a vehicle for the words, not a barrier to their appreciation - a point taken up by the council of Trent in their strictures on the comprehensibility of words. Thus the psalms should be sung in unison - and here we perhaps touch on the objections of Zwingli to the use of music in church - without harmony or instrumental accompaniment.

The power of combined poetry and music to move the human spirit can be a good or bad thing, it can uplift or lead to immorality. Spiritual music can therefore also serve as a bulwark against the

---

<sup>403</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.111.

<sup>404</sup> Francis Higman, 'Music' ed , Andrew Pettegree, *The Reformation World*, pp.495-499. The text which follows is adapted from this article.

'lascivious madrigals' of the period. The poetry of the Psalms of David, being divinely inspired, represents the highest form of spirituality and therefore has the greatest potential for spiritual uplift. Thus the psalms represent a repertoire of music for not only singing in church but also at 'home and in the fields' and here Calvin is not averse to harmonisation, a trend that later crept into the use of psalms in church.

The metrical psalms of Marot and Beza became a central feature of Calvinist - especially Huguenot - spirituality. Several testimonies exist to the intense emotion of joy experienced by religious refugees arriving in Geneva, when they first heard the free congregational singing of psalms in church. During the French Wars of Religion, the Huguenot armies marched into battle singing psalms. And many Calvinist martyrs died at the stake, singing psalms with their last breath."<sup>405</sup>

The English exiles in Geneva partook of this tradition, singing two psalms in their morning service. Their liturgy may well have been one dominated by prayer, but it was one of prayer and exhortation enhanced by singing. It should not be too difficult for us to imagine the rousing sounds that rang out from the *église* of Ste Marie la neuve<sup>406</sup> on Sunday mornings between 9 and 10 am, as the English exiles rejoiced in the worship of God in their new found city of refuge.

#### ***4.6 Liturgy and Order and the life of the church***

##### ***4.6.1 Liturgy***

Liturgy is the life of the Church and we gain some idea from the *Livre des Anglois* of how this manifested itself in the case of the English exiles. During the existence of the church there were no less than seventeen baptisms commencing with that of the child John Stafford, son of Sir William Stafford, of whom we have already spoken. This baptism was followed by that of Ruthe, daughter of Anthony Gilby, with Thomas Wood acting as godfather and later by the daughter of William Jackson with William Williams acting as godfather. The last baptism listed in the *Livre des Anglois* for 1556 is that of Bethony, daughter of James Yonge, with Anthony Gilby again acting as godfather.

Of these four baptisms, only the last, that of the daughter of the tailor James Yonge, was from parents who had not been members of the church at inception. They had arrived in Geneva, albeit soon afterwards, during the first half of 1556. Thus, where the baptised children were of parents who had arrived in Geneva with Whittingham, or soon after him, the godparents, understandably, were also chosen from this group.

During 1557, there were seven baptisms at the English church, the first being that of John, the son of John Hollingham, who had come to Geneva with the original Frankfurt group, where John Knox acted as godfather. This was followed by the baptism of Sarah, daughter of Thomas Hancock, where Anthony Gilby acted as godfather. Thomas Hancock had arrived with his wife and son in the autumn of 1556, following a two year exile in Rouen - an interesting city from which to come to Geneva as it was one linked to what Garrett distinguishes as political<sup>407</sup> as opposed to religious exiles. Yet

---

<sup>405</sup> Francis Higman, 'Music', ed Andrew Pettegree, *The Reformation World*, p.499.

<sup>406</sup> Now known as the *auditoire*, the church is nestled against the cathedral of St Pierre and is used for worship by the Presbyterian Church of Scotland.

<sup>407</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, pp. 32-33.

Hancock is described by Scarisbrick as a hot gospeller.<sup>408</sup> He subsequently stayed in Geneva throughout the exile. On the 23 May Nathaniell, the son of John Knox, was baptised, with William Whittingham acting as godfather. Nearly three months later on 14 August, John, the son of Francis Withers, was baptised with Christopher Goodman acting as godfather. Francis Withers, a merchant, had arrived in Geneva with his wife and two servants about the same time as Thomas Hancock. Three days later, on 17 August, three baptisms appear to have taken place: firstly of Zacharie, son of William Whittingham with William Williams acting as godfather, secondly of another Zacarie, the son of John Bodley where Augustine Bradebridge acted as godfather. John Bodley, together with his wife, children and servants had arrived in Geneva in May 1557 somewhat later than many of the figures already mentioned and at the same time as Augustine Bradebridge who had originally been at Strasbourg. Finally there was the baptism of Susanne, daughter of John Baron, who has already been mentioned in connection with acquisition of Bourgeois status, where Christopher Goodman acted as godfather.

We see in 1557 the beginning of the breaking up of the old pattern, namely one where a godfather had been chosen because he was linked to the 'parents' group, i.e. the group which arrived in Geneva with Whittingham or, where one of the Ministers of the church: Knox, Gilby or Goodman had been chosen, presumably just because he was the Minister. When John Bodley chose Augustine Bradebridge as godfather, he simply chose another member of the Congregation, albeit one who had arrived in Geneva around the same time as himself. Bodley was a privileged man, even by the standards of the exiles and, therefore, undoubtedly not one to be unnecessarily deferential to existing social arrangements within the church. Indeed he subsequently became a strong influence in the church in his own right.

The year 1558 was effectively the last year in which baptisms occurred at the church; there were seven of them, with the seventh baptism occurring in January 1559. The first baptism in 1558, which occurred in May of that year, at first sight appears somewhat strange for it was of Ruthe, the daughter of Anthony Gilby, where William Whittingham acted as godfather. Gilby had already had a daughter Ruthe baptised in 1556 but the *Livre des Anglois* records the burial of Ruthe, daughter of Anthony Gilby on October 7 1557, so undoubtedly Gilby had his second daughter baptised with the same name as the first. The same month, Naamy daughter of Peter Willyes, described by Garrett as an apothecary and merchant,<sup>409</sup> was baptised, with John Knox acting as godfather. Willyes - interestingly there is no reference to his wife in the *Livre d'Anglois* - arrived in Geneva very shortly after Whittingham and party, which could account for his choice of Knox as godfather. In July, Isaac, the son of John Pullein, a clergyman, who later became Archdeacon of Colchester in Elizabethan England, was baptised with Christopher Goodman acting as godfather. Pullein had been a relatively late comer to Geneva, arriving there just over a year before the birth of his son. The following month Zacaray, son of John Stubbs, a tailor from Coventry, who made the interesting choice of John Bodley as godfather, was baptised. Garrett makes the bizarre assertion of Stubbes "that it is possible that he married abroad, although there is no record of it"<sup>410</sup> yet, in the *Livre des Anglois*, it is clearly mentioned that John Stubbes of Coventrie and Mary Garton of - - were married on December 22 1556.<sup>411</sup> In the same *Livre*

<sup>408</sup> J.J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People*, p.89.

<sup>409</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.337.

<sup>410</sup> *Ibid.*, p.300.

<sup>411</sup> J. Southerden Burn, 'Livre desAnglois', *History of Parish Registers 1862*, Appendix, p.285.

Mary Garton is listed as William Fuller's maide, and becoming a member of the church, along with other members of Fuller's household on 12 July 1556.

In November 1558 Eleezer, the son of John Knox was baptised, with Miles Coverdale, a temporary visitor to Geneva, acting as witness. The rationale of the use of the word witness, as opposed to godfather, is by no means clear though, as we have already suggested, it could have something to do with the new scribe who, for baptismal records, took over in 1558. Martin makes clear that although godfathers were obliged to "reciter les articles de la foi --- mais ne prenait aucun engagement"<sup>412</sup> suggests that witness was indeed as appropriate a term as godfather in the somewhat ambiguous understanding of the status of godparents in the Reformed tradition, of which mention has already been made.

Two baptisms occurred the following month: that of Susannah, daughter of William Whittingham, where Christopher Goodman acted as witness and then of Marie, daughter of Thomas Duwick, a clergyman, where John Bodley acted as witness. It is interesting to note that Thomas Duwick is not listed as a member of the church in the *Livre des Anglois*. Finally, in January 1559, Susannah, daughter of John Daniell, a weaver, was baptised, with John Bodley acting as witness.

If one makes a tally of the godfathers to baptisms at the English church, Christopher Goodman comes up top having acted in the role on four occasions. Following him John Bodley acted as godfather on three occasions, Williams, Knox, Whittingham and Gilby on two, Thomas Wood, Augustine Bradebridge, Miles Coverdale and John Calvin on one. These figures reflect what appears to have been a growing inter-mixing at the church over the years, with John Bodley assuming an increasingly important role. Particularly interesting here is that John Stubbs, an artisan, chose Bodley as a godfather rather than one of the ministers of the church, which, one would have thought, out of deference, he might otherwise have felt obliged to do.

Much importance in the Reformed church in Geneva was given to the choice of names for a child in baptism, with a strong preference for Old Testament names. The name of Claude was regarded as particularly offensive because the shrine of St Claude, with its link to the traditional church, stood close by Geneva. Naphy records that when a father presented his son for baptism with the name Claude, the minister promptly baptised him Abraham, whereupon a riot ensued.<sup>413</sup> This preference for Old Testament names is no doubt reflected in the names chosen for children of the English exiles born in Geneva. But not entirely. The daughter of William Jackson, who is supposed to have arrived in Geneva, together with his wife and family, with Whittingham, had his daughter baptised Jane, a not notably biblical name. Perhaps this is why William Williams, former Master of the Mint in Dublin, who would probably have had a more relaxed view on the subject than Wood, Gilby or Whittingham, was chosen as godfather!

The *Livre des Anglois* also provides details of marriages that took place at the English church during its existence. There were nine of them, the first, in February 1556, being that of Jane Stafford, sister in law of Sir William Stafford, who married the minister of the Italian refugee church in Geneva, to which reference has already been made. The second was between Sir John Burtwick and Jane Bonespoir and the third, later in the year - on 15 November - between William Whittingham and Katheryne

---

<sup>412</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.107- see also pages 83-84.

<sup>413</sup> William Naphy, 'Stations - Geneva II' ed Herman J. Selderhuis, *The Calvin Handbook*, p.50.

Jaquemayne. Reference to these two marriages has also already been made in discussion of the 'inbred nature' of the English community. The last marriage in 1556 - it took place on 22 December - between John Stubbes and Mary Garton has also already been mentioned, in the context of baptisms at the church.

In 1557, there were three further marriages within the English church, the first being between Thomas Spenser and Ales Agar. Spenser, listed by Garrett as a student,<sup>414</sup> had been one of the original exiles at Zurich and arrived in Geneva in the latter part of 1556. Ales Agar, a widow from Colchester arrived in Geneva, together with her three children some six months later. The second was between Thomas Bentham, the heroic minister to the underground church in Marian London, who has already been mentioned - page 36. He had been at Zurich, Basle and Frankfurt, before arriving in Geneva with Mawde Fawson in November 1557, whom he married there a few weeks later. The last marriage listed in the *Livre des Anglois* for 1557, against which there are no specific dates, was between William Cole and Jane Agar. Cole had originally been at Zurich, but then went to Frankfurt. Following the dispute in the church there he was one of the few who, while leaving Frankfurt, did not follow Whittingham to Geneva but rather John Foxe to Basle. However, he subsequently moved to Geneva where he arrived at the same time as Ales Agar and her family (including her daughter Jane) towards the middle of 1557. The marriage must have taken place soon after their arrival.

There are two other marriages that took place at the English church, and both were in the following year - 1558. Both parties have been mentioned before, though in another context. The first was between Richard Amondesham, who was one of the members of the church who acquired *bourgeois* status and Elenor,<sup>415</sup> whose family name is indecipherable in the *Livre*, though it is mentioned that she came from Totnes in Devon. The second was between John Dawes, the hat maker from Tunbridge who married Marie Malet of Dieppe in Normandy - page 57-58.

The most poignant of the entries in the *Livre des Anglois* relates to the deaths that occurred at the church, of which there were eighteen, the first being of James, servant to Sir William Stafford in March 1556, followed two months later by Sir William Stafford himself. Life may be precarious in the XXI century but it was certainly more so in the XVIth. Thus, the last entry in the *Livre des Anglois* is also the saddest. It reads:

'A°Dni 1560: April 12. Susan the daughter of Willm Whittingham'

For, it was Sussanah's father, William Whittingham who would hand the *Livre des Anglois* to the Geneva authorities when he left the city in May 1560. Whittingham's daughter had been baptised as Susannah on 11 December 1558. She died on April 12 1560, less than one year and a half later. Many of the other entries in the *Livre* are equally poignant.

Daniel Hollingham who had arrived in Geneva with his parents as part of the original Whittingham group died in 1556. Jane Stafford, who only one year earlier had married the Italian minister Martinengo, died in February 1557. Anne, the daughter of Anne Locke, whose mother, at the behest

---

<sup>414</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.292.

<sup>415</sup> This could be the Elenor listed as maide to John Bodley in the *Livre des Anglois* who arrived in Geneva as part of the Bodley household in the first part of 1557. For, like her employer, she came from Devon.

of Knox, had come to Geneva and was registered as a member of the church on 8 May 1557 died, according to the *Livre des Anglois*, only a few days later being buried on 12 May. Bethony, daughter of James Yonge died in May 1557; like the daughter of William Whittingham, Bethony had been baptised just over a year earlier. A few weeks later John Hollingham lost his second son, John, who had been baptised at the church only a few months previously. The last burial at the church in 1557 occurred on October 7, when Ruthe, daughter of Anthony Gilby died at the age of nineteen months.

The entries for burials in the *Livre des Anglois* for 1558 records the deaths of adults as well as children, but are no less the sad for the reading. Joice, the wife of William Fuller, died in January 1558. Later in the year, on 16 August, William Gibson, the dyer, was buried. The following month Faythe, daughter of John Pullaine, who had arrived in Geneva with her parents in 1557, was buried. A few weeks later, on September 20, Richard Amondesham, whose marriage had taken place only eight months earlier, was buried. The following month the *Livre* records the death of children at birth and, the following day, the burial of their mother, Marjory Stivens (Sprons). It is interesting to note here that the Stivens were not registered as members of the church. Neither was John Baron, whose daughter Susan was buried a few weeks later. She had been baptised on 17 August 1557, so died at the age of fifteen months.

Finally, if we exclude the death of Susannah Whittingham in 1560, the last burial at the church recorded in the *Livre* is that of Erkewalde Rawlins. Once again we have here a case of someone registered in the *Livre des Habitants* as resident in Geneva, but not listed in the *Livre des Anglois* as a member of the church. Erkewalde Rawlins, a merchant, was buried on 29 April 1559.

The rites of baptism, marriage and burial written for the English exiles at their church in Geneva, were not theoretical documents but ones designed to have a practical application, to cover the situation of the birth, marriage and death of real people, as reflected in the record of the *Livre des Anglois*. These give us an insight, albeit a small one, into the life of the church.

#### **4.6.2 Order and the life of the church**

As with the liturgy, so with the Order of the church (of its ministers, elders and deacons) which was an arrangement designed to have a practical application, namely the government of the church. These arrangements also add to our knowledge of the English congregation in Geneva.

Throughout the life of the church the ministers remained the same. The *Livre des Anglois* records that “the first of Noveb A°1555, when the Church was erected, then was Christopher Goodman and Anthony Gilby appointed to preche the word of God and mynyster the Sacraments, in th’absence of John Knox .”<sup>416</sup> And throughout the life of the church, on December 16 each year – page 71 - Knox and Goodman were re-elected, the last entry in the *Livre* on this topic on 16 December 1558 recording “John Knoxe and Christopher Goodman still to continue the ministers.”<sup>417</sup> This was stability indeed, after the Frankfurt experience, Anthony Gilby filling in for Knox during his absences in Scotland.

---

<sup>416</sup> Southerden Burn, ‘Livre des Anglois’, *History of Parish Registers 1862*, Appendix, p.282.

<sup>417</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix p.283.



There was somewhat less stability, however, in the case of the elected elders<sup>418</sup> and deacons. Whittingham and Williams were the first elected elders of the church, according to the *Livre des Anglois*, and in December 1556 were joined by Gilby and William Fuller. Garrett recounts of Fuller, who had previously worked in the future Queen Elizabeth's household at Hatfield,<sup>419</sup> that he lived in Geneva, where he had arrived in July 1556, in considerable state, with his wife two servants and a maid.<sup>420</sup> At the elections in December 1557, Fuller moved from being an elder to becoming a deacon. At the same elections, Whittingham also ceased to be an elder, he and Fuller being replaced by John Bodley and Thomas Wood. In December 1558, it was Wood's turn to retire, to be replaced by Miles Coverdale, who had come to Geneva to assist in the translation of the Bible.

Martin suggests that the apparent high turnover was designed "afin de donner une place dans les autorités de l'église à des hommes de la valeur de John Bodleigh et de Miles Coverdale." »<sup>421</sup> He might also have drawn attention to the importance of William Fuller who appears to have played an active part in the life of the church and, as the first 'newcomer' among church officers, though of a similar ideology<sup>422</sup> to Whittingham, would undoubtedly have diluted the influence of the original group from Frankfurt.

A not dissimilar pattern to the election of elders can be seen in the election of deacons. At the inception of the church, its officers, almost of necessity, came from the Whittingham group, but as the church expanded from its original membership, so some of its officers were elected from the more recent arrivals. The exception to this pattern was that of William Beauvoir, a merchant from Guernsey, who was established in Geneva before 1555. Beauvoir was on three occasions elected deacon. Of the original Whittingham group, John Staunton, who was one of the original five exiles who signed the confession of faith within the *Liturgia Sacra* when they first arrived in Frankfurt in 1554, served as deacon for two years, after which he appears to have left for Basle. Christopher Seburne, who stayed in Geneva, served for one.

An example of the broadening of the base of the officers of the church - as it applied to deacons - was Francis Withers, a London merchant, who was first elected deacon in December 1556 and was then reelected to the same post in 1557 and 1558. John Pulleyn, as we have seen, served as deacon for one year in 1557. Peter Willis also served as deacon for one year, but in 1558, the same year, as we have seen, that his daughter Naamy was baptised at the church. Interesting also to note is the case of Whittingham, who like Fuller in 1557, had previously been an elder before being elected deacon in 1558. In 1557, Whittingham seems to have taken time off, or been freed by the voters, from serving in any official position in the church.

What are the principal features of the liturgy and order of the church of the English exiles in Geneva? For the liturgy it is undoubtedly one of participation of the congregation. This is a feature of all of the

---

<sup>418</sup> Whereas the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, provided for an annual election of all officers of the church, the *Liturgia Sacra* followed this procedure for deacons but not for elders who were elected for life. This latter provision could be linked to the lack of suitable candidates from among the Glastonbury workers.

<sup>419</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, pp. 77- 80.

<sup>420</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, pp.158 - 159.

<sup>421</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Geneve*, p.98.

<sup>422</sup> Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, pp. 77-80.

rites covered by the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, with the exception of 'The visitation of the sicke' and, even here, the congregation is an important feature of its long accompanying prayer, as already discussed. The other feature of the liturgy is what might be called its practicality. This is something lived by real people and if not clearly stated in the rite itself, the emphasis is there in the opening rubric to the rite, a very good example of this being the advice to the minister in 'The Visitation of the Sicke' to frame his medicine "as the disease requireth"<sup>423</sup>

It is true that, as Danner says, when comparing the liturgy of the England that the exiles in Geneva had left with the liturgy of their own church in Geneva, that "ethics had replaced aesthetics"<sup>424</sup> but the reply of the Godly would surely have been that liturgy was not devised to bring pleasure to man but what was pleasurable to God. The officers of the church came from the privileged - whether defined in a social, intellectual or financial sense. Yet, the democratic element in the election process probably led to a greater social inter-mixing than would have existed elsewhere. Richard Amondesham, described by Garrett, as a Gent, married John Bodley's maid. Thomas Agar, son of Alice Agar, is described by Garrett as an artisan<sup>425</sup> yet his mother married Thomas Spenser, later archdeacon of Chichester in Elizabethan England. No doubt such relationships were caused by the peculiar nature of a refugee church but it is certain that the order of the church - with its democratic element - encouraged rather than discouraged them.

#### 4.6.3 Liturgy and the Theology of the English exiles in Geneva

The liturgy of the English church in Geneva reflected its theology, as represented by a stream of works of doctrine produced by its members. By any standard their literary output was remarkable, Martin listing no less than forty one works produced by the exiles during their sojourn in Geneva. Towering above these, however, was their greatest literary work of all, the translation of the Bible.<sup>426</sup> This was not simply a work of translation but one of theology in its own right with, for some, what came to be regarded as its notorious marginal notes. The aim of the notes, as Alister McGrath explains, was "to make the engagement with Scripture as simple as possible for the reader."<sup>427</sup> And, one might add, to move this understanding in a strongly Protestant direction.<sup>428</sup> However much opposed by some, it was the marginal notes and other aides to understanding - maps and illustrations - that contributed to the enormous success of the Geneva bible.

On this great project several members of the church were involved led by Whittingham, who took the principal part in the translation, aided by Anthony Gilby, a distinguished Hebraist, with additional help from William Cole, William Kethe, John Baron, Thomas Bentham - like Gilby a Hebraist - and, as Martin puts it, "d'une facon intermittente par Goodman, par John Knox et par le vénérable Miles

---

<sup>423</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.55.

<sup>424</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, p.124.

<sup>425</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.69.

<sup>426</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.243. Martin suggests that for the Old Testament the principal sources used were the Hebrew text of Bomberg (1518) and the Latin translations of Pagninus (1528), Munster (1534-6), Leo Judae (1542) and Robert Estienne (1557). For the New Testament the Greek version of Robert Estienne and the Latin version of Théodore de Bèze were used.

<sup>427</sup> Alister McGrath *In the Beginning - The Story of the King James Bible*, p.120.

<sup>428</sup> *Ibid.*, p.126.

Coverdale."<sup>429</sup> McGrath suggests that Thomas Sampson was also involved<sup>430</sup> in the Bible project, but this seems unlikely given that his visits to Geneva were too short for him to have participated in any meaningful way in the project.

Whittingham's first endeavour was the translation of the New Testament into English, though McGrath regards this work as largely derivative, being based primarily on William Tyndale's translation of a generation earlier.<sup>431</sup> It was the supposedly 'non derivative' nature of the translation of the Geneva Bible that, at the time, gave it authority, distinguishing itself from the Great Bible, commissioned by Thomas Cromwell, who had given Miles Coverdale - who had no particular linguistic skills - the task of translation and who had based himself largely on the work of Tyndale. But if the non derivative nature of the translation of the Geneva Bible gave it authority, it was the marginal notes that gave the translation its notoriety, or popularity, according to taste. And this, after all, was a particularly Genevan phenomenon, for just as the *Forme of the Common Prayers* was strewn with biblical textual references in the margin, so was the Geneva translation of the Bible, the marginal notes reflecting a strongly Protestant theological position, as already mentioned.<sup>432</sup>

It was this that made the Geneva Bible offensive to Matthew Parker, Elizabeth 1's first Archbishop of Canterbury. Parker was able to block any effort by the Stationers Company - the guild that controlled the publishing of manuscripts and, later, printed books in England - to print the Geneva Bible.

A similar hostility was shown by Archbishop Whitgift - a convinced Calvinist, but one who was forever concerned to have order in the church - who endeavoured to combat the Geneva Bible with the Bishop's Bible - an officially approved translation of 1558 - when he commanded that only the Bishop's Bible was permitted to be used in the public services of the churches.<sup>433</sup> Only the godly Edmund Grindal, who succeeded Parker - and preceded Whitgift - as Archbishop of Canterbury, supported the Geneva Bible, undermining Parker's monopoly of Bible publications by giving permission to rival publishers to publish Bibles in quarto version.

Given this unhelpful background to any promotion of the Geneva Bible its success appears all the more remarkable. It was the bible of Shakespeare, himself no friend of the Godly. It was also used by the Establishment. As McGrath tells us, "having done all he could to limit the influence of the Geneva Bible, Archbishop Whitgift found himself using the Geneva Bible in his heated controversy with the Puritan writer Thomas Cartwright. The irony of this was lost on neither writer."<sup>434</sup> More remarkable, "the preface to the King James Bible itself chose to use the Geneva translation rather than the new translation that the preface was intended to introduce and commend."<sup>435</sup> The popularity of the Geneva Bible undoubtedly also had something to do with its format with the use of 'Roman' rather than 'Black letter' type as well as through the provision of maps and pictures previously mentioned.

---

<sup>429</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.241.

<sup>430</sup> Alister McGrath, *In the Beginning - The Story of the King James Bible* p.114.

<sup>431</sup> *Ibid.*, p.115.

<sup>432</sup> *Ibid.*, p.126.

<sup>433</sup> *Ibid.*, p.128.

<sup>434</sup> *Ibid.*, p.129.

<sup>435</sup> *Ibid.*, p.99.

Reference has already been made - page 14 - to what was referred to as the exclusivist and inclusivist positions of the exiles. The former only accepted worship that could be proved to be scriptural while the latter would outlaw only what was explicitly contrary to Scripture. It is undoubtedly true that the leaders (Knox and Whittingham) of the founding group at the English church in Geneva - if not their members - were rather of the exclusivist position, which inevitably placed the Bible right at the centre of life, hence the overriding importance of providing a coherent translation.

Dan Danner has also stressed the federal or covenant nature of the theology of the English exiles in Geneva which obviously both reinforced as well as reflected the importance and authority that they gave to the Bible, not least to the Old Testament. The concepts involved in this topic are complex but Diarmaid MacCulloch leads us clearly through what might be called the theological thickets. Illustration of the concepts is best made by reference to events in Elizabethan England that post date those of the English church in Geneva.

The initial conflict in the Elizabethan church was between those who accepted the Elizabethan religious settlement of 1559 and those who wished to push it further in a Protestant direction. The failure or defeat of the latter, towards the end of the century, encouraged the Godly to move away from an expression of their faith in public life to a concentration of its expression in private life. This gave rise to, or rather resulted from, the development of what is known in the 'trade' as experimental, to be contrasted with credal, predestinarianism. Members of the Godly began to ask themselves not only: how do I know that I am saved, or how can I be sure that I am saved, to how can I *show* that I am saved?

The answer to the first and second question, provided by the theologians - particularly William Perkins - was that of living experience, thus giving rise to the concept of experimental predestinarianism. Individuals had experience of their conversion or saving faith, experience of true belief, which was expressed in a doctrine of assurance. They knew that their own faith was of the saving rather than the temporary variety. The idea that there existed a distinction between saving and temporary faith was an idea picked up by Perkins from Calvin. Briefly stated it said that some of those whom God has chosen to reprobate (that is, irrevocably condemn to damnation) are given temporary faith which may stay with them for some time, perhaps even for a lifetime, but it is completely different from the *saving* faith of the elect. Experimental Calvinist piety could thus encourage separation either to find groups of the likeminded within the established Church<sup>436</sup>, or to withdraw completely from the community which seemed to contain so many with no consciousness of election.<sup>437</sup>

Leading churchmen like Archbishop of Canterbury John Whitgift, as MacCulloch explains, "playing their part in a church committed to pastoral care of an entire nation, would not be inclined to develop their acceptance of predestinarian doctrine in an experimental fashion; it would be an unwelcome complication to their task. Queen Elizabeth had committed care of the visible church in England to them; their Calvinism told them that not everyone was part of the elect, yet they were not prepared to limit membership of the visible Church to those who were visibly godly. Hence they were not prepared to put predestination at the centre of their thoughts; their predestinarianism would remain

---

<sup>436</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch *The Later Reformation in England*, p.88 - see also comment of John Guy - footnote to page 7.

<sup>437</sup> *Ibid*, p.88.

'credal', merely accepting predestination as one aspect of the whole range of Christian doctrine. Whitgift was perfectly prepared to accept that there was an invisible church of the elect, but he insisted that this was not and could not be the same as the visible church over which he presided by the Queen's appointment."<sup>438</sup>

What answer would experimental predestinarians give to the question how can I *show* that I am saved? Withdrawal from the community might be one answer but it was not one favoured by what might be called the mainstream Godly. Experimental Calvinism, MacCulloch suggests "unwittingly led those who embraced it back towards a doctrine of works, because it constantly focused the attention<sup>439</sup> on the search for visible proofs of election" or, the expression of a lively faith, in the words of Thomas Cranmer. The expression of a lively faith and its call to good works along the long road towards sanctification was such that experimental predestinarianism and its consequent Puritan manner of godliness was led, as Philip Benedict has shown,<sup>440</sup> to call for standards of good behaviour which far outdistanced those required by any consistory.

One consequence of these questionings MacCulloch further explains, "was a nervous return to the regulations provided supposedly through Moses for the ancient Israelites in the first five books of the Old Testament, trying to sift out from them what could be described as permanent moral law."<sup>441</sup> Ironically, this approach was initially associated with William Tyndale who started out as a follower of Luther; ironic, because it was Luther who, alone among the major Reformers, was completely immune from interests in Mosaic law. However, Danner informs us, Tyndale later abandoned Wittenburg for Zurich as his interest developed in the Old Testament motif of covenant, a contract between God and his people and "from mid-century it was this covenant theme which was increasingly used to provide a systematic answer to the Protestant dilemma about works."<sup>442</sup>

MacCulloch explains that there are many varieties of covenant envisaged in the Old Testament. Some are conditional (God and Adam in the Garden of Eden before the Fall), God makes promises in return for obedience. Some are unconditional (God and Noah after the Flood), God grants blessings without asking a return the most important of all, of course, being the offering of his son Jesus Christ. The Apostle Paul thus drew a contrast between the demands of God's law and the gifts of God's grace: humankind after the Fall was incapable of fulfilling the conditional covenant by works, so God opened the road to salvation through an unconditional covenant of grace. There is reference to this unconditional covenant of grace in one of the prayers in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* in, as the rubric states, a prayer 'used to be said after the sermon.' It reads: "We have obtained by thy goodness a far more excellent covenant which we may alledge, that is, the covenant which thou first madest and established by the Hand of Jesus our Saviour and was also by thy Divine providence written with his Blood, and sealed with his Death and Passion."<sup>443</sup>

Expressions of the covenant theme among the reformers on the continent of Europe first emerge in Zwingli, in the context of his defence of infant baptism - page 80- as he battled with the Anabaptists in

---

<sup>438</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch *The Later Reformation in England*, pp. 88-89.

<sup>439</sup> *Ibid.*, p.89.

<sup>440</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p. 429 and pp. 518-521.

<sup>441</sup> MacCulloch, *Later Reformation in England*, p.90.

<sup>442</sup> *Ibid.*, p.90.

<sup>443</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, pp. 26-7.

Zurich and, as MacCulloch further reminds us, “to guard against accusations of antinomianism.”<sup>444</sup> Bullinger inherited this tradition but Calvin showed little interest in it. For Calvin, the emphasis is on the gifts of God’s grace. In England, the contrast between these two approaches, as MacCulloch informs us, was reflected in the work of Dudley Fenner who, in *Sacra Theologia*, was the first theologian specifically to mention a covenant of works which could be identified with the Adamic and Mosaic covenants which contrasted in a Pauline manner with Abraham’s covenant of grace; the elect were given faith through the covenant of grace, just as Abraham had been given it.<sup>445</sup>

Covenant theology subsequently developed into Federal theology (foedus=covenant) shifting the covenant from one between an individual and God to one between a nation and God. There is no doubt that the development of the concept of a conditional Covenant between man and God to one between a nation and God is reflected in the theology and liturgy of the English exiles in Geneva. It appears right at the outset, in the preface<sup>446</sup> to the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, with the suggestion that the failure to reach a more biblical form of worship during the reign of Edward VI had been the cause of God’s wrath and the consequent current distress of the true church in England. Similarly, the return to the true faith would bring God’s blessing, as expressed in the *Booke of Psalmes* published in Geneva by Rowland Hall in 1559. Dedicated to Queen Elizabeth the book stated that the Queen “must suppress papistry and let the word of God shine forth so that God “will bless you with godly posterity and maintain you in perfect peace and quietness.”<sup>447</sup> God makes promises in return for obedience. This was a noted feature of the writings of Knox, while Goodman’s *How Superior Powers Oght to be Obeyd*, Danner tells us, is filled with the motif of England as God’s chosen nation. “Thus the thrust of the exiles covenant theology was England’s status as an elect nation under God, and that the commonwealth’s faithfulness to God’s covenant with his new Israel was the measure of current events. They could expect blessing and honor for faithfulness but curse and rejection for idolatry.”<sup>448</sup>

How else do we see the theological work of the exiles reflected in their liturgy? The first of Martin’s forty one works of the English exiles in Geneva was not a work of doctrine at all but a translation. It was undertaken by William Whittingham in 1556, a translation into Latin of Nicholas Ridley’s treatise, written from prison, on the sacrament of Holy Communion. This was followed, in the same year, by his translation from the Latin of Théodore de Bèze’s pamphlet on predestination, that had appeared the previous year in Geneva at the time of the dispute on the issue with Castellio and Bolsec. We see here the two audiences to which the exiles addressed themselves. To European scholars they wrote in Latin to show “que les réfugiés tenaient à faire connaître aux chrétiens du continent la personne et les doctrines de leurs compatriotes qu’ils regardaient comme de bons et fidèles réformés. »<sup>449</sup> To their compatriots in England they wrote in English to provide « une des nombreuses preuves de leur désir de faire pénétrer en Angleterre, (and in Scotland) malgré la persécution, les enseignements des Réformateurs genevois, regardés par eux comme leurs maîtres. »<sup>450</sup>

---

<sup>444</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England*, p.91.

<sup>445</sup> Ibid., p.91.

<sup>446</sup> Probably written by Whittingham - see Martin *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève* p.80.

<sup>447</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, p.123 quoting the preface to the *Booke of Psalmes*.

<sup>448</sup> Ibid., p.133.

<sup>449</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.120.

<sup>450</sup> Ibid., p.120.

Danner states that “the common thread which ties together the various Reformed doctrines of the Eucharist is the role of faith in the reception of the supper.”<sup>451</sup> This may well be true, but his suggestion that the Eucharistic theology of the English exiles in Geneva was, albeit with shades of difference, essentially memorialist à la Zwingli, is doubtful. In the exhortation of the minister at the beginning of ‘the Lords Supper’ in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* appear the words: “for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood: then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us: we be one with Christ, and Christ with us”<sup>452</sup> These words are not memorialist. Nicholas Ridley was, of course, not an exile, but a Protestant martyr. But one would think that if Whittingham bothered to translate Ridley’s treatise on the Lord’s Supper into Latin for scholars on the continent of Europe, there must be a presumption that he agreed with it. Ridley believed in a real presence of Christ within the elements of bread and wine, though this presence was spiritual and not physical. This would place his thought, and, presumably, Whittingham’s, closer to Calvin than to Zwingli.

Whatever may have been shades of difference, such was the belief of the exiles in ‘les enseignements des Réformateurs’ that in the same year Anthony Gilby produced, in English, his own treatise on predestination. Martin adds that Whittingham and Gilby “n’avaient pas fait oeuvre inutile”<sup>453</sup> for in 1558 the English church in Geneva was asked by their co-religionists in England to produce a reply to the pamphlet *Careless by Necessitie* produced by an Anabaptist who criticised the doctrine of Predestination. John Knox was selected to reply to the pamphlet, much of his response being written not in Geneva but in Dieppe, Knox’s stopping off point for his shuttles between Geneva and Scotland. Martin says of *An answer to a great number of blasphemous cavillations written by an Anabaptist* that its author, in the preface to his response “s’y élève à une hauteur d’argumentation qui en fait le digne champion d’une grand cause”<sup>454</sup> but that the body of the text itself is turgid, following a scholastic question and answer method, something that Knox probably picked up from his mentor at St Andrews, John Major.<sup>455</sup>

Knox may have been chosen to reply to *Careless by Necessitie* but it was Gilby, among the Genevan exiles, who, in 1556 produced the most notable treatise on predestination and one which had more in common with Beza than it had with Calvin. There were also other exiles at Geneva interested in the subject: James Pilkington, whom Collinson refers to as the “most puritanical of all Elizabethan bishops”<sup>456</sup> had written a treatise on predestination while a student at Cambridge<sup>457</sup> while John Scory

---

<sup>451</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, p.124.

<sup>452</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.46.

<sup>453</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.134.

<sup>454</sup> *Ibid.*, p.143.

<sup>455</sup> *Ibid.*, p.157, John Major, « théologien, historien, philosophe », had been Knox’s teacher at St Andrews. Although Major remained faithful to the traditional church, Martin suggests that Major « est beaucoup plus avancé, beaucoup plus liberal dans le domaine politique - -Major y professe à plusieurs reprises des doctrines qui portèrent plus tard le nom des constitutionnelles » John Major (referred to by Benedict as John Mair) was regent of the Collège de Montaigu in Paris at the time Calvin was a student there. However, Major taught in the faculty of Theology while Calvin was a student in the faculty of Arts. *Christ’s Churches Purely Reformed*, p.82.

<sup>456</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.50. Yet, according to Garrett (*The Marian Exiles*, p.250) “he held himself studiously aloof from the contentions of the exiles” while Grindal extolled his most ‘exact judgement’.

who, like Pilkington, was briefly in Geneva in 1556, had indicated his interest in predestination with his translation of Augustine's writings in 1555.<sup>458</sup>

Observers have often drawn attention to the differing positions, within the *Institutes*, occupied by Calvin's discussion of predestination: sometimes in Book 3, other times not, one time as a subsection of his doctrine of Providence, other times not.<sup>459</sup> The common denominator of all these observations, however, is the understanding, firstly, that for Calvin predestination is but one aspect of Christian doctrine and, secondly, that it is Christological, based on the saving work of Christ.

It is easily forgotten that all the XVI century main stream (or Magisterial) reformers believed in predestination; Luther had, after all, written the *Bondage of the Will* in response to Erasmus's *Freedom of the Will*.<sup>460</sup> The real change came with Beza. As confessional differences hardened, not only against the traditional church, but also against the Lutherans, the Reformed tradition was forced to show what was distinctive about its own beliefs. A hardening of confessional positions also led to an accompanying systematisation of them and the development of what came to be referred to as Calvinistic Scholasticism. This is the strand of Reformed thought that led off into rationalism and deism giving rise to criticism of the Reformed tradition as a whole by people such as John Milbank.<sup>461</sup> This has all to do with Beza and little with Calvin. For Calvin the study of theology was the study of Scripture, for Beza it became a more philosophical activity, what might be called the study of God. For Beza, predestination came at the forefront of his 'Aristotelian' presentation and systematisation of Christian belief. Though distinct from Calvin, this approach undoubtedly has a biblical basis, as reflected in Chapter One of Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians verse 4: 'Accordingly as he has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame in him in love.'

And this particular predestination theme is also a feature of the *Forme of the Common Prayers*. It would certainly be wrong to say that it is dominated by it but it is nevertheless a feature of it. Predestination à la Beza appears in the prayer before the administration of Communion: "that by him alone we have entrance to the Throne of thy grace, that by him alone we are possessed in our spiritual kingdome, to eat and drink at his table, with whom we have conversation presently in Heaven, and by whom our bodies shall be raised up again from the dust, and shall be placed with him in that endlesse joy, which thou, O Father of mercy, have prepared for thine elect before the Foundation of the World was layd."<sup>462</sup>

---

<sup>457</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, p.110. Pilkington, who later became Bishop of Durham, stayed only briefly in Geneva, during the spring of 1556, before retiring to the Cevennes for reasons of health. Before coming to Geneva, Pilkington had been at Zurich. And, following his stay in the Cevennes he enrolled as a student at the University of Basle. He was briefly in Frankfurt before the end of the exile.

<sup>458</sup> *Ibid.*, p.110.

<sup>459</sup> See, for example, John W de Gruchy *John Calvin* Chapter 9 and Alister McGrath *Reformation Thought* Chapter 7.

<sup>460</sup> See particularly Diarmaid MacCulloch *Reformation* pp. 150-2.

<sup>461</sup> Peter McEnhill, 'The state we're in', *Reformed Theology: Identity and Ecumenicity*, eds W.M Alston and M.Welker, Chapter 9.

<sup>462</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.49.



Or again, in the Minister's explanation of the Articles of faith at Baptism: "The one shall heare this joyful voice, Come ye blessed of my Father, possess the Kingdome that is prepared for you, before the beginning of the World."<sup>463</sup>

In contrast, an example of what may be described as Predestination à la Calvin, rather than à la Beza, occurs at the beginning of the long prayer, already discussed in detail, for the 'Visitation of the Sicke':

but especially by the greivous plagues of sickness and diseases, using the same, as a meane, to awake and stir up the great dullnesse and negligence that is in us all, and advertising us of our evill life by such infirmities and dangers especially when as they threaten the very death, which (as assured messengers of the same,) are all to the flesh full of extreme anguish and torments, although they be notwithstanding to the spirit of the elect, as medicines both good and wholesome.<sup>464</sup>

Or again, in the same explanation of the articles of faith by the Minister at Baptism referred to above: "but we call him Father, by virtue of his free adoption, by the which he hath chosen us to life everlasting in Jesus Christ."<sup>465</sup>

Whatever these shades of difference, Danner suggests that, of the exiles in Geneva, it is only Knox who reflected Calvin in predestinarian theology. Be that as it may, Martin suggests that in *An Answer to a Brief Number of Cavillations* Knox "aurait pu la présenter ensuite sous une forme plus brève, plus logiquement établie, et par conséquent plus concluante. La méthode - - n'en est pas moins fatigante pour le lecteur et déconcertante pour l'esprit. »<sup>466</sup>

Fatigante is not a word that one would naturally associate with John Knox; electric might be a better word and certainly one that one would associate with his political tracts, particularly his *First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* published in 1558. Unlike the other writings of the Geneva exiles already mentioned, the resistance tracts of Knox and Goodman have no relation to the liturgy of the English church but their influence in Elizabethan England was such that it is not possible to pass them by without mention.

Knox's *First Blast*, directed against the rule of female monarchs was aimed at Mary Tudor, but was issued with disastrous mis-timing, for Mary Tudor died in 1558 with the result that the full force of Knox's pamphlet was felt by her successor Elizabeth. Knappen is withering in his criticism of Knox's sense of practicalities or lack of them:

When all allowances are made for the extreme provocation to which Knox was subjected, to couple this teaching with an attack on women rulers was to invite disaster. It must be admitted that Knox was most short sighted in not considering the alternatives to the rule of Mary Tudor in England. If the Queen were deposed, who was next in the line of succession? Was Elizabeth also to be passed over on the ground of sex? If Knox had stopped to ask such questions, as any realistic politician should have done, he must have been led to question his

---

<sup>463</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.42 based on Matthew Chapter 25 verse 34.

<sup>464</sup> *Ibid.*, p.56.

<sup>465</sup> *Ibid.*, p.38.

<sup>466</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.152.

interpretation of the Scriptures. Deborah's case would not have seemed such an anomaly, and the future path of the English Puritan cause might have been far smoother.<sup>467</sup>

To what teaching was Knappen referring? It was that of civil disobedience, a teaching associated with Christopher Goodman as expressed in his pamphlet *How Superior Powers Ought to be Obeyed* issued in the same year as Knox's *First Blast*. Both Knox and Goodman advocated civil disobedience when matters reached a crucial stage in the administration of an ungodly tyrant. Inferior magistrates had the first responsibility to undo the wrongdoing of an ungodly ruler but if they failed in this duty, the common people have the right to resist.<sup>468</sup>

Given what is generally regarded as the conservatism of the Lutheran tradition in the area of politics and government, it is interesting to reflect on Knappen's comment that "The *Magdeburg Bekenntnis*, which advocated the eventually triumphant doctrines of the social compact and the right of subjects to resist their rulers, had been in print since 1550."<sup>469</sup> Even more interesting, from our point of view, is the fact that the highest ranking cleric of the English exiles, John Ponet, former bishop of Winchester, later exiled in Strasbourg, had written *A Short Treatise of Politike Power* in 1556 and "composed a reasonable justification of the right of revolution and even tyrannicide."<sup>470</sup>

A.G. Dickens states that Ponet's treatise was the first book by an English reformer embracing the doctrine of tyrannicide adding that "it was written, strangely enough by an anti-Calvinist Anglican."<sup>471</sup> But Ponet's work is more like a political treatise than a biblically based essay, something that one might say of Christopher Goodman's *How superior Powers Ought to be Obeyed*, though the treatise originated in a sermon preached to the congregation of English exiles in the church of Ste Marie la neuve based on the text in Acts: 'we must obey God rather than men.' If this is verse 29 of chapter 5 of the Acts of the Apostles: 'Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men,' it is not immediately clear what a dispute between Jewish Christians and the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem over the interpretation of the Hebrew scriptures, shortly after the death and resurrection of Christ, had to do with civil disobedience or tyrannicide in the sixteenth century. Biblically based as his sermon purports to have been, one wonders whether a godly member of the congregation, say, John Harrydunce, perhaps in company with Thomas Hancock, newly converted? after his stay in 'ungodly Rouen', might not have approached Goodman and asked him why he was not preaching about Christ crucified rather than delivering a lecture on politics? They might further have pointed out to him that he was falling foul of the Church Discipline established for Ministers against "strange and unprofitable fashion in preaching the Scriptures or curiosity in seeking vaine questions"<sup>472</sup> As such 'brotherly admonition' would have been in private, we shall, of course, never know whether or not any such admonition took place. Be that as it may, the fact that Goodman did preach such a sermon provides some evidence of the broad, latitudinarian nature of the church – as mentioned in the Conclusions to this thesis.

---

<sup>467</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.147.

<sup>468</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, p.128.

<sup>469</sup> Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.145.

<sup>470</sup> *Ibid.*, p.146.

<sup>471</sup> A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, p.391. One wonders what Dickens understands by Calvinist - or Anglican - in this context.

<sup>472</sup> *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.11.

Goodman had been Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford between 1548 and 1554. Eclectic, as were many of the English exiles in Geneva, he could no doubt have switched to the politics and government faculty, had one existed in the university at the time. Jane Dawson tells us that Goodman and Knox were the best of friends and that “Goodman was probably the closest male companion Knox ever had,”<sup>473</sup> nevertheless reminding us that Goodman only wrote one resistance tract whilst the evolution of Knox’s thought on resistance can be traced over a long period and through many of his writings - - - when his resistance theories are examined - - - Knox emerges as moving more slowly and tentatively to radical positions.”<sup>474</sup> One senses that Knox wrestled with the demands of preaching the gospel of Christ crucified as well as those of the politics of the day, whereas Goodman simply treated the question as a political exercise. Be that as it may, the tracts of the two men had a disastrous effect in Elizabethan England and did much to undermine the Puritan cause, as will be mentioned later.

#### 4.6.4 *The last days of the English church in Geneva*

Danner is at pains to emphasise the independence of the theology of the English exiles over and against their mentor Calvin, while Martin is keen to emphasise the independence of the liturgy of the English exiles over and against the local Geneva church. Independent they may have been, but the time in which this independence was exercised, was short. The church was founded in November 1555, but the rationale of the English exile, the reign of Mary Tudor, came to an end with her death three years later and the accession of Elizabeth to the throne of England in November 1558.

The *Discourse* records these events as follows:

After the Lord began to show mercy unto England in removing Queen Mary by death it was concluded that foresomuch as there had been jars between them and other churches about the Book of Common Prayer and Ceremonies; it was now expedient and necessary, not only that unfeigned reconciliation should be between them, but also that they might so join together in matters of Religion and Ceremonies, that no Papist, or other enemy, should take hold or advantage, by a farther dissension in their own country; which might arise in time to come, if it were not in time foreseen and prevented.<sup>475</sup>

It would appear that the English church in Geneva, or some of its members, had begun to see the error of their former ways. From a Geneva perspective, a return home of the English exiles from their various centres of refuge on the continent of Europe, necessitated a common front between them in Elizabethan England. It was therefore decided to dispatch William Kethe to the various centres of exile with an olive branch in the form of a letter of reconciliation. Garrett is mistaken to call this a crusade against ceremonies, for the letter is irenic in tone, as the *Discourse* recounts: “And as we, for our parts, freely remit all offences and most entirely embrace you dear Brethren! so we beseech you in

---

<sup>473</sup> Jane E.A. Dawson, ‘Goodman and Knox’ Roger A Mason ed, *John Knox and the British Reformations* p.132. It is nevertheless worth observing that this friendship did not prevent Knox from choosing other godfathers (Whittingham and Coverdale) over Goodman for his two sons baptised at the English church in Geneva.

<sup>474</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 136-7.

<sup>475</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.223.

the Lord that unfeignedly you will do the like on our behalf."<sup>476</sup> But the old battles had not been forgotten. For the *Discourse* records that while the reply to the Geneva initiative from Aarau was entirely positive, that from Frankfurt was notably cautious.

Frankfurt began their reply by regretting the past, pointing out that "there be not here past four left which were then present in 1554-1555; and not one of the learned sort saving Master Beesley."<sup>477</sup> The reply continued: "as for our parts as we have had no contention with you at all afore time, so we purpose not, as we trust that there shall be no cause, to enter into contention with you hereafter"<sup>478</sup> adding that the question of ceremonies was not one to be settled by the exiles themselves but by Parliament. Frankfurt however trusts that "true religion shall be restored; and that we shall not be burdened with unprofitable ceremonies" nevertheless stating "as we purpose to submit to such Orders as shall be established by Authority, being not of themselves wicked; so we would wish you willingly to do the same."<sup>479</sup>

This might have been a big enough rebuke to Geneva, but there was a further sting in the tail to the Frankfurt reply. Their letter continues: "For whereas all the Reformed Churches differ among themselves in divers Ceremonies, and yet agree in the unity of Doctrine; we see no inconvenience if we use some ceremonies diverse from them so that we agree in the chief points of our Religion."<sup>480</sup> The tables had been turned. Geneva no longer had the upper hand. The prospects for a common front on the return of the exiles to England did not look good.

Martin records that: "a peine Kethe fut-il revenue de son ambassade, que la plupart des membres de l'église quittèrent Genève. »<sup>481</sup> Kethe had set off on his mission towards the end of 1558 and thus returned to Geneva during the first quarter of 1559 when the English church there was in the process of being dissolved. The *Livre des Anglois* records the last member admitted to the church in September 1558 and the very last entry in the *Livre*, the burial of Whittingham's daughter Susannah, in April 1560. Soon afterwards Whittingham would hand the *Livre des Anglois* to the city authorities when he left Geneva in May 1560. Whittingham, Gilby, the printer Rowland Hall and William Kethe were the last exiles to leave the city, allowing the completion of the translation of the Bible and, in the case of William Kethe, the production of his metrical version of the Psalms. Thus came to an end the life of the English church in Geneva whose duration had been of less than three and a half years.

What can we learn from this church in the context of the assumption and questions posed at the beginning of this thesis? We stated there that Liturgy and Order may be seen to be the expression of the way in which human beings think of themselves and their relationship with God and each other. Is this assumption true? The Liturgy and Order of the English church in Geneva was certainly what

---

<sup>476</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse* pp. 223-5.

<sup>477</sup> *Ibid.*, p.225.

<sup>478</sup> *Ibid.*, p.225.

<sup>479</sup> *Ibid.*, p.226.

<sup>480</sup> *Ibid.*, p.226. Among the signatories to the letter appears the name of John Grey whom Garrett states is Lord John Grey of Pyrgo. This possibility receives some support from Stanford Lehmberg, in the D.N.B., who states that, after October 1554, Grey "lived obscurely for the remainder of Mary's reign." Cecil named Grey as one of the four noblemen to supervise the alteration of the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1558 along with James Pilkington, who also signed the Frankfurt reply. It thus seems that Frankfurt knew what was being planned and Geneva did not.

<sup>481</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève*, p.258.

its members thought was the correct expression of their relationship to God as it was biblically based, the sole basis, according to them, for the worship of God. Of this liturgy, and the exiles in Geneva, Danner notes its "simplicity, order, intelligibility and fidelity to the scriptures, characteristics which had replaced the impressive mystery and pageantry of medieval worship that they had known in Henrician and Edwardian (?) England. Now they were more participants than spectators and ethics had replaced aesthetics. But above all, it was a restoration of the primitive practice of the apostolic church as they believed it to have been."<sup>482</sup>

To this extent the above assumption is true and it is worthy of note that no arguments over liturgy or order ever appear to have occurred at the English church in Geneva. The contrast with the English church at Frankfurt is stark. Can we also say that the liturgy and order of the church was also an expression of the way individuals think of themselves and each other? The answer to the question again appears to be in the affirmative. The church seems to have been a contented and happy community quite free of strife. Social relations had, as has already been pointed out, a democratic element which may have had something to do with the conditions of exile but was reinforced by the liturgy and order that may equally have given rise to them. The key feature of the liturgy, that one notices over and over again, is expressed in three words: congregation, participation and practicality.

What of the underlying questions posed at the beginning of this study. Were the members of the church all Protestants of what Scarisbrick refers to as the hotter sort? The answer given to this question in this thesis is in the negative. The footnote to page 50 suggests that the English church in Geneva exuded more the atmosphere of a broad church than a conventicle. While, as mentioned on pages 61- 62 - one can legitimately raise a question regarding the quality of sources supporting this assumption, particularly the *Livre des Anglois* and the *Livre des Habitants*, there appear to have been far too many English people registered as living in Geneva, who were not members of the church, yet who were able to use its facilities, more or less as it pleased them, to claim that this was a church of the Godly.

If church members were not all Protestants of the hotter sort, were they collections of people who, out of personal interest, happened to have assembled together outside their own country rather as, put in a twentieth century context, might the members of a local tennis club? Or, perhaps something of both? The answer suggested here is something of both.

Of our second underlying question: was there a natural tendency towards disputation and fraction in the Refugee churches of the XVI century or to one of unity, the English church in Geneva poses both a very interesting situation, as well as a question. For, unlike virtually all refugee churches elsewhere which, at one stage or another, showed signs of disputation and fraction, the English church in Geneva showed one of unity. Why was this? The conventional answer would be that the church members all had work to do. In fact they would not *all* have had work to do, less, perhaps, than 'peaceable Aarau', where a third of the English exile community were weavers.

An alternative answer to this question might be the social mix - the spread of social backgrounds of members of the church - which was one which gave rise to cooperation rather than conflict. There were after all courtiers (Sir William Stafford and William Fuller), business men or merchants (John Bodley and William Beauvoir) workers or artisans (John Harrydunce and John Stubbes) quite apart

---

<sup>482</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, p.124.

from the numerous 'students'. There is undoubtedly some truth in this explanation as there would be to the suggestion that the life of the church was short and, had it continued longer, similar disputes would have surfaced not unlike those in the refugee churches elsewhere.

We should also not forget the social isolation of the English exiles in Geneva, brought about, with one or two exceptions, by their lack of knowledge of French. In Frankfurt the English exiles would have been able to speak Latin to some of their neighbours, but in Geneva the chances of doing so were much reduced for reasons discussed earlier - page 59. Social scientists will wish to pronounce on whether isolation tends to produce solidarity or conflict. What is certain is that it is not without effect one way or the other.

The background to the English church was also undoubtedly supportive, not only with Calvin's consolidation of his position in Geneva after the summer of 1555 but in the absence of harassment from Lutheran ministers which was a feature of many other refugee churches. Yet, we should be wise not to forget what would certainly been the view of the exiles themselves that God had rewarded the English church in Geneva with peace and quietness in recognition of their true worship of him.

It is worth considering the case of John Foxe, whose *Acts and Monuments of the Church* was to come for Protestants a book of importance second only to the Bible, in this context. Foxe had supported Whittingham at Frankfurt, yet did not follow him to Geneva. Instead he went to Basle, where the first edition of his *Acts and Monuments* was published in 1559.<sup>483</sup> Undoubtedly Foxe already had his great literary project in mind and Basle with its university and printing presses certainly had attractions for him that did not exist in Geneva. But Foxe was eirenic in nature and out of step with his time in being a supporter of religious toleration. As Knappen puts it Foxe "was much milder in his Puritanism than Whittingham and Gilby. Throughout the Frankfurt struggle he deprecated the tumult and had, for the most part, essayed the difficult role of a neutral. He was not unwilling, therefore, to keep clear of the partisan activity into which he realised the Geneva group would be plunged."<sup>484</sup> If Foxe really thought this he could not have been more wrong. For, it was not Geneva which was plunged into partisan activity but Basle, as reported by what Collinson refers to as the caustic pen of John Bale. And the dispute at Basle, to which Bale referred, was over the use of the Edwardian Prayer Book, not totally dissimilar to that which had taken place at Frankfurt.<sup>485</sup>

What of our third underlying question: did the English church in Geneva exercise any influence on the course of church history as well as on the history of the country of origin of its members? Here, it certainly had an influence, and on both counts. But, from a Protestant point of view, the influence on the Church of England was a negative one. The stumbling block was Queen Elizabeth herself. Though conventionally pious, reading a portion of the New Testament each day in Greek<sup>486</sup> she was vehemently anti-godly. MacCulloch has characterised her Protestant piety as similar to that of Henry VI's last wife Catherine Parr, with whom Elizabeth was brought up: one of justification by faith alone but with prayer, meditation and contemplation expressed "in markedly visual terms"<sup>487</sup>

---

<sup>483</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.82.

<sup>484</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.134.

<sup>485</sup> Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.73. John Bale had been Bishop of Ossory in Ireland during the reign of Edward VI.

<sup>486</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation, Europe's House Divided 1490-1700*, p.287.

<sup>487</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, p.187.

Elizabeth retained a life long love of church music and a dislike of married clergy while her chapel remained vested throughout most of her reign with a crucifix and candlesticks to the horror of her own clergy. She abhorred sermons. She preferred to pray to God rather than be lectured at by a minister of God. She would have certainly been more at home in another version of the Church of England than her own. She might also have been at home in the post Trent traditional church and almost certainly would have preferred the company of one of its most noted representatives Cardinal Borromeo, bishop of Milan, to that of the godly Edmund Grindal.

Yet she could also appear markedly inconsistent, “exploding in fury at the unfortunate Dean of St Paul’s when in 1561 he presented her with a copy of the new Prayer Book lavishly illustrated like a missal,”<sup>488</sup> while on Christmas day 1558 “she walked out of her chapel service after the officiant, Bishop Ogelthorpe, refused to obey her instructions not to elevate the host.”<sup>489</sup>

But Elizabeth was, after all, the daughter of Anne Boleyn and whatever her own feelings “could hardly do otherwise than reject the authority of Rome, in that to accept, it would have been to grant the illegitimacy of her parents’ marriage and of her claim to the throne.”<sup>490</sup> Benedict has suggested her piety was “more attuned to the scrupulous performance of basic obligations than deeply evangelical.”<sup>491</sup> Unlike her step-brother ‘Josiah’ she was no ‘Deborah’ a reference she heartily detested and indeed, in terms of religion, the contrast between her and her step-brother Edward could hardly have been more marked. But Elizabeth was devoted to her chief advisor William Cecil, who had stood by her as her secretary during the Marian regime. On the Scarisbrick scale of hot gossiper to cold statute protestant, Cecil stood somewhere in the middle but with a slight tendency towards the hotter end. However, caution was the by word in the 1559 Religious Settlement, not only for reasons of foreign policy but because the vast majority of the English nation, apart from small pockets in the south east of England and the big cities,<sup>492</sup> remained attached to the beliefs and practices of the traditional church.

For Elizabeth the religious settlement of 1559 was, as one of her advisors, Sir Christopher Hatton put it “placed upon a square stone to remain constant.”<sup>493</sup> Not even Cecil, or her first archbishop of Canterbury Matthew Parker, had foreseen the degree of hostility that Elizabeth would come to show to further Protestant reform. As Knappen has observed, Elizabeth was “a huge boulder in the path of Puritanism, unavoidable, insurmountable, and immovable.”<sup>494</sup> But it was a boulder in large part placed there by the tracts of Goodman and Knox. William Fuller, one of the more prominent members of the English church in Geneva, tried hard to undo the negative effect of his co-religionists.

---

<sup>488</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England*, p.29.

<sup>489</sup> Susan Doran, *Elizabeth1 and Religion 1558-1603*, p.7. It is ironic to note that the reformed church in Hungary retained the elevation of the host as part of its liturgy, though the practice was under attack from reformers, often under the influence of the Godly in England with whom they had been schooled. See Benedict, *Christ’s Church Purely Reformed* pp.362 and 501.

<sup>490</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ’s Churches Purely Reformed*, p.243.

<sup>491</sup> *Ibid.*, p.243.

<sup>492</sup> Particularly those with access to the sea and with a corresponding exposure to international trade, and ideas.

<sup>493</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, pp. 192-194.

<sup>494</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.168.

Before moving into exile, Fuller had been a member of Elizabeth's household at Hatfield.<sup>495</sup> A member of the Godly, he was convinced he could move Elizabeth in that direction and, on his return to England, endeavoured to have an audience with the young Queen. However, Fuller was informed by Thomas Parry, a former Marian exile in Frankfurt - page 19 - who had now become treasurer of the Queen's household that "the Queen was extremely irritated with the controversial book by Christopher Goodman advocating civil disobedience and denigrating female sovereigns."<sup>496</sup> Parry suggested to Fuller that any information that he could provide of Goodman's whereabouts would ingratiate him to the Queen and put him "in good stead for a visit."<sup>497</sup> Fuller thus became potentially mixed up with the dirty world of politics, although it so happened that he knew nothing of Goodman's whereabouts and, according to Danner, in spite of a strong affection for Knox, had never had any sympathy for his or Goodman's political ideology. It seems that the delicate ground of politics was clearly not to Fuller's liking for he made no further efforts to have an audience with the Queen, disheartened that she had not even acknowledged the books that he had sent her. However, the Queen must have had some fond memories of Fuller from her earlier life at Hatfield, for later in her reign, in 1579, she had an audience with him on two occasions. However what Danner describes as "a heavy dosage of Deuteronomic retributive justice doused with apocalyptic fervour"<sup>498</sup> did nothing to favour the former courtier to the Queen and she saw him no more.

These latter events took place in 1579. Twenty years earlier, Pettegree reminds us that it was on 15<sup>th</sup> January 1559, the date of Elizabeth's coronation, that Calvin sent her a copy of his Isaiah commentary, together with a letter dedicating his work to her.<sup>499</sup> Another person experienced disillusionment, for the Geneva reformer, Pettegree informs us, "was due a rude awakening."<sup>500</sup> Calvin was made aware of the disastrous results of the publication of Knox's book *First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* that had led to a house to house search and three consequent arrests. The resistance tracts of Goodman and Knox had made them *persona non grata* in England, while Whittingham, who had written an introduction to Goodman's pamphlet, only narrowly escaped a similar fate because of the support of powerful Puritan patrons. "For a brief but fatal moment Geneva was indelibly associated in the mind of the Queen with political subversion as well as religious prescription."<sup>501</sup> Fuller's attempt to prove to her that Calvin and Geneva were not co-terminous with Knox and Goodman's political ideas came to nought.

According to the *Livre des Anglois* the last member to be received into the English church in Geneva was David Linsey (Lindsay), later leader of the Kirk of Scotland.<sup>502</sup> How was it that the *Forme of the Common Prayers* would, after a tortuous path, ultimately become *The Book of Common Order of the Scottish Kirk* while in England Protestant reformation would become ossified in the 1559 religious settlement? No doubt much was due to the Queen herself, and to Goodman and Knox. But others among the English exiles were also their own worst enemies. They had an uncanny knack of irritating those around them; not only the Frankfurt magistrates or their fellow exiles but also Protestant

<sup>495</sup> Dan Danner, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism*, p.77.

<sup>496</sup> *Ibid.*, p.78.

<sup>497</sup> *Ibid.*, p.78.

<sup>498</sup> *Ibid.*, p.79.

<sup>499</sup> Andrew Pettegree 'The Marian Exiles and the Elizabethan Settlement' *Marian Protestantism*, p.143.

<sup>500</sup> *Ibid.*, p.144.

<sup>501</sup> *Ibid.*, p.149.

<sup>502</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.221.



sympathisers at home where Cecil appears to have cut Geneva out of discussion on a future Prayer Book.<sup>503</sup> And they irritated the continental Reformers as well. One such exile was Thomas Sampson who could be seen as a very good example of Whittingham's portrait of the exile, which, for some, became "a pleasant Progress or recreation."<sup>504</sup> In a letter to Beza, Bullinger described Sampson as "of an exceedingly restless disposition. While he resided amongst us at Zurich, and after he returned to England, he never ceased to be troublesome to master Peter Martyr of blessed memory, who often used to complain to me, that Sampson never wrote a letter without filling it with grievances: the man is never satisfied; he has always some doubt or other to busy himself with."<sup>505</sup> This is a comment on one exile; but, from micro to macro, we also have a similar comment on the Prayer Book opponents as a whole. Nicolas des Gallars, minister of the French church in London, writing of the former English exiles to Calvin in July 1560, had this to say:

"Ceux qui ont été chez nous ne gardent aucune mesure ; malgré cela ils veulent à tout prix obtenir mon appui et mon assentiment. Sans doute, je condamne les restes de la superstition qu'on trouve encore en ce pays. Mais lorsque la pureté de la doctrine est assurée, je ne pense pas qu'on doive s'exposer à un schisme à cause de ces pauvres restes de papisme.»<sup>506</sup>

Four hundred years later a similar sentiment was expressed by Billy Graham when he said that "he was 'sick and fed up' with such controversies and just wanted to get on with preaching the gospel."<sup>507</sup> In 1956 the issue was fundamentalism; in 1560 the issue was ceremonies. Some observers would say that not much had changed in the meantime.

On a more optimistic note Geneva certainly had an effect both on Scottish church history and on the Scottish nation, the glories of which need not be repeated here. While Garrett's description of the movement of English men and women to the continent of Europe from the England of Mary Tudor as a planned migration rather than a flight is certainly controversial, the link that she sees between these exiles and the events of the next century in England is surely a plausible one. Equally, while Collinson is no doubt right to refer to Christina Garret's "creative and somewhat anachronistic imagination"<sup>508</sup> the path that she sees leading from some of the Marian exiles, to the emigration to New England in the following century is, no doubt, a valid one.

To have stamped the character of Scotland and, albeit in a very small way, helped stamp the character of the United States of America, is no mean achievement for the congregation that worshipped at Ste Marie la neuve in Geneva between 1555 and 1559.

---

<sup>503</sup> See footnote to page 111.

<sup>504</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, p.86.

<sup>505</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, pp.279-280.

<sup>506</sup> Charles Martin, *Les Protestants Anglais Réfugiés à Genève*, p.268.

<sup>507</sup> Alister McGrath, *Christianity's Dangerous Idea*, p 395.

<sup>508</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.67.

## Chapter 5: Some comparisons with other Refugee Churches

In this chapter we look briefly at other Refugee churches and endeavour to establish, from what we know of their lives, to what extent the 'Geneva experience' was exceptional. Was the life of the English exiles in Geneva so different that it would be impossible to make any generalisation about Refugee churches as a whole or did their experience confirm some or, indeed, many points we have drawn out of the 'Geneva experience'?

We start with an examination of the Stranger churches in London. They have what may be called two lives in the context of this study: one during the reign of Edward VIth, and the other during the reign of his step-sister Elizabeth I. In the following section it is their life under Edward VIth that is our concern.

### 5.1 *The Stranger Churches in London*

The London Stranger churches occupy what might be called a quasi iconic status in XVI century Reformed church history for reasons that are not immediately apparent. On closer examination, however, it appears that there are three factors involved.

Firstly, the churches are the first example of an officially sponsored church yet one with an order and liturgy quite independent of the church of the authorities who were sponsoring it. This bizarre situation had not been achieved without conflict and, indeed, was one of considerable irritation to the Bishop of London Nicholas Ridley.<sup>509</sup> As Pettegree says:

A powerful faction within the hierarchy of the new English Church remained resolutely opposed to the concession. By the time of the official foundation of the foreign churches in 1550 the strangers' cause had in fact become bound up with far more fundamental issues, concerning not only their own privileges, but also the whole nature of the Protestant Reformation in England. Specifically, the events surrounding the foundation of the stranger churches in 1550 can be seen as part of a concerted effort to effect a substantial revision of the 1549 Prayer Book, and introduce into England a radical Reformed polity on the Swiss model.<sup>510</sup>

Pettegree notes that the events leading up to the establishment of the stranger churches ran virtually in tandem with John Hooper's battles - and initial victory - with the Privy council over his refusal to be consecrated as bishop of Gloucester in the prescribed vestments. The supporters of Hooper were the supporters of the establishment of the stranger churches and vice-versa. These churches were thus emeshed in the world of English politics from the start.

Secondly, and linked to the first factor, the churches represented a striking example of what may be called the 'Prague Spring' of Edwardian England when, at least in the years up to 1551, a remarkable diversity of opinion was tolerated. As MacCulloch says: "Part of the popular excitement of the Edwardian Reformations was the variety of independent thought which they generated."<sup>511</sup>

---

<sup>509</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.76.

<sup>510</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, p.25.

<sup>511</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, p.140.

This has undoubtedly attracted the interest of historians for, though not officially a period of religious toleration, it was certainly, at least initially, one of liberation. Ironically, the stranger churches themselves later became a tool to control this liberation. For, with the growth of ever weirder beliefs in Edwardian London, which were seen to be closely connected with the immigrant community, both the English authorities and the leaders of the stranger churches themselves realised that they had a common interest in rooting out heresy. The most prominent example of this 'cooperation' was that of the Dutch surgeon George van Parris who denied the Trinity "acknowledging only God the Father as true God."<sup>512</sup> He was, effectively, handed over to the English authorities by the stranger church. After examination by a heresy commission headed by Cranmer, with Coverdale acting as interpreter for the accused who spoke no English,<sup>513</sup> he was condemned and subsequently burnt.

The third factor involved is undoubtedly the personage of the man at the head of the stranger churches John à Lasco, described by Benedict as the "most aristocratic of reformers" yet one who "helped draft an exceptionally democratic church order."<sup>514</sup> He was also someone not totally devoid of the talents of self publicity.

John à Lasco had been born to a family of the lesser nobility in Poland in 1499. The family had been propelled upwards by John à Lasco's uncle, of the same name, who became a trusted secretary to King Sigismund and, ultimately, chancellor of Poland and archbishop of Gniezno. Clearly a glittering future career attended his nephew the young John, who was ordained at the age of twenty-two, before setting off on a European tour that took in educational stints in Bologna, Padua and Paris. On his student travels à Lasco passed through Zurich and met Zwingli. He lived for several months in Basel in 1524-5 in the house of Erasmus and also attended Oecolampadius's lectures on theology.<sup>515</sup> John à Lasco was clearly possessed of considerable charm, described by Erasmus "as a true pearl - and so unassuming and free from arrogance, although he is one day called to fill one of the highest offices in his native land."<sup>516</sup> MacCulloch, however, puts a rather different interpretation on this reminding us that "Erasmus was susceptible to youthful male charm and scholarly talent, but more particularly he appreciated Laski's lavish kindness in buying the elder scholar's library in reversion - the equivalent of providing him with a pension fund."<sup>517</sup>

But, as the Laski family had been propelled upwards, so they were subsequently propelled downwards. For, in 1528 they made a fateful choice in supporting John Zápolyai's claim to the vacant Hungarian throne, following upon the Turkish victory at Mohacs. The Polish king supported the rival claim of Ferdinand of Habsburg who subsequently won control of most of the country. The bishopric promised John à Lasco in Hungary slipped from his grasp. Although à Lasco had been appointed Archdeacon of Warsaw in 1535, the family eventually lost favour in Poland as well.

Further attempts to secure a bishopric came to naught.<sup>518</sup> "As his prospects for higher ecclesiastical office dimmed, à Lasco entered into correspondence with Melancthon, remembered fondly the

---

<sup>512</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, p.65.

<sup>513</sup> *Ibid.*, p.65.

<sup>514</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.72.

<sup>515</sup> *Ibid.*, p.69.

<sup>516</sup> Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities*, p.47.

<sup>517</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation, Europe's House Divided 1490-1700*, p.254.

<sup>518</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.69.

pleasures of pious, learned conversation in evangelical circles to the west and at last embarked on several journeys in that direction.”<sup>519</sup> His marriage in 1540 declared his rupture with the traditional church and the same year “he fled to East Friesland known as a safe haven for dissidents of various stripes.”<sup>520</sup> In 1543 he was made superintendent of its territorial church. As Benedict says, “he thus gained in East Friesland the Protestant equivalent of the episcopal office he had been unable to obtain back home.”<sup>521</sup>

At a time when the ‘Protestant’ churches of ‘Germany’ were being squeezed into a Lutheran mold, certain geographical areas stood apart. In the introductory chapter to this study reference was made to the peculiar position of East Friesland and its capital Emden, part of the empire, yet isolated from it by a barrier of marshes. In 1540 its ruler Count Enno II died, leaving his widow, Anna Von Oldenburg with three young sons. A resourceful and cultured woman, Countess Anna brushed aside opposition to her assumption of regency power on behalf of her children, planning to build them a secure and well-governed inheritance in East Friesland that might form the basis of greater things for the dynasty. In politics she sought out alliances with rulers who, like herself, wanted to keep out of religious or diplomatic entanglements. In religious policy she likewise sought to avoid alignment with either Lutherans or Catholics.<sup>522</sup> She thus threw in her lot with à Lasco and named him superintendent of the territorial church.

The new superintendent went about his new job with vigour. He convinced his patron to order the removal of all altars and images from the territory’s churches. Shortly thereafter, he was able to put in place a discipline managed by ministers and lay elders with powers to exclude individuals from communion for misbehaviour and false belief. He also put in place a ministerial *Coetus*, a weekly meeting of ministers whose purpose was to discuss issues of doctrine, review and censure one another’s behaviour and examine candidates for the ministry. Michael Springer<sup>523</sup> has made much of the *Coetus* as a child of à Lasco but its origins lay not with him but with Zwingli in Zurich, even though it could be said that it was à Lasco who gave the *Coetus* practical reality.<sup>524</sup> À Lasco also prepared a catechism for the church as well as a confession of faith and encouraged Countess Anna to introduce laws requiring attendance at church on Sunday, the punishment of blasphemy, excessive feasting and usury.

The superintendent had needed to go about his new task with vigour for, even in East Friesland the regent was forced to accept a mitigated form of the Augsburg interim, the result of which was à Lasco’s departure from the territory and his emigration to London.

Edward VI acceded to the throne of England in January 1547. But it was only in July 1550 that the King issued a letter of privilege creating the Strangers’ Church and appointing à Lasco as its superintendent. Before this time French and Dutch congregations had been worshipping separately but, in contrast, the royal charter established a corporate framework that united both congregations

---

<sup>519</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ’s Churches Purely Reformed*, p.69.

<sup>520</sup> *Ibid.*, p.69.

<sup>521</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 69-70.

<sup>522</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation, Europe’s House Divided*, p.254.

<sup>523</sup> Michael S. Springer, *Restoring Christ’s Church*, pp. 4 and 65. Confusingly referred to as a weekly meeting on p. 4 and a monthly meeting on p. 65.

<sup>524</sup> Benedict, *Christ’s Churches Purely Reformed*, p.31.

into a single ecclesiastical body.<sup>525</sup> The churches, who answered directly to the King, also received from him the building of Austin Friars for worship. The original idea had been for Austin Friars to accommodate all the strangers but when it became apparent that the former priory could not accommodate both the French and Dutch communities,<sup>526</sup> arrangements were put in place for the French community to rent the former hospital of St Anthony on Threadneedle Street. St Anthony's was in serious need of repair and, as Austin Friars had been handed over to the strangers as a free gift fully repaired, it was agreed that the stranger community as a whole would share the rent of St Anthony's as well as the cost of its repair. Thus, in the event, while there may have been a corporate framework that united the two congregations they effectively came to work as two separate churches with separate consistories and, at least at the outset, liturgies. The royal charter, it should be remembered, allowed the churches to follow their own practices "provided they did not contradict the English doctrine."<sup>527</sup>

The stranger churches may soon have been up and running - the Dutch church had appointed four elders by October 1550 - but within a few months their liberties were again under attack when bishops opposed to the idea of an officially sponsored church with a liturgy independent of the Church of England convinced the King's council to instruct the strangers to follow 'English' practices for baptism and communion. À Lasco responded by defending the strangers' liturgy. But, it was only in 1552, following the publication of a series of lectures in which he defended the strangers' Eucharistic rite, that the sacramental liberty of the strangers was restored to them. They were then left undisturbed, but this would not be for long. For Edward VI died in 1553 and before the end of that year his successor and step-sister Mary Tudor - a staunch supporter of the traditional church - had arranged for the stranger churches to be closed down.

The world of London in the early 1550's was not the same as that of Geneva in the same period. Furthermore, one might also say that the world of the London stranger churches was a 'world away' from that of the English church in Geneva. The case of George van Parris - page 118 - is a case in point. In Geneva there is no record of a member of the English church being brought before its own consistory for censure and subsequent excommunication, let alone before that of the local authorities. The background in which the churches worked was also different. London had long been the home of foreign merchants and workmen, and while "many of these foreign residents of an earlier generation would give the foreign churches sturdy support in their first difficult years,"<sup>528</sup> the majority of the foreigners in London would never become members of the stranger churches. Pettegree has estimated the number of foreigners in London in 1547 at between five and six thousand or between five and eight percent of the city's total population.<sup>529</sup> This figure clearly increased sharply during the reign of Edward VI, at the end of which our commentator suggests that there were ten thousand foreigners in London or ten per cent of a total city population of around 100,000. Of these numbers Pettegree

---

<sup>525</sup> Michael Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church, John à Lasco and the Forma ac Ratio* p.44 -footnote. Poullain suggested that the King's charter had established a church for the Dutch, French, and Italian refugees. In fact, Italian refugees eventually formed their own, albeit very small, church.

<sup>526</sup> The vast majority of refugees who came to England during the reign of Edward VI were Protestants fleeing persecution in the Netherlands. The Dutch came predominantly from Flanders and Brabant. The French speakers - the Walloons - from the adjoining Southern Lower Countries.

<sup>527</sup> Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church*, p.45.

<sup>528</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, p.9.

<sup>529</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

comments “on this reckoning the members of French and Dutch churches would have made up less than half the total foreign population of the capital.”<sup>530</sup>

How then would one sum up these differences between ‘London and Geneva’? They were largely those of magnitude. In the first place the immigrant community in pre Reformation London was far more important in both absolute and relative terms than that in Geneva. Secondly, this community could never be seen as co-terminous with the church in spite of attempts to tie the acquisition of denizen<sup>531</sup> status to membership of the churches.<sup>532</sup> Nevertheless, such measures which were designed as a means of control, came to give the stranger churches the characteristic of the ‘tennis club’ model, referred to at the beginning of this study, rather than that of a compact group of the Godly. This tendency was reinforced with the reestablishment of the churches in Elizabethan England when the two churches came to be seen as the centre of life of the immigrant communities, irrespective of whether or not the immigrants concerned were members of the church. Whatever questions have been raised in this study about the assumption that the English church in Geneva was one of the Godly, Geneva never conformed to the ‘tennis club model’ in the way that came to be characteristic of the stranger churches in London.

The two churches are generally associated with à Lasco’s publication *Forma ac ratio*,<sup>533</sup> the purpose of which was to defend their rites from attack as well as to give wider audience to a liturgy and order which, in the eyes of à Lasco, was proper for a reformed church. In fact, although à Lasco began writing the *Forma ac ratio* while in London in the early 1550’s, he had not completed the work at the time the churches were dissolved in 1553. The final parts of the work were only completed in Emden and, subsequently, in Frankfurt where it received publication in 1555. It is thus not possible to know to what extent the liturgy of the stranger churches in London actually followed that of the *Forma ac ratio* or whether *Forma ac Ratio* grew out of liturgies adopted by the stranger churches from sources elsewhere. Springer’s comment: “Over the next three years, he (à Lasco) worked to unite the refugees under a single doctrine and common set of liturgical rites”<sup>534</sup> suggests that this was not how the churches started out. The Dutch had, after all, been worshipping in a private house in London<sup>535</sup> during the early years of Edward’s reign while a group of French refugees began meeting for worship in Canterbury in the summer of 1548. The stranger churches in London only came into existence in 1550.

The Glastonbury project - page 6 - may have pre-dated all of them and it is certain that the French community would, at inception, have been following Poullain’s *Liturgia Sacra* for their liturgy. Poullain’s *L’Ordre des Prieres et Ministere Ecclesiastique, avec la Forme de Penitence Pub. & Certaines*

---

<sup>530</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, p.78.

<sup>531</sup> Something for which one had to pay, in return for which one received a right of residence on a semi-permanent basis. Described by Pettegree as “a sort of quasi-naturalization that conferred significant economic and legal advantages” ‘The Stranger Community’ *Marian Protestantism*, p.45.

<sup>532</sup> Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities*, p.43.

<sup>533</sup> *Forma ac ratio tota Ecclesiastici Ministerii, in peregrinorum, potissimum vero Germanorum Ecclesia* (Frankfurt, 1555.) or, as translated into English, *Full Form and Manner of the Ecclesiastical Ministry*.

<sup>534</sup> Michael Springer, *Restoring Christ’s Church*, p.41.

<sup>535</sup> *Ibid.*, p.43. It appears that the Dutch congregation meeting in London from the end of 1548 resulted from à Lasco’s own efforts. It may be assumed that any liturgy and order of the church, meeting in a private house, was influenced by him.

*Prieres de L'Eglise de Londres, et la Confession de Foy de l'Eglise de Glastonbury en Somerset* published in 1552 is identical to the *Liturgia Sacra*.<sup>536</sup>

It is not the purpose here to present a detailed analysis of *Forma ac Ratio*, although it is undoubtedly worthy of such, being generally regarded as a seminal document in its own right. Rather our objective is to see in what ways à Lasco's order and liturgy differed from that of the English church in Geneva and how it influenced the life of the refugee churches elsewhere. What is fairly certain is that though there may have been differences in liturgy between the two stranger churches, at least at inception, the order was more common to both of them.

What was distinctive, among Protestant reformers, of à Lasco's views on church order? Undoubtedly one factor was the institution of superintendent "a type of reformed bishop who was chosen from among the preachers to oversee the clergy and congregation."<sup>537</sup> Among their specific tasks envisaged by à Lasco were the supervision of congregations and their leaders, to ordain and oversee the other ministers, maintain unanimous opinion and purity of doctrine, advise on matters of discipline and defend the congregations against detractors. Superintendents were also expected to continue to preach, in addition to these other duties.<sup>538</sup>

À Lasco thought that the role of superintendent had scriptural authority, Calvin did not. And indeed, while the superintendent came to have a place in the Lutheran church and, briefly, in the Reformed church in Scotland, it did not become a feature of the 'mainstream'<sup>539</sup> churches of the Reformed tradition. One can not entirely escape the impression, in the context of Benedict's words - page 119 - that à Lasco was influenced by his own background when justifying the place of superintendent in a reformed church.

The position of Preachers, Elders and Deacons in *Forma ac Ratio* does not call for particular comment. However, à Lasco, unlike Calvin, who distinguished between doctors who taught and pastors who preached, fused the two roles into that of preacher. He also, unlike Calvin or, indeed, the English church in Geneva, gave deacons a liturgical role as well as that of poor relief functions. They were for instance "to assist the preachers and elders during the Lord's supper by helping the participants to the table and refilling the wine glasses."<sup>540</sup> It should be remembered that similar arrangements were provided for in Poullain's *Liturgia Sacra* - footnote page 87 - as well as in the Eglise Protestante de France.<sup>541</sup>

The position of superintendent was one factor that made the *Forma ac Ratio* distinctive when compared to other Reformed orders. The second and most important factor, however, was the role given to the congregation in the election of ministers.<sup>542</sup> Springer suggests that à Lasco's "insistence

---

<sup>536</sup> Albeit with the omission of the last page.

<sup>537</sup> Michael Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church*, p.62.

<sup>538</sup> *Ibid.*, p.62.

<sup>539</sup> In the reformed churches of Eastern Europe the position was maintained. See *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, pp.263 and 276.

<sup>540</sup> Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church*, p.69.

<sup>541</sup> Raymond A.Mentzer, 'The piety of Townspeople and City Folk' in *Reformation Christianity*, ed Peter Matheson pp. 32-35.

<sup>542</sup> The term minister appears to cover all officers of the church in Springer's analysis.

on the congregation's involvement was uncommon among Protestant communities and is a distinguishing feature of his London order."<sup>543</sup>

The election process moved along the following lines. The vacant post should first be made known to the congregation. A week before the vote the congregation would be assembled for a sermon about the duties of the office to be filled and the qualifications sought in suitable candidates. Church members could then nominate persons for the vacant post during the following seven days by giving names to the preachers or elders. All ministers would then meet to select a replacement, à Lasco stating that the ministers "must consider who had received the most nominations from the congregation"<sup>544</sup> The ministers would then examine, publicly, the 'elected' candidate before presenting him to the church for their approval. At this point the congregation was given one week to register any objections which would be investigated by the ministers. Once all disagreement had been resolved the new minister<sup>545</sup> would be ordained in front of the entire church subject, in the case of superintendents and preachers, to the approval of the King (Edward VI) beforehand.

Although we have suggested that there was a common order for the two stranger churches, it may be wondered, as in the case of liturgy, whether the two churches actually lived by the details of the order of *Forma ac Ratio*. Both the superintendent and the initial ministers or preachers (two for each church) had, after all, been appointed by Edward VI rather than through formal elections. Be that as it may, what one can undoubtedly say, and with some certainty, is that à Lasco's order had a greater effect on refugee churches elsewhere than it did on the church for which he wrote it.

Springer has set out the Order for worship services from the *Forma ac Ratio* as below and it is interesting to make comparisons between this and that of both the *Liturgia Sacra* and the *Forme of the Common Prayers*.

#### Sunday & Holy Days

Opening Prayer  
 Singing of Psalms  
 Sermon (sixty minutes)  
 Large Catechism (thirty minutes-pm)  
 Announcements  
 Public Prayers  
 Ten Commandments (am)  
  
 Admonition of Sins  
 Prayer for Confession of Sins  
 Remission and Absolution of sins  
 Confession of faith (*am*)  
 Prayer for the Church

#### Tuesdays and Thursdays

Opening Prayer  
 Singing of Psalms  
 Sermon (sixty minutes)  
  
 Announcements  
 Public Prayers  
  
 Prophecy\*  
 Admonition of Sins  
 Prayer for Confession of Sins  
 Remission and Absolution of Sins  
  
 Prayer for the Church

<sup>543</sup> Michael Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church*, p.71.

<sup>544</sup> *Ibid.*, p.70.

<sup>545</sup> See footnote 542 above. The new minister - Springer's words - should presumably read the new preacher. However all officials (ministers) of the church were subject to the same election process – see *Restoring Christ's Church* p.70.



Lord's Prayer	Lord's Prayer
Baptisms (if any)	
Lord's Supper (if scheduled)	
Marriages (if any)	
Singing of Psalms	Singing of Psalms
Dismissal	Dismissal
Recommendation of the Poor	Recommendation of the Poor
Collection of alms	Collection of alms
Benediction	Benediction

*am* = morning only

\* French congregation on Tuesday

*pm* = afternoon only

Dutch congregation on Thursday

Readers will undoubtedly notice similarities between the foregoing and order of Morning Prayer in the *Liturgia Sacra* and the *Forme of the Common Prayers* - page 65. However, there are important differences, the major one, of course, being the incorporation of the various rites of the church (burial and visitation of the sick excepted) into one document. This undoubtedly emphasises the corporate nature of each particular rite and the importance of congregational participation in each one of them, a point that was particularly stressed by à Lasco.

A key objective of participation of the congregation was their instruction and education. This is particularly true of baptism. As in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* a baptism should remind the congregation of their own baptism, thus strengthening them in their own faith. But à Lasco puts even greater emphasis on this point because "he viewed baptism as another valuable tool to strengthen doctrinal consensus and to protect against religious radicals."<sup>546</sup> This is a theme that occurs again and again in *Forma ac Ratio* - in the weekly Prophecy, in the importance given to catechetical instruction, indeed in the commentary regarding every rite of the church - namely the overriding importance of instruction of the congregation in pure doctrine, given the threat to the stranger churches from the various heterodox views circulating in London at the time. As à Lasco says, regarding baptism: "we shall not allow any foreigner to offer their children for baptism in our churches if they have not sworn publicly their faith, in front of us, and in addition they must agree to follow the ecclesiastical discipline."<sup>547</sup>

The other ecclesiastical rites in *Forma ac Ratio* call for no particular comment though certain features of them are worth mentioning. Springer makes much of the importance placed by à Lasco on sitting for communion (as was done at the English church in Geneva) following apostolic tradition, the latter being something that à Lasco emphasises throughout *Forma ac Ratio*.<sup>548</sup> Preparation for communion,

<sup>546</sup> Michael Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church*, p.84.

<sup>547</sup> *Ibid.*, p.84. This does not appear to have been the case of the English church in Geneva where the *Livre des Anglois* records the baptism and burial of the daughter of John Baron who is nowhere registered as a member of the church - see page 53.

<sup>548</sup> À Lasco argued that 'his' procedure for selecting clergy was modelled on the Ancient Church. "Calvin agreed, but argued that during the time of St Cyprian (d 258 AD), the laity's role had changed

which was celebrated monthly, was particularly rigorous. Ministers should make an announcement fifteen days before the ceremony so that members could prepare themselves. "All who wished to partake in the Eucharist had to go before the ministers (preachers?) and elders during the following two weeks to make a public confession of faith, agree to observe the discipline and testify that they were not involved in any arguments or controversies."<sup>549</sup> A particularly strenuous examination awaited new members of the church.

There is a note on public fasting and prayers, which is to be distinguished from that in the *Forme of the Common Prayers* by the detail that it gives for the rite. The tone is otherwise very similar.

For marriage, the rite would always be part of the morning service. However, in the *Forma ac Ratio* it is clear - page 124 - that the marriage should also take place on Sunday. In the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, on the other hand, although it is stipulated that the service should take place in church, there is no mention that it should take place on Sunday. An interesting addition of à Lasco to the marriage service is his stipulation that the minister (preacher)" should condemn celibacy in front of the congregation, since there are more biblical passages that praise marriage than promote virginity and celibacy."<sup>550</sup>

Visitation of the sick, which, like burial, is not mentioned in the order for worship services shown on page 123-4, is similar to treatments of this rite that we have discussed elsewhere. There are, however, two interesting features of à Lasco's liturgy here. Firstly, there is the statement that "because the illness had been sent as a punishment, the preacher or elder should encourage the parishioner to reconcile with anyone that they had offended."<sup>551</sup> Secondly, the order provides for congregational involvement: "ministers should name the afflicted and the cause of their suffering during the church's public prayers and, following their recovery, they should present the member to the assembled congregation so that all could join in a prayer of thanks."<sup>552</sup>

Perhaps because à Lasco was more concerned about the potential corruption that might come upon the stranger churches from Anabaptist influence than he was about the influence of the traditional church, the rite of burial in *Forma ac Ratio* allows for more ceremony than that in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*. In the first place a service was held in church and it took place *before* the burial. Where any burial service had occurred at the English church in Geneva it had occurred *after* the burial. At the expense of labouring the point, à Lasco once again saw the occasion as one to be used for doctrinal instruction of the congregation.

For à Lasco, discipline constituted the third mark of the church, a view shared by neither Luther nor Calvin but shared by the English exile church in Geneva. Once again the details of the discipline should not contain us because the great part of it will be familiar to us from elsewhere. What,

---

merely to approving new ministers through their consent. The Geneva reformer also explained that in the fourth century, the council of Laodicea had made a wise decision when they took away this privilege from the entire congregation and bestowed it on the other ministers because it had become too difficult to obtain unanimous consent among the laity. Lasco rejected the council's judgement, preferring the earlier model of the Ancient Church." *Restoring Christ's Church*, p.73.

<sup>549</sup> Michael Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church*, p.87.

<sup>550</sup> *Ibid.*, p.91.

<sup>551</sup> *Ibid.*, p.92.

<sup>552</sup> *Ibid.*, p.92.

however, was distinctive about à Lasco's discipline? Almost certainly it was the involvement of the congregation in the disciplinary process from an early stage. Springer reports of the Polish reformer: "if the Kirchenrat (Consistory) finds an offender to be guilty, but the member refuses to acknowledge his error and seek reconciliation, then the matter should be presented to the entire congregation in the form of a public censure. During Sunday worship services, the ministers were to recount to the assembled members the sin that had been committed and the subsequent admonitions that were made."

À Lasco notes that this should be done without revealing the identity of the offender.<sup>553</sup> The preachers then should lead a public prayer encouraging the transgressor to seek reconciliation after which they set a new deadline for the accused member to repent.<sup>554</sup>

Should the offender show repentance he, or she would make a public confession of their sins to the whole church and pledge to follow the discipline of the church. The public rite would then end with the preachers and elders giving their hand to the penitent member embracing them, signalling reconciliation with the church. Benedict recalls that when Jehane Saloe confessed her adultery before the French church of London in 1560, many of the church broke into tears at her evident regret for her behaviour, accepting her back into the communion of the faithful.<sup>555</sup>

Should, on the other hand, the offender prove obstinate a date should be set for excommunication. À Lasco notes that a date should be announced by at least eight days in advance so that those who disagreed with the action could report their complaints to the ministry. "If no objections are made, the silence of the church is held for their silent consent and for their approval of the forthcoming excommunication"<sup>556</sup> Thus, like the reconciliation ceremony, the practice was to be held in front of the entire congregation.

The educational, didactic role played by the ministers in explaining doctrine, and the offence caused by breaching teaching and doctrine, is seen throughout.

À Lasco held that an unrepentant member was not to be cut off from the church by the ministers and elders, but rather by the unanimous consent of the whole church."<sup>557</sup> Springer says that "this distinctive emphasis on lay power over excommunication is a distinguishing feature of his (à Lasco's) London ordinance."<sup>558</sup> This may well be so but, for supporters of Presbyterianism, it was to hold future hostages to fortune by opening the door to congregationalism, as we shall see in the subsequent and concluding section to this study.

How does one sum up à Lasco's achievements? They were undoubtedly those of a church organizer where his strength of character, self confidence, pro-active nature, were all put to good effect. But he was not to everyone's taste, not least to that of Calvin. Cranmer, in spite of his forgiving nature, must

---

<sup>553</sup> Though it appears that this was not the case when the offence concerned false doctrine. *Restoring Christ's Church*, pp.99 and 103.

<sup>554</sup> Michael Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church*, p.100.

<sup>555</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.466.

<sup>556</sup> Springer, *Restoring Christ's Church*, p.101.

<sup>557</sup> *Ibid.*, p.102.

<sup>558</sup> *Ibid.*, p.103. But congregational participation in the process of excommunication was also a feature of the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, p.63.

also have found à Lasco's indelicate intervention in the affairs of the Church of England somewhat irritating; particularly after the hospitality the English primate had offered the Polish nobleman at Lambeth. À Lasco's social position undoubtedly encouraged him to punch above his weight. He can not be considered an intellectual luminary: "his theological opponents did not have much regard for his skills as a theologian and he himself never published his longest work of doctrinal exposition, the *Summary of the Doctrine of the Church of East Frisia* (1544) after Bullinger and Melanchthon, to whom he sent copies, pointed out flaws in it."<sup>559</sup> A Lasco's heritage could thus be regarded as confusing, at least this is the impression one gains from some of the commentators. Pettegree, for example, describes à Lasco as "the distinguished Polish theologian"<sup>560</sup> and as an 'original thinker' but 'not always clear headed,' the last two references occurring on the same page!<sup>561</sup>

But, confusing or not, à Lasco's greatest legacy must be regarded as, quite simply, having been party to the existence of the stranger churches. For Pettegree is undoubtedly right when he says:

To their embattled co-religionists in France and the Netherlands the churches in exile provided a vital source of support and encouragement ; it is conceivable that the Reformed community in the Netherlands would not have survived the effective persecution of the decades preceding the war of independence against Spain without the support of the exile communities, and certainly the liturgical models developed in the exile churches had a formative and enduring influence on the doctrine and practice of the emerging Dutch Reformed Church.<sup>562</sup>

The difference in influence of the English church in Geneva on the Church of England and that of the stranger churches in London on the churches under the cross in the Netherlands could not have been more stark. It is in this that lies the iconic status accorded to the stranger churches in London referred to at the beginning of this section.

## 5.2 *The English church at Emden*

With the English church at Emden we return to the world of the refugee churches as understood as small rather than large. For, while it has been estimated that around 4000 people were affected when the two stranger churches in London were closed down, the English church in Emden would not come to count for much more than 100. Admittedly this figure is based on registered citizens and as some members of the church might have wished neither to pay the fees nor to take the oath necessary to obtain citizen rights, the congregation could have been larger, but no where near the size of the stranger churches in London.<sup>563</sup>

Mention was made of Emden in the introductory chapter to this study and later, on page 12, it was stated that, while no record has been found of the liturgy of the English church there, its order appeared to follow that of à Lasco and the stranger churches in London. Subsequently reference was

---

<sup>559</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.70.

<sup>560</sup> Andrew Pettegree, 'The Stranger Community', *Marian Protestantism*, p.42.

<sup>561</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, p.73.

<sup>562</sup> Andrew Pettegree, 'The London Exile community and the Second Sacramentarian Controversy, 1553-1560', *Marian Protestantism*, p.55.

<sup>563</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix 2, pp. 170-171.

made to the background to à Lasco's appointment as superintendent of the church in East Friesland - page 119 - and his movement to London in 1550.

It appears that, in the meantime, the Regent in East Friesland, Anna von Oldenburg, had been able to preserve her compromise version of a Reformed church within the context of the Augsburg Interim, for when à Lasco returned to the territory at the end of 1553 East Friesland's Reformed church was still in operation. It would undoubtedly have its standing further reinforced, at least temporarily,<sup>564</sup> less than two years later when the Peace of Augsburg enshrined the principle of *cuius religio, eius religio*.

The local Reformed church may well still have been in operation when à Lasco returned to Emden but his journey to get there from London had been fraught with difficulty. Following the closure of the stranger churches, efforts were immediately made to get the most prominent and most vulnerable members of the foreign congregations out of the country. Two Danish ships lying in the Thames were hurriedly chartered to facilitate this initial exodus. But the two vessels were only able to accommodate 175 people, at less than five percent a very small number of the total congregation. Undoubtedly many more would have made their way back to the continent of Europe under their own resources while some would have stayed in London. For the proclamation of 1554, which ordered all foreign residents to leave the country within 14 days, excluded those with denizen status. This would have covered many of the better off members of the stranger churches, some of whom may well have seen no reason to leave London. It is interesting to note that, from among these people there were those who rejoined the stranger churches when they were reestablished during the reign of Elizabeth 1, even at the cost of making a confession of guilt for attending mass during the reign of Queen Mary before the whole congregation. Others, however, did not rejoin. Be that as it may, it can reasonably be assumed that those who returned to the continent of Europe were among the more zealous members of the stranger churches.

Zealous they needed to be for the hardships that awaited the two ships that set sail from Gravesend on 17 September 1553 were staggering. The two small ships were first separated from each other by a storm in the North Sea that carried them towards the coast of Norway. Only at the end of October were they united at Elsinore in Denmark whence the main body of exiles found their way to Copenhagen. À Lasco, together with the distinguished elder of the Dutch church, Jan Utenhove, and one of their ministers Marten Micron left the main group and went on to Kolding where the Danish King was holding court. The outcome of the exiles request to restore their community on Danish soil was that they could remain, but only on condition that they conformed to the local rites. Unwilling to accept these terms à Lasco and his company left Kolding and made their way via Holstein and Bremen to Emden where they found fellow exiles from London who had gone directly to Emden 'under their own steam.'

The much larger group of exiles that had gone to Copenhagen faced the greatest hardship of all. Forced to split into three groups the first group made its way across the Baltic and put in at Warnermunde but neither there nor at nearby Rostock did they receive a favourable reception. They then went on to Wismar where they joined a second group of exiles who had received a more

---

<sup>564</sup> The Regent's sons did not agree with their mother on religion. One son was a supporter of the Reformed church, another son was a Lutheran – see Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.209.

sympathetic reception from the local authorities. But disputes between the exiles and local anabaptists led the local authorities to repent of their earlier generosity and the exiles were ordered out of the town. In the last week of February 1554 they reached Lubeck where the third group from Copenhagen was now located. They were not there for long, for, following a dispute with the local Lutheran ministers, they were ordered out of the city. On the first of March 1554 they moved on to Hamburg where they met the greatest opposition of all.

Throughout their troubled journey the exiles had met with the uniform hostility of Lutheran ministers. Where the civil authorities had been more welcoming, it was the Lutheran clerics who pushed them into a more uncompromising position. Confessional differences between Lutheran and Reformed had been hardening in previous years and news of the troubles met by the London exiles were to harden them even further.

Since Luther's death in 1546, Lutheranism had come to be divided between self-styled genuine Lutherans (Gnesio-Lutherans) and the followers of Philip Melancton (Philippists) who were referred to by their opponents as crypto Calvinists. The major division between the two groups centered on the interpretation of The Lord's Supper. Among the strongholds of the Gnesio-Lutherans were the cities of Northern Germany, not least Hamburg, presided over by Joachim Westphal, pastor of St Katharine's and subsequently superintendent of the Hamburg church.

A two day disputation between Westphal and the former minister of the Dutch (stranger) church in London, Marten Micron, ended in what had now become a routine of bitterness and denunciation. As a result the exiles were ordered out of Hamburg soon afterwards. The weary travellers then, at last, made their way to Emden.<sup>565</sup>

The church that these exiles joined was not, of course, the English church but the Reformed church of East Friesland. The Dutch community appears to have functioned, at least initially, as a 'sub section' of the 'state' Reformed church but can be assumed to have become subsumed by it within a relatively short period of time. There was also a Reformed church in Emden for French speakers, but it was very small.

The English exiles from the land of Mary Tudor would have made their own way to Emden<sup>566</sup> and there formed the nucleus of a church for English speakers. This church is justly known for its printing and publication activities but it is not our purpose here to give a detailed history of the English church in Emden, but rather to focus on one event at the church which is of particular interest in the context of this study. As has been earlier mentioned, the church adopted an order largely influenced by the ideas of à Lasco. For the Polish reformer, as well as his ideas on church order, would almost certainly have been known to some of the English exiles from the time that he spent in London.

How was the English church organised? There were two ministers at the church, John Scory, a former Bishop of Rochester and, subsequently, Chichester and Thomas Young who later became Archbishop of York in Elizabethan England. These two ministers were assisted by six elders and nine deacons.

---

<sup>565</sup> Andrew Pettegree, 'The London Exile Community,' *Marian Protestantism*, pp.58-62.

<sup>566</sup> With some exceptions the most notable of which was David Whitehead, who, prior to the death of Edward VI, had been nominated to the bishopric of Rochester. Whitehead left England in the company of à Lasco in September 1553 but did not stay in Emden. He moved more or less straight away to Frankfurt where he arrived in October 1553.

There were also two school masters. The congregation met three times a week in a house specially set aside for the purpose: on Sunday for their main service and for prayers on Wednesday and Friday. Very much in the tradition of à Lasco it is generally thought that there was also a discipline and one with congregational participation.

But, as Pettegree states “ this did not insulate either<sup>567</sup> community from dissension among its members, indeed probably rather the reverse, since a system of participatory discipline encouraged expectations of a high standard of personal conduct - not least on the part of the ministers and elders - which they often found it difficult to live up to.” From this stemmed the problem brought about by one member of the congregation, John Dowley.

The background to the issue raised by Dowley was one common to the sixteenth century, that of plague. Put bluntly the question asked was: should the Christian save his, or her, own life, metaphorically and literally, before that of others? This question had already posed itself to the Reformed Church in Geneva. Should Calvin, for example, spend his time writing another version of his *Institutes* or visiting the sick? For Calvin the Genevan authorities had answered the question for him, decreeing that his life was too precious to be put at risk by visiting plague victims. They specifically forbade him from doing so.<sup>568</sup> Clearly the council in Geneva had warmed to their reformer since his initial visit to the city in the late 1530's!

John Dowley was a relative newcomer at the English church in Emden. According to the list of 'English and Scottish Newcomers Enrolled as Citizens of Emden, 1554-1558'<sup>569</sup> he was only enrolled in the city in June 1558. Pettegree states that “in 1558 the church was riven by a serious dispute”<sup>570</sup> so it would appear that the dispute took place not so long after Dowley's arrival in the city. In his own submission to the French and Dutch churches appear the words “a deacon of the church, as he told me”<sup>571</sup> which might suggest that Dowley was not even aware of the officers of his own church!

Nothing is more irritating, for most human communities, than to receive criticism from relative newcomers. Yet, throughout the dispute, Dowley appears to have received the support of the congregation as well as, latterly, the French and Dutch churches in Emden to whom he later presented his 'Submission.'

The specific issue raised by Dowley was the decision of the ministers and elders of the church to abandon the normal place of worship as a result of a local outbreak of plague. As Dowley put it “I and a few others were offended that we would abandon our usual place for prayers and assemblies to God in this manner because of a visitation from God.”<sup>572</sup> Dowley records that he met with his pastor alone to express his misgivings, subsequently suggesting to him that he (the Pastor) spoke to the congregation. It was from this moment that the temperature of the debate rose sharply. It was not, after all, considered proper for a member of the congregation to make a suggestion to the pastor but

---

<sup>567</sup> The other exile community referred to was in Wesel. Andrew Pettegree *Marian Protestantism* p.20.

<sup>568</sup> William Naphy, *Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation*, pp. 68-69 and 90.

<sup>569</sup> Andrew Pettegree, 'The English Church at Emden', *Marian Protestantism*, p.20.

<sup>570</sup> *Ibid.*, p.20.

<sup>571</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix Three, p.174.

<sup>572</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix Three, p.172. Such an interpretation of an outbreak of plague will be staple fare for those who have read the prayers within the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, the liturgy and order of the English church in Geneva.

rather for the pastor to make a suggestion, or admonition, to a member of the congregation. But Dowley was a persistent and dogged man and not one to be faced down by a former Bishop of Chichester or a future Archbishop of York. He subsequently asked the pastor - Scory or Young - whether they felt obliged to visit the sick if they knew that they were plague victims? Another member of the congregation then asked whether the normal mid week services would continue to be held? The answer of the pastor to the first question was equivocal while to the second question the answer was clearly in the negative.

When Dowley and other members of the congregation decided, upon their own initiative, to visit the sick, open conflict broke out. Insults, accusations and slanders were exchanged - in the style of the disputes at Frankfurt - though the latter were rather from the pastors and elders than from Dowley and his sympathisers. Messrs Scory and Young certainly did not distinguish themselves.

Some quotations from Dowley's Submission to the Dutch and French churches give a flavour of the underlying issues that were to emerge:

'Therefore I began to speak to the church but not them'

'The church readily agreed but the pastors and elders were reluctant'

'You have no right to order or command a brother this way without the consent of the church'

'Either the elders judge or no one does'

'There can be no decision unless it is made by the elders of the church'

'I gave this document to a deacon of the church as a testimony that I wished to commit my case wholeheartedly to the entire church'

'I asked whether the pastor and elders would indicate clearly and plainly if they intended to submit the controversy to the whole church or not'

Getting nowhere with his own church Dowley sought the mediation of the local Dutch and French churches, hence his submission to them from which we have quoted. The officials of the English church refused to appear before the Dutch consistory arguing, by letter, that the issue was a purely internal matter. The Dutch consistory took a different view, entering into their minutes a judgement that essentially endorsed Dowley's position.<sup>573</sup> There the matter rested, for within a few months the English church appears to have been dissolved when most of its members left Emden and returned to England.

Clearly Dowley was not only persistent but articulate. His submission to the Dutch and French churches was also not without a touch of humour - something rare in such documents - as when he described a reply of Young as long and boring which managed to say nothing.<sup>574</sup> But what is most surprising in the submission is that there is no reference to a discipline. Yet Pettegree suggests that discipline was central to life of the church.<sup>575</sup> Was there indeed a discipline? Discipline or no, Dowley remarks that letters against him were written "after the custom of an English judicial enquiry."<sup>576</sup> No slouch in these matters himself, Dowley put his finger on a fundamental point of jurisprudence when

---

<sup>573</sup> Andrew Pettegree, 'The English Church at Emden', *Marian Protestantism*, p.22.

<sup>574</sup> *Ibid.*, Appendix Three. p.177.

<sup>575</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

<sup>576</sup> *Ibid.*, p.175.



he said that he understood that “one party of a dispute was not supposed to act as a judge to the entire dispute.”<sup>577</sup>

The pastor and elders held that all such disputes were to be dealt with by them and that congregational involvement was limited to removing them, as necessary, at the time of elections for officials of the church. Was there any interim power given to the congregation? There certainly was - in principle. In the disciplines that we have seen at Frankfurt, in Poullain’s *Liturgia Sacra* and in the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, there was a common denominator in the discipline as it applied to ministers. And that was, in the words of what came to be called ‘the Old Discipline’ at Frankfurt, that “the same Order and Form is to be used for the reformation of offences and crimes in Ministers and Elders, which is described for other Offenders ; and to be done towards them rather with more severity.”<sup>578</sup>

In practice, as we saw in the case of discipline for officials in the English church in Geneva - page 74 - the instances of discipline covered are those of personal behaviour, rather than what might be described as corporate behaviour or, more bluntly, the possibility that the whole government of the church might go wrong. It is in this that lies the ‘origins’ of Congregationalism. These origins might not have been associated with John Dowley and the English church at Emden but they were reflected, with a vengeance, in the English church at Frankfurt, to which we now turn.

### 5.3 *The English Church at Frankfurt 1555-1558*

Given the quietness associated with the English church in Geneva and the turbulence associated with the English church at Frankfurt it is at first sight surprising to see the respectability that the Frankfurt church acquired in Elizabethan England – footnote page 111. For, having been racked by troubles in 1555, further disputes broke out at the church in 1557. These disputes are particularly interesting to us not only because they could be said to portray the ‘origins’ of Congregationalism but because they also illustrate the fact that, in a refugee church there is no necessary relationship between church liturgy and church order.

Collinson’s suggestion - page 33 - that the secession of Knox and his colleagues had not brought peace but a sword to the Frankfurt church bears some truth to the initial period following Whittingham’s departure. With Cox having left Frankfurt to return to Strasbourg, there was no dominant character to fill the office of Pastor.<sup>579</sup> Once more the choice fell on Whitehead who, Knappen suggests, “showed himself quite unsuited to the pastoral office.”<sup>580</sup> When an effort was made to organise a school, he resigned his position rather than give the divinity lecture and forsook the Pastoral office as well. “Great contention there was about the matter in the Congregation.”<sup>581</sup> It appears from the *Discourse* that in new elections Robert Horne, a former Dean of Durham, was elected Pastor, but that in the

<sup>577</sup> Andrew Pettegree, ‘The English Church at Emden’, *Marian Protestantism*, p.177.

<sup>578</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort*, pp.148-9.

<sup>579</sup> As the role is described in the ‘Old Discipline’ of the church - *Brief Discourse*, p.148.

<sup>580</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.154.

<sup>581</sup> [Thomas Cole], It is widely assumed that Thomas Cole, of Whittingham’s company but who remained in Frankfurt, continued the *Discourse*, part two of which is called *The History of that Stir and Strife which was in the English Church at Frankfort from the 13<sup>th</sup> day of January , Anno Domini 1557*. For the purpose of this study we will continue to refer to this ‘part two’ as the *Brief Discourse*, p.94.

interim, John Makebray - who had served as the very first minister at the church - held the post until Horne's arrival.

For almost a year we hear of no commotion in the church of the White Ladies, but in January 1557 a new dispute arose. In times chronological the events at Frankfurt preceded those we have recounted at Emden but for readers of this study the problems that John Dowley met at Emden in his dispute with the ministers and elders of the English church there act as a good re-run of the problems at the English church in Frankfurt during 1557.

This particular dispute evidently began in the most sociable of settings, over dinner. Sociable as it may have started out, some sharp exchanges evidently took place between the Pastor, Horne and a member of the congregation, Thomas Ashley. But by the end of the dinner it seemed that things had been patched up, for the *Discourse* records "but yet they so departed, by the industry and labour of some certain persons, that they drank wine one to another; and all that strife and contention was thought to be wholly taken away." Not so. Three days later Ashley was sent for by the elders and asked to explain himself. So began "*The History of that Stir and Strife which was in the English Church at Frankfurt, from the 13<sup>th</sup> day of January, Anno Domini 1557.*"<sup>582</sup>

What is most surprising to the reader is that in the forty two pages devoted to the affair in the *Discourse* it is only after having worked through nineteen of them that he or she is informed as to what the dispute is about. The first nineteen pages appear in many ways a 're-run' of Emden. They are all about the source of authority in the church and related issues. Were the pastor and elders a party against Ashley or not?<sup>583</sup> If they were a party to the dispute they could not be its judge<sup>584</sup> etc, etc. Proceedings eventually took on what could be described as a *Comedia del Arte*, with the pastor Horne rushing in and out of meetings at the church (when he condescended to attend them) sometimes sitting in the pastor's chair, then leaving it to sit with the congregation, then returning to the chair. Papers were stuck upon the pulpit.<sup>585</sup> "At the church the minority made stormy exits, and, on one occasion, an equally stormy entrance, properly timed by a signal from spies."<sup>586</sup> The local magistrates became involved and arbiters - other English exiles based elsewhere - were brought in with a view to bringing peace to the church.

As at Emden there was no provision in the regulations of the church for dealing with such a situation. What was this situation? It was essentially about money. Knappen records that most of the members of the Frankfurt church were living below or near the poverty line. At first sight this seems surprising as the congregation in Frankfurt was made up of predominantly privileged people - page 55 - in contrast to the one at the English church in Geneva. But privileged people do not always have money, or at least access to it which was a particular problem of the sixteenth century English exile. They may also not have possessed a work ethic - despite their Protestant affiliations - for Knappen records that

---

<sup>582</sup> [Thomas Cole] *A Brief Discourse*, p.99.

<sup>583</sup> *Ibid.*, p.100.

<sup>584</sup> *Ibid.*, p.107.

<sup>585</sup> *Ibid.*, p.115.

<sup>586</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.156, quoting the *Discourse*, p.134.

some of the congregation who had been clergymen at home scorned to work as printers or serving men.<sup>587</sup> Working men, in contrast, work, as we have seen in the case of the English exiles in Geneva.

The particular problem of the church at Frankfurt was that among the deacons - who would normally be assuming the role of administrators of poor relief - were some who were recipients of alms that they were themselves supposed to be distributing. This was clearly an unsatisfactory situation. It was therefore decided that the job should be taken on by the wealthy merchant Richard Chambers. Chambers had originally been at Zurich - pages 13 and 14 - but had later moved to Frankfurt where he remained after the departure of the Whittingham group. He became an elder of the church but, by January 1557, was effectively doubling up as Deacon - at least in one of their roles - as well. This could be regarded as 'unconstitutional' but was, quite obviously, a situation brought about by circumstances. Given the efforts that the Marian government in London was making to obstruct the exiles from use of their assets in England, it was understandable that there came to appear a non transparent, clandestine aspect to Chambers's activities. Raising funds in England - from where most of them came - had to be undertaken in the utmost secrecy.

This was not how things were seen by the majority of the Frankfurt congregation who complained about the distribution of alms and how much various people were receiving. Indeed, it was the non-transparent nature of Chambers's activities that gave rise to the dispute at dinner in January 1557 and the subsequent conflict in the Frankfurt church. The 'congregationalists' were in the majority, those opposing Horne and the elders described variously as 'thirty and three, two and thirty, thirty three persons'.<sup>588</sup>

The unsolvability of the conflict resided in the fact that, as in Emden, there was no 'legal' provision for dealing with it, unless there was the utmost good will shown on all sides. This, unfortunately, was notably absent. Horne frequently used the term 'ordinarily called' meaning that he would abide by the regulations of the church, but none other. Though his behaviour throughout the conflict was quite unacceptable, the pastor and elders were not without reason on their side. The Discipline of the church, referred to as the 'Old discipline', lists among the functions of the Pastor that:

as the chief mouth of the Church, to open and declare all Orders, taken by him and the Elders, which are to be opened and published; to whom no man may, in the face of the Congregation, reply. But if any think himself to have cause to speak ; let him come before the Elders in the place appointed for their meeting; and there to open his mind, and to be heard with all charity indifferently (impartially).<sup>589</sup>

Of the office of Elders the discipline says that the Elder should "be with the Pastor in all consultations for the public Order of the Church and that all corrections and exercises of Discipline be done with their common counsel."<sup>590</sup>

Horne and the elders argued on the basis of the above throughout the conflict. Any concessions that they made to the congregation were done so grudgingly and then often withdrawn. The

---

<sup>587</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.155.

<sup>588</sup> [Thomas Cole], *A Brief Discourse*, pp. 107.

<sup>589</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 147-148.

<sup>590</sup> [Thomas Cole], *A Brief Discourse*, p.148.

'congregation' made the running all along. Eventually a new Discipline, called the 'Second New Discipline' in the *Discourse*, was drawn up which was subscribed to by forty-two of the sixty-two members of the then congregation. It aimed to cover the shortcomings of the Old Discipline. But in doing so it also uncovered new ground. Article two of the New Discipline sets the tone:

The Congregation thus assembled is a particular (distinct) visible church, such as may be in divers places of the world very many. And all these particular Churches joined together, not in place (for that is not possible) but by the conjunction of true doctrine and faith in the same, do make one whole church in this world.<sup>591</sup>

The problems that had been met by members of the congregation in dealing with their pastor were covered in Article seven: "It is thought expedient for the Church, at this present to have Two ministers or Teachers of the Word, elected of Doctrine and Godly Life; such as the rule of the Scripture doth require, as much as may be. And that the said Two Ministers and Teachers of the Word, shall in all things and points be of like authority; and neither of them superior or inferior to the other."<sup>592</sup>

Knappen observes that "this was a body blow at the whole Episcopal notion, repudiating even the à Lascan modification held by Horne's group"<sup>593</sup> that, though the pastor ought not to "be above the rest (of the ministers) by lordship, so yet ought he to be above others in charge and in burden, inasmuch as he must needs give a greater account than the rest of his flock committed unto him and to his charge."<sup>594</sup>

"The church was above the pastor and not the pastor above the church"<sup>595</sup> Garrett, in colourful style, states that "in the space of seventeen days a democratic revolution had been effected and the first Bible Commonwealth been born. - - - the immediate prototype of the New England *town meeting*, composed of church members came into existence by majority vote among Englishmen exiled in Germany on Sunday 30 January 1557."<sup>596</sup>

Stipulations set out in the new discipline of the church do indeed appear revolutionary. Though there are to be six elders to assist the two ministers they "shall have no authority to make any manner of Decrees or Ordinances to bind the Congregation, or any member thereof: but shall execute such ordinances and decrees as shall be made by the Congregation to them delivered."<sup>597</sup> Among other measures provision was made for the possibility for the body of the church legally to assemble itself. The majority of such a meeting might bind the whole congregation.<sup>598</sup> Provision was also made for trying the church officials as a body, or any part of them, by congregational committee. Any

---

<sup>591</sup> [Thomas Cole], *A Brief Discourse*, p.150.

<sup>592</sup> *Ibid.*, p.153 One wonders what had been the situation when Knox and Lever had been pastors at the church!

<sup>593</sup> M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*, p.157.

<sup>594</sup> [Cole], *Brief Discourse*, pp.163-164.

<sup>595</sup> *Ibid.*, p.113.

<sup>596</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.189.

<sup>597</sup> [Cole], *Brief Discourse*, p.185.

<sup>598</sup> *Ibid.*, p.188.

disagreement among the ministers and elders about the interpretation of the Discipline was to be referred to the entire congregation.<sup>599</sup>

It will no doubt be surprising to readers to know that among all this there is Article five which states: "We observe and keep the Form and Order of the Ministration of the Sacraments and Common Prayer, as it is set forth, by the authority of the blessed King Edward, of famous memory, in the last Book of the English Service (1552): whereof, notwithstanding, in respect of times and places and other circumstances, certain Rites and Ceremonies appointed in the said Book, as things indifferent, may be left out; as we at present do."<sup>600</sup>

At Frankfurt, in its latter phase, the English church had thus separated Liturgy from Order which, by the standards of the time, was unknown. More startling still is the fact that the leading opponents of Horne and the elders at the Frankfurt church were none other than David Whitehead and Thomas Ashley. Whitehead had, after all, been the *bête noire* of Whittingham and his associates in the earlier disputes at the Frankfurt church while it was Thomas Ashley who was part of the group at the church - page 33 - who summoned Whittingham and his associates demanding from them an explanation for their departure from Frankfurt.

How was it that these two supporters of the *Book of Common Prayer* had suddenly become Congregationalists? Philippe Denis provides us with the reply when he says that "le congregationalisme des Eglises du refuge ne fut jamais revendiqué: il allait de soi." <sup>601</sup> Congregationalism was not something specifically claimed or demanded by the refugee churches of the Rhine, it came upon them by circumstances. Furthermore, Denis continues, "ce modèle, cependant, ne devait pas résister à l'épreuve de la durée. L'histoire montre, en effet, que les Eglises d'étrangers de la vallée du Rhin ont connu un développement non seulement agité mais finalement éphémère." <sup>602</sup>

One can certainly say this about the English church at Frankfurt where supporters of the *Book of Common Prayer* hardly thought of importing their form of church government into England. As it was, the church lived on until the return home of the exiles following the death of Mary Tudor. In the meantime, Horne and Chambers left Frankfurt.

While congregationalist in order the church appears to have been inclusivist - contrary to classical congregational theory - rather than exclusivist in nature, in that members of the congregation who did not sign the new discipline remained members of the church. Of the January 1559 letter sent from Frankfurt to Geneva in reply to the latter's request to unite in a common front on return to England - page 111 - there were eleven signatories. Five of these subscribed to the new discipline, three did not while three others are assumed to have been relative new comers to the city i.e. they had not yet indicated a preference one way or the other. Whatever the foregoing, a renewed period of peace

---

<sup>599</sup> [Thomas Cole], *A Brief Discourse*, p.199.

<sup>600</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 152-153. This would be *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*, i.e. the 1552 Book of Common Prayer altered by Cox and colleagues - in a Protestant direction - after Whittingham and his company left Frankfurt. See pages 27-30.

<sup>601</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.622

<sup>602</sup> *Ibid.*, p.624

appears to have followed at the church in 1558 such that Cecil chose men of Frankfurt rather than of Geneva to sit on his Prayer Book committees - footnote to page 111- back in England.

Certainly, in the context of the Refugee churches of the XVI century the history of the English church in Frankfurt appears somewhat odd. One wonders what the author/s of the *Discourse* made of it all?

In the first phase of the church Messrs Whitehead and Ashley had been portrayed as bad boys who persecuted the good boys Messrs Whittingham and Wood. Then, in the second part of the book, the bad boys suddenly become the new good boys when Messrs Ashley and Whitehead are attacked by Messrs Horne and Chambers, the new bad boys. But the author of the *Discourse* omits to remind the reader of the rather inconvenient fact that the new good boys are still supporters of “ceremonies.” Perhaps the author had forgotten this himself, for there is no hint in the *Discourse* of this disagreeable fact, nor of the issue of Presbyterianism versus Congregationalism that the latter conflict had raised. No doubt this is because the *Discourse* was written in the 1570’s when these issues had yet to come to the fore.

Undoubtedly Denis is right when he says “les Eglises d’étrangers de la vallée du Rhin ont connu un développement non seulement agité mais finalement éphémère », for this appears to be a particularly apt description of the English church at Frankfurt between 1555 and 1558.

#### 5.4 *The Refugee Churches in Wesel*

The first refugee church established in Wesel was founded in 1545 by a group of Walloon linen weavers from Tournai. Philippe Denis describes Wesel in the XVI century as a city “particulièrement accueillante” nevertheless adding the rider that “dans aucune ville du refuge au XVI century, l’intégration sociale et professionnelle des étrangers ne s’est opérée sans difficulté »<sup>603</sup> This is a very necessary qualification for, in the event, the refugees landed up expelled from Wesel due to the intransigence of the city council and local Lutheran ministers.

Economic capital of the Duchy of Cleves, which was situated close to the frontier with the Netherlands, Wesel accepted the Reformation in 1544. Denis explains that in the Duchy of Cleves “la politique suivie en matière religieuse était d’inspiration érasmiennne »<sup>604</sup> for while Wesel became Protestant - “il s’acheminait paisiblement vers une Réforme de type mélanchthonien”<sup>605</sup> - the Duchy remained loyal to the traditional church. From 1545 onwards, however, the religious background hardened somewhat, both from the side of the traditional church as well as from that of the Lutherans.

While the religious backcloth was, at least initially, somewhat sympathetic to the refugees, the economic background looked decidedly unfavourable for them. For, in the early 1540’s Wesel faced an economic crisis brought about by the collapse of the wool-producing industry. This was hardly an atmosphere in which to welcome refugees who would, one would have expected, be seen as unwelcome competitors for the reduced number of jobs available in the city. Rather astonishingly the local guilds came to act quite differently, welcoming the Walloon refugees into their community.

---

<sup>603</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d’Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.162.

<sup>604</sup> *Ibid.*, p.163.

<sup>605</sup> *Ibid.*, p.164.

The key to this attitude lay in the occupation of the refugees. They were weavers. For, while the French speaking part of the Netherlands had been hit by the same industry crisis, they had managed to recover from it through the development of what came to be called 'new draperies.' The economic situation had clearly become so dire in Wesel that the refugees appear to have been seen as saviours, even to the local guilds, because they brought with them new skills and techniques. These, after all, might create jobs and be the means to survival of the local textile industry. Indeed, instruction of the local population in these new techniques was one of the conditions of settlement laid down by the local council for the Walloon newcomers.<sup>606</sup>

Nigel Goose explains that "a key feature of many of the new draperies - the variety of which defies description - was that they often combined elements of traditional woollen cloth production with worsted making techniques - - - there was no particular *invention* associated with cloths - indeed the new draperies were more labour intensive than the old - but they incorporated a range of *innovations* that produced a great variety of colours and designs and, in the major centres of production at least, were produced under strict regimes of quality control that further enhanced their marketability."<sup>607</sup> It was from the French speaking parts of the Netherlands (the Southern Lower Countries) particularly Flanders that these techniques passed to other parts of the Netherlands, to France and to England. The welcome given to Southern Lower Countries weavers with skills in this area was widespread. It is therefore no wonder that the refugees became welcome in Wesel.

Although the Walloon refugees had been granted the right to hold religious services in their own language, they were prohibited from celebrating the sacraments. As Denis suggests: "c'est sans doute parce que les sacramentaires, c'est-à-dire les protestants non luthériens orthodoxes, étaient amalgamés aux anabaptistes, que les étrangers se virent refuser le droit de célébrer la cène dans leur temple. »<sup>608</sup> And indeed the church was infiltrated by at least one Anabaptist during its life. However, the conditions of worship laid down by the local authorities were ill received by members of the refugee community, some of whom suggested that they could do without the sacraments altogether.<sup>609</sup> To this situation the refugee church in Strasbourg then became involved as did Calvin in Geneva.

Calvin's view - similar to one that he was later to give to the English church in Frankfurt - was that, as the doctrine of the local (Lutheran) church was pure and their liturgy not idolatrous, the refugees should accept to celebrate communion with the local church. Sensing a touch of disorder in the refugee church, he also suggested to the refugees that they adopted a discipline.

His advice went unheeded for the local Walloon community proceeded to celebrate communion in their own church at the beginning of 1547. Four months later the local council effectively closed the

---

<sup>606</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.162.

<sup>607</sup> Nigel Goose, 'Immigrants and English Economic Development', *Immigrants in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, Nigel Goose and Lien Luu eds, p.140.

<sup>608</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.171. It was the austerity and simplicity of the Reformed liturgy as well as the importance given to discipline that led some observers to confuse the Reformed with Anabaptists, a subject of constant concern to the Reformed throughout the period.

<sup>609</sup> *Ibid.*, p.171.

refugee church down.<sup>610</sup> The background was not favourable. A month earlier Charles V had won a decisive victory against the Protestant armies at Muhlberg. The Augsburg Interim followed soon afterwards as a result of which Wesel returned to the traditional church. But not for long. In 1552, following the Peace of Passau, Wesel once more became Protestant. Protestant the city may have once more become, but, in the meantime, confessional positions had been hardening. If there was now less pressure from the traditional church, pressure from the Lutherans was on the increase. Indeed, at around this time, sacramentarians were threatened with expulsion from the city.

Pettegree reports that there was a new arrival of refugees in October 1553 and suggests that this was the first of a new influx of exiles “for which the town was hardly prepared.”<sup>611</sup> The initial group was led by Francis Morellus who presented a Confession of Faith to the city council.<sup>612</sup> Among this group appear to have been members of the stranger church in London but the bulk of the exiles from Marian England arrived somewhat later. Among them were, Valérand Poullain and his Glastonbury weavers with another party led by Jan Utenhove. Utenhove, who had left England with à Lasco - page 128 - had not stayed in Emden but moved on to Wesel.<sup>613</sup>

While Poullain and his group left Wesel soon afterwards, eventually arriving in Frankfurt, there were further arrivals from London to take their place in Wesel. Most important was Francois Perrussel - a former minister of the French stranger church in London - who was chosen as minister at the church to serve alongside Morellus. Once again the refugees were told that while the local council accepted their confession of faith, they had, nevertheless, to abide by the local rites. The initial reaction of the congregation was that this was unacceptable and, following a meeting in the house of one of their members, Augustin Le Grand, it was decided that the church should move elsewhere. But, as on an earlier occasion outside advice on the issue was canvassed. Calvin was approached (again) and, subsequently, à Lasco. The advice of the two reformers differed, but the elders of the refugee church put their own interpretation on the replies of the two reformers and, having assembled the whole church for a debate on the issue - which lasted three days - it was eventually decided to stay put. Perrussel endeavoured to arrange some form of compromise with the local clergy - some of whom remained sympathetic to the refugees - but this was not to the liking of some members of his congregation, one of whom denounced him behind his back.<sup>614</sup>

As several, apparently disillusioned, members of the refugee congregation subsequently left Wesel for Frankfurt, or indeed for their home town Tournai in the Netherlands, the church's existence came to look more and more precarious. Although some of the local clergy, as already mentioned, seemed ready to compromise with the refugees, the civil authorities became more and more intransigent. However, a truncated church - some sixty persons - finally pulled itself together and in the autumn of

---

<sup>610</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.177. Accounts of subsequent events differ. It is not clear, at least to this writer, to what extent the original Walloon community continued to exist - in a semi-clandestine fashion - independently of later arrivals.

<sup>611</sup> Andrew Pettegree, 'The London Exile Community', *Marian Protestantism*, p.65.'

<sup>612</sup> Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers*, p.181 suggests that this was a Confession of Faith of the 'old' community.

<sup>613</sup> Utenhove had been an elder of the Dutch stranger church in London and he was now associated with a Walloon community in Wesel. Eclectic man! But at an earlier stage he had been an officer of the French church in Canterbury.

<sup>614</sup> Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers*, p.196.



1554, meeting in the house of one of their members, elected six elders who were to double up as deacons. Worship was to be held before sunrise at 6 am, reminiscent of the early church, and communion was to be celebrated. Meanwhile, the local clergy declared that they were not opposed to church assemblies on condition that the local population saw some of the refugees taking part in communion in their local parishes.

The arrival in Wesel of the Duchess of Suffolk and her husband Richard Bertie, in the early months of 1555 appears to have been the beginning of an English exile in Wesel: Denis reports that “Les anglais de Wesel eurent d’emblée un culte dans leur langue, clandestin bien sûr.”<sup>615</sup> Denis is right to use the word ‘clandestin’ for the religious background was ever hardening with threats of expulsion from the city for those who would not accept the Augsburg Confession. This always gave rise to the question: which version of this confession? Variata, where the doctrine of the Lord’s supper could be interpreted in an eirenic way - à la Melanchthon - or the Invariata where it could not? The background to this was the Peace of Augsburg, which only granted legal toleration to churches who accepted the Augsburg Confession and for these purposes it was the original - Invariata - version of this document that was used.

It is surprising to record that into this charged atmosphere came the ecumenically minded theologian of the traditional church from Cologne, George Cassander, who visited Wesel in the summer of 1555. He achieved the remarkable in managing to persuade the Wesel council to carry out their earlier pledge to allow the exiles to worship in separate communities. In October 1555 the Heiliggeistkapelle was finally made over to the French-speaking exiles while the English-speaking exiles were permitted to meet in the Augustinerkirche, the church already used by the old established Walloon group.<sup>616</sup>

The English exiles, as relative newcomers to the city, appear to have simply gone ahead and celebrated communion, following the Edwardian Prayer book of 1552. “L’audace des insulaires” says Denis “fut tout de même payante » for the council agreed to give them full use of the sacraments on condition that one of the city ministers administered them. For the sick, the English minister could administer communion, but on condition that a Lutheran minister was present. While the council was no doubt aware that it should be consistent in its treatment of the two exile communities, it was always possible that, in the event, they showed a certain favouritism towards the English as their liturgy would have appeared closer to the Lutheran rite than that of the Reformed churches.

The zig-zag nature of relations between the Wesel council and the exiles continued but in the autumn of 1556 reached a climax. Perrussel and Traheron - who had now succeeded Coverdale as minister at the English church - were summoned to appear before the city council on 9 October. The ministers were presented with an ultimatum: to agree with the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper as expressed in the Augsburg confession or leave the city. Ever ready to search for a solution - even in the most desperate of circumstances - Perrussel suggested sending the exiles’ confession of faith to Melanchthon for arbitration.<sup>617</sup> Although in his reply to the Wesel council Melanchthon

---

<sup>615</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d’Étrangers en Pays Rhénan*, p.202.

<sup>616</sup> Andrew Pettegree, ‘The London Exile Community’, *Marian Protestantism*, p.68. Denis suggests that the two exile communities used the same building for worship – la chapelle de l’hospice du Saint – Esprit – the Heiliggeistkapelle? *Les Églises d’Étrangers*, p.204 footnote.

<sup>617</sup> For the reformed, Melanchthon appears to be the hero in these disputes. Everybody wanted to meet and speak to Melanchthon, including Henry VIII ! Yet, if one undertakes a short check list, it is

recommended that the refugees be given the right to celebrate the Lord's supper in their own churches - adding that although there may exist differences between Lutheran and Reformed this was not a reason to expel them from the city - the council ignored his recommendation.

Both the English and Wallon churches were closed down in 1557 after a final effort by Perrussel and Thomas Lever to come to some compromise with the Wesel council came to nought. There was to be no further English church in Wesel though when the Lutherans later overreached themselves and their leader Heshusius was himself expelled from the town<sup>618</sup>, a softening atmosphere eventually led to the reopening of the 'French' church in 1567 as well as one for Dutch speakers. Wesel played host to a religious assembly in 1568 which was followed by one in Emden in 1571 "which in time came to be viewed as the first national synods of the Dutch Reformed Church."<sup>619</sup>

This was undoubtedly a satisfactory outcome, but in the initial period the legacy of Wesel appears to have been one of bitterness and confusion. The town council seems finally to have been bent on expelling the exiles at whatever cost. At first sight this seems surprising as the hostility of the Lutheran ministers was never universal and, in contrast to Frankfurt, we do not hear of the hostility of craftsmen and artisans. Undoubtedly the new techniques and skills brought to the town by the Walloon refugees had borne fruit.

Unlike the English church in Geneva, which was able to shelter under the protection of Calvin, the churches in Wesel existed in a generally hostile environment. They also contributed - albeit by the force of circumstances - to a hardening of divisions between Christians of the Lutheran and Reformed traditions. The lives of these churches were short: some three and a half years for the French speaking congregation and barely two for the English one. Short their lives may have been but it was long enough to make their legacy, at least in the short term, a particularly unsatisfying one.

### 5.5 *The English Aftermath – Aarau*

Aarau is of interest to us because, like Geneva, it was a peaceful community. According to Garrett<sup>620</sup> some of its church members also had links - albeit distant - with the Dudley conspiracy in England, undertaken with a view to the overthrow of Mary Tudor.<sup>621</sup> Given that this would be an example of 'political' exiles - page six - overlapping with 'religious' exiles, it warrants a short comment.

Thomas Lever had been elected as minister at the English church in Wesel following the retirement, on grounds of ill health, of Bartholomew Traheron. But Lever's ministry there was short. The

---

only his views on the Lord's supper that should have recommended Melanchthon to the Reformed. His views on *adiaphora* were far too broad for them while his views on resistance were far too passive. In this sense it is Flacius Ilyricus (Magdeburg Confession) who is the true 'father' of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, certainly not Philip Melanchthon. It was Melanchthon's accommodation with the Interim that led to the rise of the Gnesio Lutherans, who became such vituperative opponents of the Reformed.

<sup>618</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers*, p.234.

<sup>619</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.189.

<sup>620</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian exiles*, pp. 50-51.

<sup>621</sup> John Guy, *Tudor England*, p.247. Among other conspiracies was one to take Calais, recently recaptured by the French.

*Discourse*,<sup>622</sup> in Arber's version, gives some background to the subsequent movement of Lever and his congregation to Aarau. It seems that this town had not been the first choice for a new refuge and at one stage Basle, among other possibilities, had been considered. Basle, with its university and associations with Erasmus, as well as its importance as a printing and publishing centre, gives the image of a tolerant, liberal city but in some ways it was very much the opposite applying a notably xenophobic policy in terms of immigration.

In the 1550's government of the city was dominated by the guilds and "les étrangers, les Français surtout étaient perçus par la ville comme des concurrents."<sup>623</sup> As Denis puts it "Les Balois suivaient à cet égard une règle fort simple : pas d'étrangers, à moins qu'ils ne fussent ou riches, ou instruits. D'autres villes existaient pour recevoir les émigrés pauvres et incultes. »<sup>624</sup> It was thus perfectly acceptable to the Basle authorities that Lady Dorothy Stafford, who wished to leave Geneva, should settle in Basle - page 61 - but not that Thomas Lever should arrive with his congregation from Wesel - many of whom were weavers - and settle in the city.

Mention was made at the beginning of this study - page five - that the XVI century English exiles were predominantly privileged people, unlike their Walloon and Dutch counterparts. So it should come as no surprise to know that the English exiles who moved to Basle - with the possible exception of Dorothy Stafford - became associated with its university. Clearly the restrictive immigration policy operated by the Basle authorities had indeed worked in favour of the 'instruits' for these English exiles proved to be the only refugee group numerous enough to form a church there - page 113.

It may be assumed that the more privileged of the Wesel congregation moved on to another port of exile of their own choosing. Quite apart from the Duchess of Suffolk and her entourage we have the case of John Bodley who, together with his family, left Wesel for Frankfurt before finally moving to Geneva.

But such cases were probably the exception, for the majority of the Wesel congregation, some 93 people, were subsequently led by Lever to Aarau where they arrived on 11 August 1557.<sup>625</sup> This isolated town stands on a hill-top over-looking the river Aar between Basle and Zurich. It was, perhaps, the remoteness of the position that appealed to Miles Coverdale who spent two years in Aarau together with his wife and children. Remoteness and seclusion gave him the opportunity to study. Coverdale however, was rather an exception, because over one third of the congregation appear to have been working men and women. Some similarity might be seen with Poullain's community at Glastonbury, for members of that church had been led there by its Pastor Poullain, just as Lever had led the majority of his congregation to Aarau. Garrett has suggested that this is what gives Aarau its special claim to remembrance namely "its movement from Wesel under the leadership of a Pastor" which provided after 1630 a new type of corporate colonisation in New England.<sup>626</sup> Presumably one could make the same comment in the context of Poullain. But he, after all, was a Walloon while Lever was an Englishman.

---

<sup>622</sup> Thomas Wood, *A Brief Discourse*, pp. 218-221.

<sup>623</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.242.

<sup>624</sup> *Ibid.*, p.241.

<sup>625</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, p.51.

<sup>626</sup> *Ibid.*, p.53. But, see also the comments of Collinson in footnote page 116.

We do not know anything about the Order of the English church in Aarau, though its liturgy - with Lever as minister - would almost certainly have been that of the 1552 Edwardian Prayer Book. Coverdale occupied no pastoral office during his stay in Aarau while Lever, who preached to his congregation on Sundays in the Stadtskirche, remained minister of the church throughout its life. Stability in the ministry, stability in the church; for "what changes in personnel occurred between its arrival on 11 August 1557 and its departure about 2 January 1559 was caused by birth and death, not by coming and going of its members."<sup>627</sup>

While an important part of the congregation may have been of humble origin Garrett adds that five were gentlemen "but with the exception of Lord John Audley none was a man of rank."<sup>628</sup> The signatories to the letter from the church at Aarau to the English church in Geneva in January 1559 are interesting in this regard. Apart from Lever there are three signatories: Richard Langhorne, Robert Pownall and Thomas Turpin but not Lord John Audley. However, Audley had connections with Calais as did the three signatories of the letter to Geneva, Garrett suggesting that Audley may have been the father in law of Sir Henry Dudley.

Our commentator further suggests that from among the English exiles in Wesel were some who had been linked to one of Henry Dudley's conspiracies, in this case his designs on Calais following its loss to the French. This, it is suggested, was the real reason for their expulsion from the town. It is true that the authorities of the European cities of refuge were ever conscious to ensure that they were receiving genuine religious exiles rather than conspirators fleeing from justice. But it is hardly likely that the Wesel authorities would have proceeded against the Walloon and English congregations at one and the same time if Calais had been the reason for their action. Furthermore, it has been suggested here that the Wesel council might have shown some preference for the English exiles over their Walloon brothers. That the exiles should have been expelled from Wesel for such reasons seems quite implausible.

The refugee church in Aarau has clearly some similarities with the English church in Geneva. More stable in its congregation than Geneva, it was equally peaceful. There was also stability in the ministry. Furthermore, like 'Geneva,' 'Aarau' lived and worked in a supportive civic environment. We discuss these points in the conclusions to this study.

### ***5.6 The Flemish and Walloon Refugee churches in Frankfurt***

Like the English church in Frankfurt, the Walloon church there tore itself apart while the Flemish church was not totally devoid of similar influences. However, while the English church survived - if only because the death of Mary Tudor in November 1558 made its continued existence unnecessary - the Flemish and Walloon churches were eventually closed down.

The background factors to the churches in Frankfurt were not dissimilar - with important shades of difference - to those in Wesel. There was a generally sympathetic city council at the outset - with certain council members being very supportive - combined with a growing hostility of the local

---

<sup>627</sup> Christina Garrett, *The Marian Exiles*, pp.52-53.

<sup>628</sup> *Ibid.*, p.52.

Lutheran ministers over time. One marked difference, however, was the attitude of craftsmen and artisans. In Wesel it had been generally favourable; in Frankfurt it was generally hostile.

The first request made to the Frankfurt council for a church for religious exiles was made by Jan Utenhove in May 1546. But the international background for such a request was far from ideal - the defeat of the Protestant armies at Muhlberg followed less than a year afterwards - and the request was refused. Eight years later Valérand Poullain was more successful when he arrived in Frankfurt with his group of Walloon weavers from Glastonbury in England in the spring of 1554. Not only did Poullain manage to obtain a place of worship for his community, but, in contrast to Wesel, the Frankfurt council also permitted them to celebrate the sacraments. This harmonious situation was certainly still operating when the English exiles arrived in Frankfurt a few months later, but growing immigration into Frankfurt soon put the relations between the city and the foreign community under strain.<sup>629</sup> By the end of 1555 there were close on 2000 refugees in the city representing around ten per cent of the total population and it was to grow substantially reaching close to 20% in 1590. This was clearly a favourable background for Lutheran ministers who wished to attack the refugees by pointing out the upward pressure that they were putting on prices and rents. It is worth remembering that in Strasbourg, with a similar sized population, the immigrants there never exceeded eight per cent of the total population at any point in the XVI century.<sup>630</sup>

Denis reminds us that the majority of the refugees in Frankfurt came from the French speaking parts of the Netherlands – the Southern Lower Countries. This was in marked contrast to Strasbourg, most of whose immigrants came from France and Lorraine. Reflecting their geographical background, over half of the Frankfurt exiles, at least in the initial phase, were weavers. But the dynamism of the new immigrants was not confined to textiles, Denis mentioning other trades: shoemakers, carpenters, joiners and cabinet makers adding “ce furent véritablement deux systems économiques qui s’affrontèrent: le corporatisme et la liberté d’entreprise.”<sup>631</sup> However, it is interesting to note that the refugees were supported by the privileged classes of the town, both old wealth and new, “qui avaient tout à gagner de leur presence à Francfort.”<sup>632</sup> Their main opponents were the guilds.

While the refugee artisans may have received the support of the privileged classes of Frankfurt, this was not the case within their own church where emerging social differences among the congregation were the cause of the first, and ongoing, crisis at the church. Its origins lay in the arrival of more privileged exiles in Frankfurt typified by Augustin Le Grand. It had been in the house of Le Grand - a wealthy merchant from Bruges - that the Wesel community had met and initially decided to leave Wesel rather than accept the terms of the local council for their continued residence there - page 139. As Denis remarks of the arrival of Le Grand and his friends: “La difference sociale entre les premiers arrivants et ceux qui les suivirent à l’automne était donc on ne peut plus nette. »<sup>633</sup>

The conflict centered on the discipline of the church and the workings of the consistory. Although both the new and the old immigrants were members of the Consistory, the new arrivals accused Poullain of unjustly favouring his Glastonbury colleagues. It has been observed that the church was

---

<sup>629</sup> Andrew Pettegree, ‘The London Exile Community’, *Marian Protestantism*, p.70.

<sup>630</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d’Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.305.

<sup>631</sup> *Ibid.*, p.308.

<sup>632</sup> *Ibid.*, p.308.

<sup>633</sup> *Ibid.*, p.327.

marked by two characteristics: its social heterogeneity and the character of its minister Valérand Poullain who has been described variously as: *emporté et irritable, de caractère tumultueux*<sup>634</sup> and autocratic.<sup>635</sup>

The election of Richard Vauville as minister to serve with Poullain does not appear to have reduced tensions between the two groups at the church. Vauville had served as minister at the 'French' stranger church in London alongside Perrussel, but rather than act as a counter-weight to Poullain in Frankfurt, Vauville supported him throughout.

The temperature among the exiles in Frankfurt rose markedly with the arrival of à Lasco from Emden in the spring of 1555. Although the vast majority of the immigrants to Frankfurt had been Walloons, there were among them an increasing number of Flemings (Dutch speakers) who hankered after a church of their own.<sup>636</sup> The ever energetic à Lasco was only too happy to oblige and in the summer of 1555 he summoned Marten Micron to Frankfurt to assist in the organisation of the new church.<sup>637</sup> Micron had served as one of the ministers at the Dutch stranger church in London and it was Peter Dathenus, who had been a member of the Dutch church there, who preached at the new church's inaugural service in September 1555.<sup>638</sup> During his time in Frankfurt à Lasco appears to have acted as a sort of supernumerary superintendent of both churches, involving himself as much with the Walloon church as with the Flemish.

A Lasco's greatest asset was as a church organiser and it was in Frankfurt that he completed and had published his *Forma ac Ratio*. Yet, whatever his skills in this area, he was unable to quell the disputes in the Walloon church. As Denis states somewhat bluntly : "*l'impuissance de cet ancien familier d'Erasmus n'en fut que plus désolante.*"<sup>639</sup> However, à Lasco, increasingly troubled by ill health, attempted to play what he felt to be a conciliatory role throughout the initial crisis at the church, not least as a supporter of Poullain against his critics.

In December 1555 Le Grand and his associates peremptorily resigned from their positions as elders of the church. Poullain then went ahead and nominated six new elders (all from Glastonbury) while his opponents resubmitted themselves to the congregation for election. If this had been a planned coup by the newcomers to obtain control of the consistory it failed, for in the subsequent elections neither Le Grand nor any of his associates was elected as elder. The new consistory then excommunicated the old as a result of which three of the excommunicated approached the city council with a complaint against Poullain. With the newcomers contesting the legitimacy of the election, as well as that of Poullain himself as minister, the church appeared to be on the verge of collapse when Vauville fell victim of the plague.

Calvin was very much aware of the troubles at the Walloon church in Frankfurt; for all parties to the dispute sought his advice on the issues at stake, including the refugees' chief supporter on the city

---

<sup>634</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, pp. 321 and 328.

<sup>635</sup> Andrew Pettegree, 'The London Exile Community' *Marian Protestantism*, p.70.

<sup>636</sup> *Ibid.*, p.71.

<sup>637</sup> *Ibid.*, p.71.

<sup>638</sup> Accounts differ; Denis suggests that it was Micron who "*celebra le culte inaugural*", *Eglise d'Étrangers*, p.332.

<sup>639</sup> Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.333.

council, John à Glauberg. Calvin eventually decided that attempts to pacify the dispute by correspondence were not enough and that his intervention in the affairs of the church necessitated a visit to Frankfurt.

Calvin arrived in Frankfurt in September 1556 and on 20 September the commission appointed to settle the dispute met for the first time. Denis reminds us that the commission “était sous l’autorité du Magistrat” represented by John à Glauberg, even if he himself was not a member of the commission. Its number was eight including four members from Frankfurt: à Lasco, Robert Horne, minister of the English church, Nicholas Walet, an elder at the Walloon church who had been an associate of Le Grand, and a local citizen. From outside Frankfurt came Jean Crespin and Laurent de Normandie from Geneva, who were in the city for the Frankfurt fair and two other persons from the Reformed world: the Spanish theologian Juan Perez de Pinéda and the Lille doctor Eustache de Quesnoy, who was, himself, proposing to settle in Frankfurt. Calvin took the chair.

The objective of the commission was to establish the merits of the accusations of Le Grand against Poullain while, for Calvin personally, the objective was to bring about peace in the church. The commission sat over two days. Its eventual judgement was on the whole favourable to Poullain but made certain criticisms of his conduct which prompted the sensitive Poullain to offer his resignation.<sup>640</sup> The commission then suggested that his proposal be put to the congregation and, in a subsequent election, a majority of the church voted for Poullain to remain, but the minister remained adamant. Neither the commission, nor, more particularly, Calvin, did anything to encourage Poullain to withdraw his resignation.

Clearly Calvin had come to the conclusion that there could be no lasting peace at the Frankfurt church as long as Poullain remained minister. Calvin’s plan appears to have been to bring Perrussel from Wesel to replace Poullain as minister in Frankfurt. Perrussel had, after all, expressed to Calvin that the conditions laid down by the Wesel council for the refugee churches there had become increasingly intolerable for him; by bringing Perrussel to Frankfurt - and finding a replacement for him in Wesel - both the church in Wesel and that in Frankfurt might be saved.<sup>641</sup> In the event both churches were closed down.

Denis records that “après le depart de Calvin l’église connut pendant un mois une grande confusion. »<sup>642</sup> This could be said to have characterised the life of the church not only for the following month but up to its closure in 1561. In the short term there were several issues outstanding, that it had not been in the remit of the commission to address, and Guillaume Houbraque, the minister who had come to the church to replace Vauville, soon found himself amid a church in turmoil as much as had his predecessors. However, a certain, albeit temporary, calm seems subsequently to have returned to the church and it was at about this time (October 1556) that à Lasco left Frankfurt to return to his native Poland where he died in 1560.

Undoubtedly the departure of à Lasco, regarded by the local Lutheran ministers as a noted sacramentarian, improved the external atmosphere for the church. Poullain, having resigned his office, eventually distanced himself from the church as well though he remained in Frankfurt where he died

---

<sup>640</sup> Andrew Pettegree, ‘The London Exile Community’, *Marian Protestantism*, p.76.

<sup>641</sup> *Ibid.*, p.76.

<sup>642</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d’Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.347.

in the autumn of 1557. The former minister may have been writing anti-Lutheran pamphlets up until his death but it is interesting to note that Denis records that in 1554 Poullain participated in communion in his local parish. Perhaps his main disputes had been with his own church and not with the local Lutheran ministers?

In January 1557, Poullain was replaced as minister at the Walloon church by Perrussel. Relations between the new minister and Houbraque appear to have been good at first but deteriorated during 1558. The dispute between them appears to have begun over the response of Perrussel to a slanderous comment that was directed at him by a member of the congregation. "Comme le ministre avait répondu aux calomnies don't il était le victime par d'autre calomnies, Houbraque et plusieurs anciens prirent parti contre lui. »<sup>643</sup> With a divided church Houbraque decreed that communion should not be celebrated until the dispute was resolved. Perrussel disagreed.

From this dispute not only rose, as in the English church, the seeds of congregationalism but also a 'theological' dispute over discipline. It also raised the question of the authority of the consistory over and against that of the local council all questions which, as we saw in an earlier part of this study - page 41 and footnote page 86 - had pitted Zurich and Berne against Geneva.

For his refusal to celebrate communion and failure to put his complaints in writing, as requested by the council, John de Glaubourg deposed Houbraque as minister in January 1559. Houbraque, who had come to Frankfurt from Neuchatel, was strongly influenced by Calvin. He therefore took a very strict line on the access to communion. Until the disputes, and wounds, at the church had been both solved and healed, he thought it wrong to celebrate the sacrament – see Glossary. Perrussel, who was supported by the city council, took a more liberal view. The two ministers did not interpret chapter five of St Matthew, verses 23-26 in the same way.<sup>644</sup> Furthermore, Perrussel, in line with Zwingli, Bullinger and Musculus, but not Calvin, held that the city council should have power over excommunication, not the consistory.

In this new dispute both the council and Calvin were involved. But on different sides. The council supported Perrussel, while Calvin supported Houbraque. Calvin had been responsible for bringing Perrussel to Frankfurt but relations between the two men had cooled. 'Spiritualists and anabaptists' had been reported to him as circulating around the church but undoubtedly what most distressed the Genevan reformer was to learn that Perrussel had, for many years, been in contact with Sebastian Castellio, his old adversary in Geneva and advocate of religious toleration. But, as Denis tells us, Calvin was, above all affected by weariness and, having lost the support of his friend on the council, John de Glauberg, had come to the conclusion that it was useless for him to intervene.<sup>645</sup> "Rarement, le ministre de Genève aura fait un tel aveu d'impuissance. »<sup>646</sup>

In initially requesting and then leaving the Council free rein to arbitrate the issue, it would transpire that Houbraque had made a mistake. For, when the congregation turned against their own consistory over the election of the elders: "sous la pression populaire, il fut alors décrété que le tribunal ordinaire du consistoire serait réplacé par un tribunal extraordinaire de six hommes élus par la multitude

---

<sup>643</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.362.

<sup>644</sup> *Ibid.*, p.368.

<sup>645</sup> *Ibid.*, p.370.

<sup>646</sup> *Ibid.*, p.371.



auxquels seraient adjoints deux juristes,"<sup>647</sup> the council was only too happy to oblige. For this could enable them to step in and take on the powers of the consistory, at least as far as powers of excommunication were concerned. Thus emerged an alliance between what might be called Congregationalists and supporters of a church under magisterial control.

At the beginning of September 1560 the Council gave judgement on the action brought by Houbraque and his associates against Perrussel. The latter was totally vindicated. In a letter of 20 September to Bullinger, Perrussel "manifesta sa satisfaction."<sup>648</sup> But the former minister of the stranger church in London was not vindictive and showed a conciliatory attitude towards his opponents. Houbraque's supporters, on the other hand (Houbraque himself had already left Frankfurt for Strasbourg during the summer), did not. Events were approaching a climax. When complaints criticizing the Council's action were circulated around the city, they took action. The refugee churches were closed down until the following Easter (1561). They were not to re-open.

Readers might be wondering what had been happening at the Flemish church in Frankfurt since its opening in September 1555. Its congregation was smaller than that of the Walloon church, from whose conflicts the Flemish church stood aside, although its minister Peter Dathenus took a close interest in what was going on. Denis describes Dathenus as "militant,"<sup>649</sup> and he was, indeed, a strong supporter of Houbraque and opponent of Perrussel. This did not, however, prevent him from taking a moderate line in the dispute that emerged at the Flemish church in 1562. For, although, in contrast to the Walloon church, many of the Flemish church left Frankfurt after the official closure, it was still existing and large enough to be the site of the dispute in 1562.

The dispute concerned baptism. Dathenus took the view that, in the circumstances (the refugee churches having been closed?) it was legitimate to present a child to a Lutheran minister for baptism. His colleague in the ministry, Gaspar Van Der Heyden, took the opposite view. Dathenus sought the advice of Calvin on an issue that had come to divide the church. In previous cases of this nature Calvin had taken a conciliatory line: 'though it was not ideal, given that the doctrine of the church was pure, it was acceptable in the circumstances' had been his approach. On this occasion, however, he took a different attitude, perhaps out of weariness with the endless disputes at the Frankfurt churches, perhaps out of despair at the hostility of the Lutherans. Whatever the reason for his change of attitude, he supported the position of Van Der Heyden, but under certain conditions.<sup>650</sup>

Dathenus was, understandably, irritated by the reply but it was an irritation that was no doubt softened by a letter from Calvin some months later which was notably emollient in tone.

The fact that the dispute at the Flemish church took place after the official closure of the two churches reflects the fact that they continued to exist in a semi-official capacity. Efforts were made by the refugees, particularly Perrussel, to have the churches reopened. But after further negotiations with the Lutheran ministers had come to nought, Perrussel himself left Frankfurt at the end of September 1561. The church then elected a new minister Arnaud Banc. He arrived in Frankfurt in December 1561 but, after the rejection of his confession of faith by the Council, left the city less than four months later. The

---

<sup>647</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans* p.363.

<sup>648</sup> *Ibid.*, p.374.

<sup>649</sup> *Ibid.*, p.355.

<sup>650</sup> *Ibid.*, p.389.

semi-official status of the churches nevertheless lasted until 1567 when they passed into semi-clandestinity. On a more positive note it is worthwhile to record that Perrussel was later reconciled with Houbraque as well as with Calvin. A sign of his renewed respectability was his presence, with Beza, at the ecumenical discussions at St Germain which followed the Colloquy of Poissy in 1561, "the high-water mark of Protestantism in France."<sup>651</sup>

The refugee churches in Frankfurt do not leave a happy legacy. Their endless quarrels and conflicts do not reflect well on a Christian community. The attitude of the Lutheran church was also relentlessly hostile. To the uninitiated, the fact that two Christian communities should tear into each other in the way they did must appear profoundly shocking, not least because of the mutual respect Luther and Calvin had held for each other.<sup>652</sup> Undoubtedly the churches were the product of circumstances; of the relentless southwards march of 'orthodox' Lutheranism from its North German stronghold. But it is unfortunate to have to record that the refugee churches themselves contributed to the hardening of confessional differences which made the possibility of any union between the Reformed and Lutheran traditions increasingly remote.

### ***5.7 The Stranger churches in London – The aftermath***

The restoration of the stranger churches on the accession to the English throne of Elizabeth was, contrary to the expectations of some of their former members, no sure thing. When Anthony Ashe, heading a delegation from the refugee congregation in Emden,<sup>653</sup> went to London to renegotiate the return of the stranger church's privileges (presumably the Dutch church), he found that things did not run smoothly.<sup>654</sup> Ashe made it clear on his return to Emden that the unexpected lack of sympathy for the strangers' cause that he had met in London stemmed from the subversive pamphlets of Goodman and Knox - pages 108-109 and 114.

This was indeed 1559 and not the very different atmosphere of the late 1540's: there was to be no Edwardian Prague spring and no Trojan horse to reform the church of England along the lines of the best reformed churches of continental Europe. The religious settlement of 1559 was 'placed upon a square stone to remain constant' - page 114. In these circumstances it might seem remarkable that the 'stranger' churches were restored at all.

It appears that an important factor in their restoration was an economic one. England may not have been in the situation of the Duchy of Cleves and its economic capital Wesel, but there was a general awareness of the extent to which the country had become dependent on imports. A comprehensive list of money spent on necessary and unnecessary goods brought into the Port of London was presented to the Queen's chief minister in 1559. It included: 3,000 pounds for pins, 10,000 for satin and silk, 2,500 for gloves and 8,000 for hats. He was advised to place a ban on the import of such products. But Cecil had other ideas: what today would be called 'import substitution' whereby domestic production would replace imports. Elizabeth's chief minister had, after all, acted as secretary to Protector Somerset so would have been closely involved with the Glastonbury project for

---

<sup>651</sup> Carter Lindberg, *The European Reformations*, p.272.

<sup>652</sup> Herman J Selderhuis, 'Calvin and Wittenberg', Herman J.Selderhuis ed, *The Calvin Handbook*, pp. 57-58.

<sup>653</sup> See comment on page 115.

<sup>654</sup> Andrew Pettegree, 'The Marian Exiles and the Elizabethan Settlement' *Marian Protestantism*, p.145.

establishing the weaving of Continental-style worsteds.<sup>655</sup> Many such investment proposals now put before the chief minister did indeed involve foreigners. One such proposal concerned a group of Italian silk-weavers; it was suggested to Cecil that they might be persuaded to journey from Geneva to London to set up their looms if they were allowed to enjoy freedom from custom duty on their goods and protection from competition for ten years. They were also to be provided with a house and allowed a church in which the Gospel might be preached to them in Italian.<sup>656</sup>

Pettegree reflects on the apparent success of this 'import substitution' programme from lists of requests for denization recorded by the consistories of the stranger churches. These lists often recorded the trades of petitioners. In 1550, at the time of the original establishment of the stranger churches, requests for denization from members of the Dutch church had all been from people working in trades competing with English artisans: shoemakers, cobblers, tailors and woodworkers - joiners and chestmakers. By contrast, in 1561, most of the petitioners were weavers, of whom among the 30 weavers, nine were silk weavers. Shoemakers and woodworkers had dropped right down the list. From the French church, of the 34 weavers who requested denization, 28 were silk weavers while there were also 41 hatters, glovers and cappers, makers of those superfluous goods whose import was so much resented.<sup>657</sup>

Whatever economic advantages it was thought would be gained from the foreign immigrants, there was no intention that their churches should be restored on the same basis as that which had obtained during the reign of Edward VI, a situation that had so irritated the then bishop of London, Nicholas Ridley. After 1560 the stranger churches no longer comprised an autonomous 'corpus corporatum et politicum' and they were obliged to accept a superintendent who was not a minister elected from their own membership but the bishop of London.<sup>658</sup> It was a happy circumstance for the churches that their first superintendent under the new regime was none other than Edmund Grindal, recently installed as bishop of the capital. Grindal would undoubtedly have felt quite at home in the resurrected stranger church, for, as Collinson wryly observes, "there was, after all, another model much less to his taste: the queen's chapel with its lights and crucifix."<sup>659</sup> Maybe there were to be no 'trojan horses' in Elizabethan England, but Grindal was nevertheless aware of the positive influence that the stranger churches could still have on his own church which, in a letter to Calvin he described as "not so settled as all good men wished and at first hoped."<sup>660</sup>

Although there may have been aspirations within the immigrant community that the position of superintendent could have been occupied by one of their own, especially the distinguished former elder of the church Jan Utenhove, the foreign congregations very soon appreciated Grindal's presence and support. When the dean of Westminster ordered two members of the French stranger congregation to worship in their parish church, Grindal upheld the rights of the French church and in 1565 ordered all the clergy of his diocese not to admit foreigners to communion in their parishes

---

<sup>655</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, p.140.

<sup>656</sup> *Ibid.*, p.140. This would be state-subsidised competition of the type which would be condemned by today's free market/liberal economists. The silk weavers would almost certainly have been from among those who moved to Geneva from Luca - see pages 54-55.

<sup>657</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.146-147.

<sup>658</sup> Patrick Collinson, 'The Foreign Reformed Churches of London', *Godly People*, p.253.

<sup>659</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.129.

<sup>660</sup> *Ibid.*, p.130.

unless they brought the written consent of their own ministers.<sup>661</sup> Of this intervention the clerk of the French consistory at the time noted in 'his' minutes: "Acte de levesque remarquable."<sup>662</sup>

Three features of the life of the stranger churches in the Elizabethan period warrant our attention. Firstly, doctrinal and other disputes which emerged at the churches which were accompanied by what might loosely be called the rise of Calvinist orthodoxy. Secondly, the involvement of the churches with the government's political and economic regulation. And thirdly, the work of the consistories in both social control and the provision of a wide range of social services such that the churches came to conform to what we described as the 'tennis club model' at the beginning of this study.

### 5.7.1 *Doctrinal and other disputes*

The French stranger church started off its renewed life in the embarrassing situation of having selected two ministers to head their church. A group of elders had requested the Geneva church to send them a minister and Calvin had obliged by releasing to them Nicholas des Gallars, one of his trusted lieutenants. Prior to des Gallars's arrival in London, however, Pierre Alexandre, former minister of the French refugee church in Strasbourg, prebend of Canterbury and friend of Cranmer had been ministering to the church for whose restoration he was in no small way responsible. The congregation understandably felt indebted to Alexandre, yet their own elders, or an important part of them, had invited a minister from Geneva to resume the pastoral office. This was the first indelicate situation in which the stranger churches placed Grindal who worked hard to find a solution satisfactory to both men. In the ensuing power struggle the church could be regarded as the ultimate loser because if Alexandre lost out against des Gallars when he left England around the New Year 1562, Des Gallars did not remain much longer in London, returning to the continent of Europe in June 1563 where he subsequently took up the post of minister at the reformed church in Orléans.

The dispute between des Gallars and Alexandre was personal not doctrinal. If there was any sociological factor discernible in the supporters of the two men, Pettegree suggests<sup>663</sup> it was one between members of the church dating from the Edwardian era, who naturally felt indebted to Alexandre for his help in restoring the church, and the new arrivals who tended to support des Gallars. In the intervening period Calvin's star had been rising and while the Geneva reformer does not seem to have been closely associated with the stranger churches in the Edwardian era,<sup>664</sup> in their reincarnation his influence was in the ascendant.

---

<sup>661</sup> This presumably excluded immigrants with no church.

<sup>662</sup> Patrick Collinson, 'The Foreign Reformed Churches of London', *Godly People*, p.255. On the other side of the 'divide', the English authorities were keen to contain the influence of the stranger churches in their midst and to ensure that their own nationals attended their local parish church and not one of the 'foreign' churches. Such 'controls' were not always successful. John Bodley, for example, became an elder of the French church in London.

<sup>663</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, pp.158, 160 and 162.

<sup>664</sup> When his name had been invoked in the context of criticism that a newcomer had made of practices at the stranger church which did not agree with those of Geneva, Calvin's response was a letter to the whole French congregation "sharply reproving those who raised dissension by making an idol of me and a Jerusalem of Geneva" Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities*, p.72.

In this sense Calvinist orthodoxy can be seen to be associated with des Gallars who, during his ministry at the church of just three years, issued a *Forme de Police* which was essentially a shortened version of à Lasco's *Forma ac Ratio* marginally amended, but the changes, as Pettegree points out "though subtle, were of some significance."<sup>665</sup> The overall effect was to reduce the 'democratic' element in à Lasco's order and move it in a more authoritarian direction. Calvin had never been a great fan of the weekly *prophesy* as it originated in Zurich whereby "church members who had questions or doubts about points advanced by the pastor in his Sunday sermon could submit their questions to the elders for discussion at the next prophesy"<sup>666</sup> and under des Gallars's *Forme de Police* its frequency was reduced, the regular mid-week exercise being replaced by a sermon. Greater emphasis, in contrast, was placed on the *coetus* the regular meeting of ministers and elders for, inter alia, mutual reproof and admonition. In the case of elections to the consistory, universal suffrage was maintained 'for the present' but the order anticipated a greater control over the community's choice."<sup>667</sup>

If the French church eventually came to be seen as a bastion of orthodoxy, a rather different image emerged from the Dutch church. However, the two churches shared one similarity in that they both started out, as if by mistake, with two ministers. Peter Delenus had been chosen to serve as minister at the Dutch church but before he could arrive in London his place had been filled, ex officio, by Adrian van Haemstede, sometimes referred to as the John Foxe of the Netherlands for his martyrology which he completed just prior to his arrival in London. Unlike the protagonists in the French church, however, Haemstede's behaviour was initially eirenic. He appears to have had no pretensions to head the church and seems to have been quite content to play second fiddle to Peter Delenus. Haemstede played an active and constructive role at the church and it was only in July 1560, well over one year after his arrival in London that a problem arose; he was said to have met with certain anabaptists.

It is worth while remembering that this was not the first time a 'doctrinal' problem had occurred at the Dutch church. Given the overriding importance that à Lasco placed on congregational instruction as a tool to combat 'heresy' in the Edwardian era "it must therefore come as something of a shock that the first serious challenge to the doctrine of the church came from within its own ranks ; indeed from one of the church's own ministers."<sup>668</sup>

In order to give the stranger church a wider influence beyond that of its own members, à Lasco had instituted a series of mid-week scripture lectures in Latin to accompany the prophesy in Dutch. The Old Testament lecture was given to the distinguished Hebrew scholar Gualter Delenus, who with Marten Micron was minister at the church. That one of the lectures was used by Delenus to criticize doctrines and practices of the church must have come as something of a thunderbolt. The points that he questioned were: the function of godparents at baptism, the practice of kneeling at communion,<sup>669</sup>

---

<sup>665</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, p.163.

<sup>666</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.71.

<sup>667</sup> Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities*, p.163.

<sup>668</sup> *Ibid.*, p.64.

<sup>669</sup> If Gualter Delenus criticised kneeling at communion, it may reasonably be assumed that this was the practice of the church. Yet, given the importance that à Lasco is said to have placed on sitting at communion - page 124 - there must be some substance to the comment made - page 121 - that *Forma ac Ratio* had something of a theoretical document about it rather than one that was actually put into practice by the stranger churches in the Edwardian period. Pettegree bizarrely suggests that the

and his declaration that the article on the descent into Hell ought to be removed from the Confession of Faith.<sup>670</sup> Admonished by the consistory - in this case the weekly meeting of ministers and elders - Gualter Delenus was brought to admit that he had erred and the quarrel was patched up.

Things did not move so smoothly for Gualter Delenus's son Peter, minister at the Dutch church during the Elizabethan period. When questioned by the consistory Haemstede stated that he had not met with anabaptists because he agreed with them but because he wished to reform them. This, he might have added, was, after all, exactly what Calvin had done when minister at the refugee church in Strasbourg. However, Haemstede's colleagues were hardly satisfied with his own explanation and demanded that he openly confess and repudiate his fault.<sup>671</sup> This Haemstede refused to do. Thus began a dispute that lasted over two and half years only ending with Haemstede's death at the end of 1562. What had begun as a dispute about behaviour eventually became one about doctrine, as Haemstede's subsequent provocative behaviour encouraged both Peter Delenus and Jan Utenhove to show that the Dutchman, by his writings, actually approved of the doctrines of the anabaptists he had met.

Anabaptists, under the influence of Menno Simons, may have become a peaceable community but were known to hold opinions "which were fundamentally erroneous, concerning the nature of Christ himself. Specifically, it was a tenet of the Mennonites that Christ's flesh was not derived from the Virgin Mary but was a 'celestial flesh.'"<sup>672</sup> Whether or not Haemstede actually subscribed to this doctrine "he adopted the formal position that the Christological question was 'circumstantial' not 'fundamental'."<sup>673</sup> Not surprisingly this put him beyond the pale and, combined with his contempt for church discipline, led to his excommunication. It also led to the excommunication of his supporters. As often in such cases it is not clear to what extent Haemstede's sympathisers actually supported his supposed doctrinal position or were simply protesting about the way he had been treated by the consistory. At all events, the affair left a scar on the church that was not easily healed.

If the Haemstede affair was regarded by some as a dispute not about doctrine but about the way the discipline of the church was applied by the consistory, a similar dispute where behaviour became inter-mixed with doctrinal questions was later reflected at the French church in their encounter with the two Spanish Protestants Casiodoro de Reina and Antonio del Corro. A Spanish protestant in the age of Philip II was, as Collinson reminds us, the "freest of free spirits."<sup>674</sup> The two men were among a group of young monks from the monastery of San Isidoro del campo near Seville who developed protestant leanings. De Reina, who is best known for the first translation of the Bible into Spanish (Castilian) subsequently moved to London where, having initially attached himself to the French church, he later formed a Spanish congregation that was granted the use of the church St Mary Axe for worship. He composed a confession of faith in which, Collinson tells us, were 'traces of unsoundness easily detected by sensitive noses.' Reports of de Reina's contact with anti-trinitarian circles in Geneva were then picked up by leaders of the French church in London. But it was Corro

---

"strictures must have been directed" at the Church of England *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, page 64 footnote no 80.

<sup>670</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, p.64.

<sup>671</sup> *Ibid.*, p.169.

<sup>672</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.137.

<sup>673</sup> *Ibid.*, p.137.

<sup>674</sup> Patrick Collinson, 'Calvinism with an Anglican Face', *Godly People*, P.234.

who was said to have given proof of this unsoundness, though this 'evidence' came from the embarrassing source of an intercepted private letter. It is interesting to note that, in a later commission of enquiry reconvened under Grindal, by then Archbishop of Canterbury, the commission found in favour of de Reina on all points while Corro, whose behaviour had done so much to disfavour him, who had been excommunicated by the Italian church that he had joined in London and who had been barred from all service in the French Reformed church, subsequently found employment in the Church of England as a lecturer at the Temple.

Throughout these troubles Grindal had played a remarkably conciliatory and tolerant role while, in contrast, the consistories of the Dutch and French churches had been intent on capturing their prey. Whether this reflected 'Calvinism with an Anglican face'<sup>675</sup> or 'Calvinism with a Human Face'<sup>676</sup> the greatest irony of all is that the wide latitudinarianism in doctrine for which the Church of England has become notable - or notorious - according to taste, can be said to have begun with none other than the godly Edmund Grindal.

### **5.7.2 Political and Economic regulation**

While the stranger churches began their second life during the reign of Elizabeth in somewhat muted tone, as time went on they acquired a sort of respectability not least as a partner of the government in political and economic regulation.

The import substitution policy, to which reference has already been made - page 150 - was followed by the direct involvement of the stranger churches in capital investment projects. One such project involved the revival of the flagging economic prosperity of Sandwich with the introduction of Dutch workmen to make bays and says and other cloths new to England. These men were not to be new immigrants but craftsmen and their families already resident in London and members of the stranger churches. The craftsmen concerned seem to have been selected by the ministers of the Dutch church. Peter Delenus assisted in the establishment of a church in Sandwich for the community in 1561.

The harassment of the immigrants in London and the consequent difficulty for them in finding accommodation persuaded the ministers at the stranger churches that only acquisition of denizen status would provide their congregations with the necessary security to maintain a satisfactory life in London. Concerted and ultimately successful lobbying of the government led to a marked increase in the number of denizens within the stranger congregations. The idea first mooted in 1553 that no stranger should be eligible for a patent of denization unless he was a member of the stranger churches had been revived.<sup>677</sup> The churches thus became involved with the work of government. In 1562 the major enrolment of new denizens took place after a list had been compiled by the ministers of the stranger churches. For the government this operated as a form of stamp of approval of and guarantee for the good behaviour of the applicant concerned.

Throughout the closing years of the century there was rising hostility shown towards the immigrants from local workmen accompanied with occasional outbursts of xenophobia. The fact that the authorities were able to withstand these pressures and be generally supportive of the immigrants was

---

<sup>675</sup> Patrick Collinson, 'Calvinism with an Anglican Face', *Godly People*, pp. 213-244.

<sup>676</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, pp.125-152.

<sup>677</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, p.142.

undoubtedly in large part due to the good stead in which the stranger churches had come to be held by the government.

### 5.7.3 *The social and welfare work of the consistories*

Any person who thinks that the role of a consistory is limited to personal admonition would be pleasantly surprised by reading Andrew Pettegree's *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*. The range of activities undertaken and, perhaps more important, the effort put into them by the stranger churches, is staggering. The churches appear to have undertaken the work of several departments of a modern government at once and, in certain instances, could be seen to be acting as something like a modern welfare agency.<sup>678</sup>

Their work as executors of wills is as good an example as any. Ensuring that legacies reached the correct destination when most testators left assets to beneficiaries not only in England but also on the continent of Europe, was a formidable task. More generally control was seen as a means to welfare, not only spiritual but practical. The insistence that marriages at the church should only take place with parental consent may have been extremely irksome in cases where the parent, as must often have been the case, was resident overseas but this procedure was not without its beneficial side. At a time when church members were often transient visitors to England, the procedure could be seen as a check on bigamy where a wife had been abandoned overseas and a new one taken in London. Undesirable marriages, which the potential partners would themselves later come to see as such, were often avoided. Elsewhere, an enormous amount of time was spent by the consistory in endeavoring to patch up inter-marital disputes.

The churches took an active role in regulating the business practices of the congregation. The consistories dealt with a steady stream of cases concerning debt, breach of contract, and apprenticeship agreements. On occasion the terms of an apprenticeship agreement might even be ratified in the consistory. Expectations of the help that the consistory could give the congregation in their commercial activities was high. But there were limits: "a woman of the Dutch community had to be told to look elsewhere when she wanted to use Austin Friars for the sale of the goods of a deceased friend, and asked permission to advertise the sale from the pulpit."<sup>679</sup>

Much of the welfare work of the church was concerned with the sick and the dying and here aid went beyond its own members and stretched into the immigrant community as a whole. As Pettegree states:

The concern of the ministers to succour any fellow countrymen in evident need, taken with the generous response of foreigners to this endeavour, argues strongly for a sense of community which went beyond the frontiers of the gathered church community. The stranger churches had for the foreign community a social role which for many was as important as their spiritual function - - Times of crisis made explicit what was, in fact, always the case: that the ministers and elders recognized a responsibility to maintain the community in

---

<sup>678</sup> This, however, could be seen as part of the Reformed tradition being a feature of the work of consistories elsewhere. See Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, chapter 14.

<sup>679</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, p.198.



distress or hardship, and that their concern extended far beyond those who formally submitted to the discipline of the church; indeed it embraced the whole foreign community.<sup>680</sup>

What are the salient features of the stranger churches, in their second life, in the context of the questions posed at the beginning of this thesis? They are that of a broad church, not a conventicle (footnote page 50), not all Scarisbrick's Protestants of the 'hotter sort.' Both the congregations and their ministers, showed signs of fraction rather than unity. Yet, the broad nature of the church showed that they had the ability if not to contain wide divergences of doctrine at least not to be destroyed by them. They were a sustaining force to the Reformed congregations on the continent of Europe, particularly in the Netherlands. In England they continued to be a rallying point, albeit covert, to those supporting further reform of the national church. Their influence and loyalties spread beyond their own membership and thus conform to the 'tennis club' model evoked at the beginning of this study.

From a social point of view the influence of the stranger churches was certainly a positive one.

---

<sup>680</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London*, p.205

## Chapter 6: Conclusions

When one reads of the life of the refugee churches touched on in the last chapter, the life of the English church in Geneva seems to come from a different world. In contrast to the peaceable community portrayed in Chapter 3, disputation and faction seem to be the order of the day. This is as true of what might be called the 'flagship' refugee church of Strasbourg, as of any other.

The refugee church in Strasbourg<sup>681</sup> was the child of Martin Bucer who, no doubt taking advantage of Calvin's recent arrival in the city, conceived the idea of creating a church for French speakers. The church opened its doors in 1538. Following the initial ministry of Calvin, there were four other ministers at the church before its closure in 1563. Twenty five years can be counted as a long life by the standards of a XVI century refugee church and one of the ministries - that of Jean Garnier - lasted ten years. Yet, each ministry appears to have something ephemeral or impermanent about it, except that of Calvin which, admittedly, occupies only three pages of the seventy nine that Philippe Denis devotes to his history of the church.<sup>682</sup>

In what resides this feeling of impermanence given to the reader? It is undoubtedly in the disputes which arose at the church, their common feature being that - with the possible exception of the ministry of Guillaume Houbraque - they were as much personal as theological and that they involved, in varying degrees, criticism of their minister by the congregation. But criticism has its own rationale and a church is influenced by the background in which it lives. This was as true for the French church in Strasbourg as for any other.

With its liberties long established, Denis states "Strasbourg a été dans les premiers temps de la Réforme, une véritable ville libre autonome dans sa politique étrangère et indépendante dans ses choix religieux."<sup>683</sup> Yet, as the sixteenth century progressed many in the city felt that this independence was increasingly under threat, both from the kingdom of France as well as from the Emperor. The latter found expression in the Augsburg Interim in 1548 and, subsequently, in 1555, in the Peace of Augsburg which gave official recognition to the Lutheran church within the Empire but not to other Protestant confessions. These events were not without their effect on the congregation of the Strasbourg refugee church.

Thus, during the twenty five years of its existence the background to the French church in Strasbourg became increasingly unfavourable and, one might add, unstable, as the confessional background hardened. This is well reflected in the movements of Peter Martyr. Like Bucer, Martyr left Strasbourg following the Interim and took up a university post at Oxford in Edwardian England. Bucer did likewise, though at Cambridge. Bucer died in England but, following the death of Edward VI in 1553, Martyr returned to Strasbourg, but not for long. Finding that the situation under the Peace of Augsburg was no better than that under the Interim, he subsequently left Strasbourg and moved to Zurich in 1556. The uncongenial atmosphere of increasing Lutheran intransigence had made continued existence in Strasbourg untenable for him. Certainly this atmosphere was not something confined to the city of Strasbourg but spread outwards to the surrounding regions, not least to the

---

<sup>681</sup> The French church in Strasbourg and the refugee church in Strasbourg are here treated as synonymous.

<sup>682</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, pp. 66-145.

<sup>683</sup> *Ibid.*, p.50.

smaller refugee churches of the Rhine Valley, who fell under the ambit of the refugee church in Strasbourg. Reflective of this is the fact that ministers at these churches seem to circulate between them almost as rapidly as the Marian exiles from England had moved between the various places of exile established by them on the continent of Europe.

An unstable environment can give rise to an atmosphere of questioning and criticism and criticism of their minister appears to be an aspect of all the churches we have looked at, apart, perhaps, from the churches in Aarau and Geneva. In Frankfurt, both at the Walloon and the English church, congregationalism became officially established, particularly at the latter.

It was, admittedly, of an eccentric variety combining congregational church order with the *Book of Common Prayer*<sup>684</sup> at the English church and congregational church order but under magisterial control at the Walloon church. No doubt the intimacy of the refugee church naturally gave rise to congregationalist tendencies (page 72) but it is interesting to note that such pressures did not occur in the 'churches under the cross' either in the Netherlands or in France.

If one excludes the 'eccentric' cases of the refugee churches in Frankfurt one might say that the first 'official' manifesto for Congregationalism appeared with Jean Morély's *Treatise on Discipline and Christian Government* in 1562. This work was not pleasing to supporters of Presbyterianism and Morély was subsequently excommunicated from the French Reformed church. The French national synod of 1562 condemned the book for its 'wicked doctrine tending to the dissipation and confusion of the church'<sup>685</sup> and his treatise was burnt in Geneva.<sup>686</sup> Morély had some supporters but, as in a previous case that we have seen, this support was not so much based on sympathy with his ecclesiological views as on hostility at how he had been treated by the consistories.

To many of us the word refugee suggests a form of suffering. Calvin after all was a refugee and undoubtedly missed his home country; but this form of suffering was hardly akin to physical persecution. The churches under the cross in the Netherlands and in France do not seem to have had much time for congregationalism. Indeed, it was probably regarded by them - if they ever had the opportunity to think of it at all - as a luxury of exile. As Benedict says, talking of the reformed churches in France, "the proliferation of independently established churches across a broad kingdom in the face of governmental persecution suggested to those involved that they needed to cooperate with each other to maintain unity of doctrine and discipline."<sup>687</sup> Such a system stood the churches in good stead when, in subsequent years, military action was proposed: "Provincial synods played a central role in these military preparations and in the process revealed the utility of presbyterial-synodal forms for the mobilization and defence of an underground church."<sup>688</sup> Similar comments could be made of the help given by the London stranger churches to their confederates in the Netherlands whether it was in the provision of ministers or financial or military aid.

In all cases the adoption of the 'Presbyterian-synodal' system facilitated contact between the stranger churches and the continent. The contacts were such that the first synods of the Dutch Reformed

---

<sup>684</sup> As revised in *The Liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555*.

<sup>685</sup> Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.136

<sup>686</sup> *Ibid.*, p.136.

<sup>687</sup> *Ibid.*, p.135

<sup>688</sup> *Ibid.*, p.143.

Church (churches then under the cross) were organized in Wesel (1568) and Emden (1571) to which, in the case of Emden, both the Dutch and French stranger churches in London were invited. These contacts were invaluable in helping solve problems that arose at the churches as, for example, in one that tormented the Dutch stranger church in London involving the minister Godfrey van Wingen. What attitude should be taken by the church in London towards the outbursts of iconoclasm of fellow brethren in the Netherlands? Attitudes were divided. This and other issues racked the ministry of Godfrey van Wingen at the Dutch stranger church for some years. The 'presbyterian-synodal' system may not always have been successful in solving such problems, but they could be said to have lowered the temperature of them and contributed to eventual solutions.

Of all the problems facing the refugee churches in these years it was the rise of what came to be called 'Lutheran orthodoxy' that was the largest of them. It is sad to record that the refugee churches heightened the debate between the two Protestant traditions and widened the divide between Reformed and Lutheran confessions. It is also ironic to note that in this issue Calvin himself was not without blame. Ironic because, of all the reformers, it was Calvin who strove most to bring the Lutheran and Reformed traditions together. This is why the Geneva reformer took the interest that he did in the refugee churches and why he became so distressed at the conflicts that they were causing with the Lutheran churches. Yet, as Pettegree states:

The Reformed had from the beginning treated their opponent (Joachim Westphal) with an unconcealed contempt. Calvin's initial reluctance to answer Westphal, his dismissal of the *Iusta Defensio* as a 'silly and poisonous book' and repeated references to 'Luther's apes' are all indications of a serious misjudgement of Westphal's abilities and of the potential appeal of his rallying cry against the Reformed.<sup>689</sup>

It is also worth remembering the words of Philippe Denis in this context. Speaking of the Lutheran ministers in Frankfurt he says:

Bientôt, cependant, les luthériens découvrirent que l'Eglise française, l'Eglise anglaise et, à partir de septembre 1555, l'Eglise flamande se donnaient des institutions, prenaient du développement, bref vivaient, sans qu'ils fussent consultés, ni même informés de rien à leur propos. Les étrangers échappaient totalement à leur contrôle : une pareille chose leur était difficilement tolérable.<sup>690</sup>

Was this not exactly the point made by Nicholas Ridley, bishop of London, about the stranger churches in the Edwardian period? Grindal himself advised English congregations overseas, which came under his jurisdiction as bishop of London, to follow local church practices.<sup>691</sup> Perhaps the fault was not entirely on the Lutheran side. Nevertheless, only the refugee churches outside the empire avoided this unfortunate confessional backcloth though it is interesting to note that Denis records one exception, that of the 'Villages Welches' in the county of Nassau-Sarrewerden:

Les réfugiés dans les villages welches et les luthériens dans le reste du comté vécurent en si bonne intelligence que deux siècles plus tard l'inspecteur Beltzer - - tenait encore à célébrer le

---

<sup>689</sup> Andrew Pettegree, 'The London Exile Community', *Marian Protestantism*, p.79.

<sup>690</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.350

<sup>691</sup> Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal*, p.171.

fait, jugé à l'époque extraordinaire : 'La maison de Nassau-Sarrebruck, déclarit-il, s'est adonnée depuis le temps les plus anciens à la religion évangélique-luthérienne, elle a cependant de tout temps traité les réformés avec une courtoisie et une bienveillance qui n'ont la pareille dans aucun Etat de L'Allemagne évangélique.'<sup>692</sup>

One is compelled to ask, could this situation not have been produced elsewhere?

The English church in Geneva differed from the other refugee churches in many ways. The background in which the church lived was very supportive. Not only did it exist under the auspices of Calvin but it did so without the existence of Lutheran animosity. The demise of the guilds, with the fall of the traditional church, also reduced whatever hostility might have been felt for the English newcomers by local artisans. But, even with this supportive background the peaceable nature of the church appears remarkable when compared with that of the refugee churches elsewhere. Aarau was, admittedly, also a peaceful community, but it should be remembered that the English church there was much smaller than that in Geneva and its life very short indeed, less than one and a half years.

It is suggested in this thesis that the peaceable life of the English community in Geneva had much to do with the nature of the church and its liturgy. The English church in Geneva was not a church of 'religious extremists'<sup>693</sup> but latitudinarian in nature. Latitude is defined in the Oxford Dictionary as 'the angular distance of a place north or south of the equator' or, again, as 'regions with reference to their temperature and distance from the equator.' This suggests a range of incidences, not just one as is often implied when the term latitudinarian is taken to mean 'liberal', non-dogmatic, tolerant, easy-going, or something similar. A refugee church, by its nature, should tend to be broad, as its geographical situation did not provide for the luxury or possibility of several churches of different 'theological' tendencies in the same town or area. It should therefore include, for example, a Billy Graham as well as a Rowan Williams, who would not normally be found in the same church in their 'home country'. It would, of course, have been possible for an English exile to leave Geneva for a church in another place of refuge, but even by the standards of the Marian exiles, travel in the XVI century was not as easy as it has become in our own times. To travel from Geneva to Aarau or Frankfurt was not like moving to a church the other side of town. Nevertheless, the fact that there appears to have been less voluntary movement from Geneva – page 49 - than from other places of refuge of the English exiles suggests that the English refugees in Geneva were happy with their church, their compatriots, the inhabitants of Geneva or, indeed, all three. Sadly, the image associated with the church elsewhere was not that experienced by its adherents in Geneva.

For those exiles who lived through the conflicts at Frankfurt and would witness something similar in England later in the century, the interlude in Geneva was, indeed, a blessed one. There, a truly reformed church liturgy and order helped produce a unified and peaceful community. Perhaps their church was one without a compulsory confession of faith, or a compulsory subscription to the church register and Geneva a city where not every English exile resident in the city attended church on Sunday. The English exiles had indeed created a broad church in which to worship God and to associate with one another. It was undoubtedly a church that would have withstood potential conflict from doctrinal disputes which would, no doubt, have occurred at some stage had the church been of

---

<sup>692</sup> Philippe Denis, *Les Églises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans*, p.409.

<sup>693</sup> N.M. Sutherland, 'The English Refugees at Geneva, 1555-1559, *History Today*, December 1977, p.779.

longer life. But above all it was a church that possessed a liturgy dominated by prayer which could hardly leave the passer by unaffected.

As a recently arrived exile in Geneva might have wandered up to the cathedral of St Pierre on a foggy morning in November, perhaps he or she paused at the doors of Ste Marie la neuve. And, on hearing the voice of the minister intoning one of the prayers from the *Forme of the Common Prayers*, went into the church and was there reminded of the majesty of God, the wretchedness of mankind, but, above all, of God's love for us. This same liturgy also emphasised practicality, participation and community.

It was in this that resided the peaceable nature of the congregation of Ste Marie la neuve.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Manuscript Sources*

Whittingham, William, *Livre des Anglois* 1560 Archives d'état de Genève

### *Primary Sources*

*Livre des Bourgeois de l'ancienne république de Genève* J. Jullien Genève 1897 Archives d'état de Genève

*Livre des Habitants Tome 1 1549-1560* Librairie E Droz Genève 1957 Archives d'état de Genève

Leaver, Robin, *The liturgy of the Frankfurt Exiles 1555* Grove Liturgical Studies No 38, Grove Books, Bramcote 1984

Poullain, Valérand, *L'Ordere des Prieres et ministere Ecclesiastique, avec La Forme de Penitence Pub.& Certaines Prieres de L'Eglise de Londres, et la confession de Foy de L'Eglise de Glastonbury en Somerset 1552* EEBO editions

Pullanus, Valerandus, *Liturgia Sacra 1551-1555* – Dr A.C. Honders (ed) E.J Brill Leiden 1970

[Whittingham, William,] *The Service, Discipline and Forme of the Common Prayers and Administration of the Sacraments, used in the English Church of Geneva: as it was Approved by that Most Reverend Divine, M. John Calvin, and the Church of Scotland.* Nabu Public Domain Reprint USA 2011

Wood, Thomas, *A brieff discours off the troubles begonne at Franckford in Germany Anno Domini 1554 abowte the booke off common prayer and ceremonies* Schirat Heidelberg 1575

*The Book of Common Prayer*

### *Secondary Sources*

Alston, W.M. and Welker, M. (editors) *Reformed Theology: Identity and Ecumenicity* Grand Rapids Eerdmans 2003

Benedict, Philip, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* Yale 2002

Bouwsma, William J., *John Calvin – A Sixteenth Century Portrait* Oxford University Press 1989

Burn, J. Southerden, *History of Parish Registers* 1862

Chadwick, Henry, *The Early Church*, Penguin Books, 1993.

Collinson, Patrick, *Archbishop Grindal 1519-1583: The Struggle for a Reformed Church* Jonathan Cape 1979

Collinson, Patrick, *Godly People* The Hambledon Press 1983

Collinson, Patrick, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* Oxford - Clarendon Press 1967

Danner, Dan, *Pilgrimage to Puritanism: History and Theology of the Marian Exiles at Geneva 1555-1560* Peter Lang 1999

- de Gruchy, John W., *John Calvin : Christian Humanist & Evangelical Reformer* Lux Verbi 2009
- Denis, Philippe, *Les Eglises d'Étrangers en Pays Rhénans (1538-1564)* Société d'Édition « Les Belles Lettres » Paris 1984
- Dickens, A.G., *The English Reformation* Batsford 1964
- Doran, Susan, *Elizabeth 1 and Religion 1558-1603* London and New York, Routledge 1994
- Duffy, Eamon, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580* Yale University Press 1992
- Garrett, Christina Hallowell, *The Marian Exiles - A study in the origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* Cambridge University Press 1938
- Goose, Nigel, and Lien, Luu, (editors) *Immigrants in Tudor and Early Stuart England* Sussex Academic Press 2005
- Guy, John, *Tudor England* Oxford University Press 1988
- Heyer, Théophile, *Notice sur la colonie anglaise établie à Genève de 1555 à 1560. Mémoires de la société et d'archéologie de Genève* Vol 1X 1855
- Knappen, M.M., *Tudor Puritanism A chapter in the History of Idealism* Chicago University Press 1939
- Lindberg, Carter, *The European Reformations* Wiley-Blackwell 2010
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Thomas Cranmer* Yale University Press 1996
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* Allen Lane 1999
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *The Later Reformation in England 1547-1603* Macmillan 1990
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* Allen Lane 2003
- Martin, Charles, *Les Protestants Anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin 1555-1560* Genève, A Julien 1915
- Martin, Charles, *La famille Stafford et son conflit avec Calvin 1556* Genève 1918
- Mason, Roger, (editor) *John Knox and the British Reformations* Ashgate 1998
- Matheson, Peter, *Reformation Christianity* Fortress Press 2007
- McGrath, Alister E., *Christianity's Dangerous Idea* Harper Collins 2007
- McGrath, Alister E., *In the Beginning - The Story of the King James Bible* Hodder and Stoughton London 2001
- McGrath, Alister E., *Reformation Thought* Blackwell 1999



Naphy, William, *Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation* Westminster and John Knox Press 2003

Pettegree, Andrew, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* Clarendon Press Oxford 1986

Pettegree, Andrew, *Marian Protestantism* Scolar Press Aldershot 1996

Pettegree, Andrew, (editor) *Reformation World* Routledge London and New York 2000

Scarisbrick, J.J., *The Reformation and the English People* Basil Blackwell 1997

Selderhuis, Herman J., (editor) *The Calvin Handbook* William B Eerdmans 2009

Springer, Michael S., *Restoring Christ's Church: John à Lasco and the Forma ac Ratio* Ashgate 2007

Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *The Crisis of the seventeenth century, religion, the Reformation and social change* Harper & Row 1968

Vigne, Randolph, and Littleton, Charles, (editors) *From Strangers to Citizens – the Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550-1750* Sussex Academic Press 2001

Wood, Thomas, *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort in the year 1554 about the book of common Prayer and ceremonies* John Petherham London 1845

Wood, Thomas, *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort 1554 -1558 A.D.* Editor Edward Arber Elliot Stock London 1908

### **Articles**

Sutherland, N.M., 'The English Refugees at Geneva 1555-1560' *History Today* December 1977

### **Online**

DNB *Dictionary of National Biography*

### **GLOSSARY**

*Traditional church* is used in this thesis for the *Roman church*. This avoids the well known problems related to the use of the word *Catholic* as well as the fact that *Roman Catholic* only entered into official usage after the Council of Trent.

*Godly* is used where other observers might use the word *Puritan*. But, as explained in this thesis - particularly footnote to page 7 – the use of the word *Puritan* is fraught with complications. In terms of our own times *Godly* could be seen as broadly equivalent to *evangelical*.

*Minister and Pastor* are treated as one and the same in this thesis. All officials of the church in the Reformed tradition are regarded as 'ministers' and in the secondary literature, at least for this writer, this sometimes gives rise to confusion.

*Walloon* is used here where other observers might use the word *French*. Carter Lindberg describes the southern provinces of the Netherlands as the Walloon area, described in this thesis as the Southern Lower Countries. The designation Walloon has been used here to describe a church where the overwhelming numbers of its members come from the French speaking southern part of the Netherlands. Thus, there is reference to the *French* church in Strasbourg but the *Walloon* church in Frankfurt.

*Holy Communion* and *The Lord's Supper* have been treated as one and the same in this thesis.

Reference was made - page 86 - to the importance placed, throughout much of the Reformed tradition, to the suitability and preparedness of communicants wishing to participate in the Lord's supper. It should be remembered that, just as there was a difference between Zurich and Geneva over the locus of power (church or city council) over excommunication - page 41, so there was a difference between the two cities over access to communion. Benedict points out that Zurich eventually came to reserve the penalty of excommunication for those who rejected the teachings of the church, indeed after 1532 positively required sinners to participate in communion "because it was believed it might inspire them to improve." Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed*, p.31.