François Bonivard and his *Difformes Reformateurs*

W. G. NAPHY

Summary: *This article presents François Bonivard (the pre-Reformation Prior of Geneva's Cluniac monastery) and his **Des Difformes Reformateurs**, the premier example of his satirical and polemical skills. In this, he attacks the violence and immorality accompanying and undermining the Reformation. Opposed to the corruption of the "old" faith, he was a strong critic of the inflammatory preachers of the "new" as well as their followers' violence and avarice. This work emphasises that the desire for an ethical, non-violent Reformation (e.g. Erasmus and Castellio) could be found even in Calvin's Geneva.*

In the midst of the violence of the Reformation men who argued for an irenic approach to religious change and an ethical understanding of the Gospel were few indeed.¹ There is, however, every reason to assume that many people existed who had hoped that reforming the Church and Christendom would produce new societies not new wars. The previous influence of Humanism, so little marked by the animosity which would become such a feature of later reform, would lead one to expect that in various parts of western Europe there must have been individuals and groups quietly despairing of the atrocities and inhumanities perpetrated in the name of Christ. Some figures leap to mind instantly: the great humanist himself, Erasmus; the grand exponent of toleration, Castellio; the Meaux group; Marguerite, Queen of Navarre.² For the most part these singular figures, islands of reason surrounded by the ever more violent sea of confessional hatred, were swamped early in the century. The Meaux group was scattered, Erasmus and Castellio fled to the safety and solace

of Basel while Marguerite was followed by Navarrese rulers of a somewhat more violent nature.

However, in Geneva (a most surprising place indeed — despite its associations with Castellio) one finds another lone exponent, François Bonivard, of this earlier tradition whose long life and societal position allowed him to hold to — in his view — a calmer, more reasoned, more ethical approach to reform. Here, as late as the 1560s, this desire for a reform stressing ethics, a care for the poor, and the improvement of morals found a voice.³ Perhaps in this Genevan one can glimpse others scattered across the Continent who, sharing in his obscurity, strove to articulate a path of reform which they hoped would end in charity and self-abasement rather than hatred and persecution.

Bonivard is one of the great figures of Genevan history. However, because he was unable to persuade the Genevan government to permit the publication of his works, his life and work have been overshadowed by other individuals and events. While it is true that his learning and historical importance (no less than his patriotism) have been appreciated in Geneva, to the wider historiographical world his life and works are less well known. Perhaps this situation can be rectified by a close examination of one of his shorter, yet most fascinating works, *Des Difformes Reformateurs*, an essay which he completed by 1562.

Before discussing this work in detail, it might be profitable to examine Bonivard's life and writings in a general, though brief manner. He was born in Seyssel, near Geneva, in 1493.⁴ The second son of Louis Bonivard, a councillor to the Duke of Savoy, his uncle, Urbain, was Prior of St-Victor, the Cluniac monastery which stood outside of Geneva's walls near the *Pont du Rhône*.⁵ He received a traditional ecclesiastical education at Pignerol, a *doctor utriusque juris* from Turin and finished at Freiburg (Brisgau) where he learned German. His uncle's death then recalled him to Geneva and the priorship.⁶

Almost immediately thereafter, Bonivard became entangled in Geneva's nascent nationalist movement. Soon after the (1519) execution of Berthelier — the nationalist leader (and Bonivard's cousin) — Bonivard fled Geneva; however, he was captured and imprisoned (at Grolée) until 1525. Bonivard returned to Geneva to reclaim his post and rejoin the nationalist cause under its new leader Hugues with whom he then clashed.⁷ Withdrawing yet again from Geneva, Bonivard was re-arrested by Savoy and languished in prison (1530-36; a fate immortalised in Byron's *Prisoner of Chillon*).⁸ Once freed by Bernese forces, he returned to a Geneva altered beyond all recognition: church property had been secularised, his monastery levelled for military purposes, his sacrifices forgotten.⁹ Destitute, Bonivard moved to Berne whence, with

Bernese support, he was able to gain a Genevan pension in 1538.¹⁰ Sustained by his pension, he returned to Geneva where he spent the remainder of his life trying to publish his writings and to cope with his four disastrous marriages.¹¹

Little is known about Bonivard's early writings apart from their titles.¹² Fortunately, we know more about his later works. By 1551, Bonivard had completed a draft of his *Chroniques de Geneve*, which charted the city's history to 1530.¹³ Henceforth, it would appear that Bonivard's writings survive intact.¹⁴ His works present a large oeuvre of six modern volumes spanning a diversity of disciplines. The depth and breadth of this collection is all the more astonishing as it was able to survive entirely in manuscript form until the mid-nineteenth century.

This then completes the survey of Bonivard's life and work. The man presented is an individual of learning. He was fluent in a number of languages and had been educated in the best traditions of Renaissance humanism.¹⁵ Bonivard had suffered greatly as a result of Geneva's Revolution and Reformation; he remained loyal to, though not uncritical of both. Despite his many misfortunes and tribulations his writings fail to exhibit any bitterness towards life though he reserves a substantial quantity of sarcasm and irony for those whom he feels have proved less than resolute in their implementation of the ideals of the Revolution and Reformation. Nowhere is his literary bile more obvious or biting than in the work under consideration — *Des Difformes Reformateurs*.

As one might expect from the work of an author of Bonivard's educational background, this treatise is laced with classical allusions. The work soars to the sublime levels of Ciceronian Latin and yet stoops to the humblest proverbs. Aristotelian quotations rub shoulders with peasant aphorisms. However, his classicism is not of the abundance or kind which one might expect. Bonivard also makes extensive use of contemporary sources to defend his critique of the religious ferment of his day. Nor is Bonivard above the casual yet pointed promotion of his own works. Perhaps the two most interesting elements in this work at first glance are his attempts to unite the contemporary reform movement with those of the past and his substantial reliance on medical imagery. All of this Bonivard packed into a closely worked, well-argued treatise which occupies less than thirty pages in the nineteenth-century published version.

Bonivard's classical allusions, while frequent, present no desire to impress with an obtuse display of erudition. He employs references familiar to anyone with a basic Latin education. This is an author who aimed to convince

and sway not overawe his readers. Thus, in passing he refers to the civil wars of Pompey and Caesar as well as the consternation Cicero felt as he viewed the death-throes of the Republic.¹⁶ He contrasts the amorous nature of classical Cupid with the avarice of the more contemporary Robin.¹⁷ He compares the demagogic preaching of some reformers with the tyrannical harangues of Julius Caesar and Alexander the Great.¹⁸ Bonivard labels the iconoclasm and violence associated with much reform preaching a product of the Gospel of Mars.¹⁹ Later, the Gospel preached in some areas is called the Gospel of Bacchus because of the licentiousness it has occasioned.²⁰ He has selected classical references from history and mythology meant to strike a resonant chord in his readers.

It is clear that the sparse use of classicisms is intentional and a comment on Bonivard's intended audience. His other works — his *Chroniques* excepted — have considerably more classical allusions and references. For example, one finds Socrates;²¹ Virgil, Lucian, Apuleius, Thucydides, Perseus, Livy and Seneca;²² Diomedes, Aulus Gellius and Aristotle.²³ Admittedly, many are but brief references but it seems that Bonivard feels more of a need to impress his readers by "name-dropping" in these works than in his *Reformateurs*.

His use of contemporary writers and sources, historical and mythological, is in a similar vein. The images come easily to him but they are not intended solely to ornament his treatise. He quotes from a letter of Luther to Frederick, Duke of Saxony, as evidence of Luther's prophetic prescience of the inherent dangers of preaching evangelical liberty.²⁴ Bonivard makes frequent use of Sleidan's work on the Reformation drawing special attention to the author's favourable editorial practices with regard to the morality of Lutheran princes.²⁵ An epistle of Duke George, attacking Lutheran morals, is presented and buttressed by Bonivard's assertion that he had seen a printed copy of the German original with his own eyes.²⁶ He draws upon the stories of Boccaccio delighting in the tale of the Neopolitan damsel who successfully and artfully resists her over-amorous sovereign.²⁷ He also shows an interesting penchant for Marot's cautionary tale, the Abbot and his Valet, using it twice.²⁸ These literary sources parade before the reader though Bonivard is not wholly dependent upon such works. He is happy to derive anecdotes on Lutheran morality from a merchant newly arrived from Frankfurt's fairs and even offers a diverting and sarcastic comparison of the Knights Errant of King Arthur's Round Table with, as he terms them, the officially tolerated Harlots Errant of some Protestant areas.²⁹

Bonivard also finds frequent opportunities to mention many of his favourite non-classical authors and tales in his other works. Rabelais is

mentioned on any number of occasions with Marot rather popular as well.³⁰ King Arthur, Tristan and Isoldre; Budé, Bibliander, Stumpf, and Erasmus are also used to support various points in his arguments.³¹ He also refers to works by Beatus Rhenanus; Petrarch; and various lesser lights such as Olivier of Castille, Arthur of Brittany and Amadis of Gaul.³²

A similar juxtaposition of the common and the learned occurs in Bonivard's use of proverbs. In the very opening lines of his essay he offers a quotation from Cicero: "quem fugiam scio, ad quem fugiam nescio."³³ He finds this so agreeable that but a moment later he gives the Latin proverb in full and provides a vernacular translation, in verse:

Bien scay qui doibz fuir eslire.
Mais vers qui, ie ne scauroie dire.³⁴

He gives a truism from Aristotle and then follows this immediately by a common French proverb drawn from the baker's oven (a lenfournee lon faict les pains cornuz).³⁵ A few brief lines later Bonivard uses a German saying which he claims arose from the fear of religious violence which the Catholics felt every time they heard the bells calling Protestants to worship: "Da leüttent mord glocken. La sonnent les cloches meurdrieres."³⁶ This incongruous mixing of philosophers with commoners continues. Plato and Aristotle are quoted and followed fast by everyday platitudes on horses and dogs.³⁷ Cicero and Aristotle, however, are clearly his favourite sources.³⁸ Bonivard also gives free rein to his love of Latin proverbs and vulgar verse even when the meaning could be expressed with less flair. For example, the superfluous use of (una-hirundo non facit ver):

Du printemps napporte nouuelle
Venante une seule arondelle.³⁹

Bonivard shows a similar casual regard for his own works. He mentions, in an aside, his *Chroniques*. He says he needs not elaborate a point as the details are already available there.⁴⁰ He also quotes a quatrain from his now lost *Menues Pensees*.⁴¹ This subtle self-promotion is equally apparent in Bonivard's off-hand reference to his six years in prison which was certainly his greatest claim to fame in Geneva.⁴² Touching undoubtedly, but the references were woefully unable to move the authorities to permit publication.

Two final areas must be mentioned in considering this work as a whole. Bonivard makes a concerted, though by no means lengthy attempt in his opening paragraphs to unite contemporary calls for ecclesiastical change with the valiant, albeit unsuccessful labours of Wycliffe, Hus and Jerome of Prague.

His treatment of these three is so truncated as to imply that the connection was commonly seen and appreciated, needing no elaboration or defence.⁴³ Greater effort is spent in attempting to maintain a medical image in diagnosing the ills of the late medieval church and in assessing the course of treatment — patient and preparative — which Bonivard says Luther adopted rather than the application of a dangerous yet thorough purgative.⁴⁴

One should not conclude from this that Bonivard undervalues the place of these harbingers of reform. He has a traditional Protestant view that the Church fell into decay with Constantine the Great's reign.⁴⁵ He also refers favourably to Hus, Wycliffe and the Waldensians in other places.⁴⁶ In common with many, Bonivard sees Hus not only as a precursor of reform but also a prophet of Luther himself.⁴⁷ Moreover, although critical of Luther's magisterial supporters he is pleasantly disposed to the reformer himself. For example, he says that Luther's name "signiffie clair" which also serves as a comment on the reformer's doctrines.⁴⁸

A few brief words should also be said on Bonivard's welcome use of various forms of humour. He quotes a cheerfully rude poem, composed he claimed, by "un bon compaignon," on the morals and motives of Henry VIII.⁴⁹ Delightful parodies are given of intemperate sermons by Protestants whose tacit support of violence Bonivard deplores.⁵⁰ Rather naturally his breeding and education as well as his distaste for violence, of which he was often a victim, bring forth a caustic attack on poorly trained ministers — in reality mere tradesmen — whose preaching is trite, whose learning barely extends to a functional grasp of their own language, and whose morals shocking.⁵¹ Finally, Bonivard ironically compares the Catholic and Protestants, locked in mortal combat on Christ's behalf with the participants in one of Spain's recurring fraternal wars. Both destroy their King while wishing him long life.⁵²

This brief treatise combines learning with the common touch. An appreciation of the wisdom of the philosophers with an acceptance of the native intelligence of the peasantry. The pathetic images of Christians at each others' throats are enlivened and lightened by bursts of ribald humour and biting satire. Bonivard proves himself a readable author and an effective polemicist. What is most noticeable by its near absence, however, is the use of Scripture. Bonivard, the trained humanist, former Prior and devotee of Reform quotes the Bible infrequently. There are four or five allusions to Christ's sayings, one of James, and a brief reference to the Old Testament injunction against sparing the rod.⁵³ Indeed, Bonivard's references to Islam are almost as frequent; thrice he mentions the law of Mohammed.⁵⁴

This reference to Islam is perhaps worth pausing over. Bonivard opens another of his treatises with the lines:

Si vous lisés Maethon historiographie Egyptien, Berosus Chaldien, Mochus et Estius Syrien, lalkoran des thurchz, Iosephe et le thalmud des Iuifs, Hesiodo poete grec, Tite Liue Romain, voire toute le bible, et principalement le premier liure de Moysse, vous y treuueres veritable demonstrance come les homes des tout temps hont tasche a se drecher honeurz diuins, et come vn chascun pays ha auancer vn Dieu pour soy, et honeur a icelluy appartenant.⁵⁵

The grouping of these together is somewhat surprising. Not only does Bonivard show remarkably evenhanded treatment of Moslems but also Jews. Another hint of his dislike of (violent?) anti-semitism can be found in his account of German attacks on Jews while discussing false miracles.⁵⁶

What appears, therefore, is a work finely balanced to appeal to (or annoy) all readers. This work has a bias — apparent in Bonivard's *corpus* generally — towards legal and literary (esp., poetic) allusions and genres instead of Biblical imagery and exposition. If one were pressed, one might say that his humanism is more in keeping with the concerns of the Italian variety rather than the Erasmian — though one would not want to stress this rather naive and simplistic point too far.⁵⁷ However, the most noteworthy general characteristic is the attempt to be balanced in criticising contemporary religious movements. As will be shown, the ideas, taking their lead from the style, continue this rather even-handed, though not always appealing approach as Bonivard turns his critical eye upon specific examples of *Difformes Reformateurs*.

As one might expect, Bonivard is critical of the existing Catholic structure and its timorous approach to necessary reforms. Pope Leo and others were unable or unwilling to apply themselves to finding a remedy for the debilitating disease infecting the Church.⁵⁸ This singular direct attack upon the clerical hierarchy reinforces the promise made in the opening lines of the essay in which Bonivard says that this present treatise will focus on the reformers as he has already discussed (in his previous work on papal tyranny), the evil — as well as the good — deeds of the Popes.⁵⁹ For the most part Bonivard remains true to his word. His references to Catholic abuses are oblique. For example, he notes the need for reform caused by papal ambition and avarice but the focus is on finding a solution rather than detailing the problem.⁶⁰ Likewise, in passing, Bonivard contrasts the Pope's antipathy towards marriage with his toleration of concubinage.⁶¹ Repeatedly and of greater importance, Bonivard evidences a sincere concern over what will replace papal tyranny.⁶² He fears

that anarchy will follow change as “il est beaucoup [sic] plus aysé a destruire le mal que a construire le bien.”⁶³

Many of Bonivard's references are in fact favourable towards Catholics, in a rather back-handed way. Routinely he contrasts the abuses and immorality of the Pope and his followers with the greater, publicly flaunted sinfulness of the Protestants, notably the Lutherans.⁶⁴ A particular tolerance and understanding is expressed for the position of many Catholics who would retain their “ancienne institution” rather than embrace those of the Protestants with their morals and illicit behaviour.⁶⁵ However, Bonivard is no promoter of Catholicism. For the rhetorical purpose of highlighting the perversions of the Reformers, he contrasts them unfavourably with the adherents of the old faith especially in matters of personal morality. This becomes the core of his complaint: “nous crions contre les papistes et faisons pys que eux; princes et peuples sont touz debordez.”⁶⁶

Bonivard makes equally short shrift of the radical wing of the Reformation, the Anabaptists. They are discussed in a passage which begins by examining two of Luther's critics. Bonivard mentions the strongly anti-Lutheran attacks of George Wechsel.⁶⁷ He then enlarges upon this theme with an account of the breach between Luther and Karlstadt. Karlstadt's attack on Luther's acceptance of a real corporal presence in the Eucharist is favoured by Bonivard as it is the position “comme aussy nous crions.”⁶⁸ This sacramentarian view, as well as Karlstadt's rejection of the retention of images in Lutheran churches, ended in Karlstadt's withdrawal to Basel. Here he came into contact with Oecalampadius and the opinions derived from their chief exponent, Zwingli. Bonivard says that he classifies himself with this latter group: “les sectateurz de cela les Zwingliens et sacramentaires, de la bende duquel nous sommes.”⁶⁹ From this dispute sprang countless other groups, Bonivard asserts, such as Anabaptists and Osiandrians. For Bonivard, this tendency to division and dispute was proof of the common Adamic heritage of all humans, a propensity to sin.⁷⁰ Sinfulness, avarice, envy, and ambition gave birth to this deplorable plethora of sects.⁷¹ With these two sweeping statements Bonivard dismisses the whole of the radical reformation.⁷² However, as will be shown, some of his ideas echo views more commonly and naturally associated with Anabaptists.

Having passed by both extremes of the religious debate, Bonivard is free to concentrate his mind on the motives, beliefs and actions of the leaders and exponents of the vast centre of the Reformation, the magisterial reformers. As will be seen, he is acerbic in his attacks on Lutherans but Bonivard's pen is at its sharpest when attacking the English Reformation. Bonivard's previously

mentioned good friend gave a concise poetic summary of the motives which led King Henry VIII to embrace the new fait.

Pourquoy le roy Henri iadis
 A l'Euangile si contraire,
 Par faictz, par escritz et par dictz
 Ores luy est si debonnaire?
 Desir dhauoir le reliquaire
 De Saint Tomas, et sa putain
 Espouser, luy hont faict ce faire,
 Et rendu dinhumain humain.⁷³

Bonivard expresses nothing short of contempt as he details Henry's amorous permutations. He believes that the base assertion of a fear of incest never entered Henry's mind until it became the key to Anne Boleyn's bedchamber. Consumed by desire, the King corruptly sought and obtained approval for his divorce, but only from a few. The majority, of both sides of the religious debate, refused him.

Henry then turned to crass bribery, offering the Pope a substantial sum. The Pope happily accepted the kindly donation but from fear of the Emperor denied the requested dispensation. Failing to find satisfaction along this avenue, Bonivard writes that Henry pressured the theologians of his realm to repudiate supremacy. Thus, the vicar of Rome was replaced by the temporal lord who claimed sovereignty over spirit and body. In his newly revealed capacity Henry was free to grant himself a divorce. Eventually tiring of Anne, Henry moved on. Bonivard, despairing of the wearisome roll-call of wives, sums up the sad state of affairs by saying "apres en print vne autre quil repudia et apres vne autre, si quil en eut vj, desquelles deux furent decapitees."⁷⁴

The bare recitation of Henry's self-serving duplicity and immorality is not enough for Bonivard. Taking his cue from the poem, which he increasingly appears to have authored, he says that Henry was moved by two base concerns. The English King did not accept the Gospel of Christ, far from it for he left the Mass intact.⁷⁵ Rather, he bowed before the Gospel of Cupid out of an all-consuming desire to wed his whore. Not content with this perversion he also gave himself to the Gospel of Robin. Coveting the wealth, the gold and gems of Thomas More's shrine, and by extension, that of the whole church, he resolved to have "ce bon hommeau" declared a heretic for supporting spiritual power over temporal. This done he stripped the shrine (and the church) and scattered the saint's ashes to the wind.⁷⁶

This is a ferocious attack indeed. Perhaps Bonivard's views were influenced by his contacts with English refugees in Geneva during the 1550s. He

also openly confesses a debt to Sleidan for the tale, assuring the reader that even more can be discovered there though he himself was unwilling to prolong the tale by dwelling on the salacious details.⁷⁷ Nevertheless, this is a strikingly hostile tirade coming as it does so soon after Elizabeth's accession and the restoration of Protestantism in England. Once again Bonivard's seemingly oblivious attitude towards political realities shines through. His sarcasm and disgust get the better of him. No clearer example of this can be found than the end of his account of the English Reformation, his searing epitaph to the dead King. "Cestuy donc estoit vn bon euangeliste, vn precieux reformateur d'Eglise, qui ha bien faict brusler ensemble deux de diuerse religion, lun pour contreuenir à la loy du pape, lautre pour contreuenir a celle de son mariage." Bonivard laments further, "mais quel emendement de vie sest ensuyui entre les autres Princes et subiectz pour la reception de l'Evangile?"⁷⁸

Bonivard is less poetic though no less critical in his discussion of other reforming Princes. He mentions the papal hypocrisy of demanding clerical celibacy while winking at concubinage but then turns his sights upon the Lutherans. Concubinage is fornication and a sin indeed but in no way comparable to the blatant and public adultery (or better, bigamy) of Philip of Hesse. Allowing one illicit affair is a Roman abuse, concedes Bonivard, but surely the cure for this ill is not the re-introduction of Old Testament bigamy.⁷⁹

The adultery of Philip, approved by leading Protestants, is then used as an occasion for a professional jibe at Sleidan. Bonivard moves from Hesse to the carousing of the Duke of Braunschweige, a good Catholic, who boasted of the extraordinary lengths to which he went in deceiving his wife. He was reputed to have had made a lifelike statue of his mistress, a lady-in-waiting to his wife, then arranged to have it declared dead and given a state funeral accompanied by multiple masses, his wife grieving profusely at the requiems. Freed from suspicion he pursued his adulterous affair for six or seven years, producing two children in the process.⁸⁰ At the end of this amusing and shocking tale Bonivard rounds on Sleidan whom Bonivard asserts is quick to denounce Braunschweige's affair while drawing a discreet veil of silence over the irregular marriage of Philip.⁸¹ The brevity and timing of the attack makes it all the more effective.

Later in the treatise, Bonivard reprises the immorality of Henry and Philip as a prologue to a brief yet sweeping denunciation of three leading Lutheran Princes. First, he examines the character of Count Wilhelm von Fürstenburg, a man whose virtues Bonivard derides, satirising him as a "yuroigne come vn landsknecht, larron come vn guascon, qui aussy estoit la plus part du temps enrage."⁸² He then delivers a broadside against the good House of Brandenburg.

The secular Albrecht of Brandenburg converted, claims Bonivard, because he coveted the wealth of the Church in his lands. Of course, he also feigned a concern for the overburdened poor.⁸³

The other Albrecht, Grand Master of the Order of Teutonic Knights is treated in detail. He had two supreme reasons for embracing Luther's preaching. First, he wished to wed into the Danish royal family. More importantly, he also desired to provide his heirs with an inheritance. All of these wishes came true as he secularised his sacred office and became an hereditary Prince. Bonivard finds this Albrecht's actions reprehensible for two reasons. He seems incensed at the conversion of an elective office into an hereditary one as though this constituted a breach of faith. Worse, this office had been designed, he says, to ensure that an adult male, able to lead the Knights into battle, was present to protect Christendom's eastern flank from the infidel. As a result of Albrecht's avarice and hypocrisy this important duty could devolve upon the head of a child.⁸⁴

Viewing all the many reasons for embracing the Reformation, Bonivard distils them into two main categories. Some have lost their goods, even their lives, for the Gospel. Bonivard gives, as the briefest example of the laudable band, the French and other religious refugees who streamed into Geneva. The second throng, by far the larger, and the object of Bonivard's special attention, is composed of those whose adherence to the Gospel sprang from a desire to obtain the goods of others.⁸⁵ Here Bonivard places the magistrates, hereditary and elective. Bonivard's opinions on the hereditary magistrates have already been discussed, it remains to consider the elective leaders who embraced the new faith. First, however, it is worth pausing to note that such a bold assertion was hardly likely to prise a printing permit from the hands of Geneva's elective rulers. Yet again one sees an example of Bonivard charging about where angels would have feared to tread.

The intrepid Bonivard is quick to dismiss the motives of the elected magistrates. Their unwillingness to live by the Gospel is obvious. In Geneva, a scant two years after the Reformation the authorities expelled their ministers.⁸⁶ The attack is widened by Bonivard (resident in a city dominated by a merchant oligarchy) to include merchants as a group. He accuses them of having used the confusion of religious debate to settle old scores. They are ever rushing to the ministers with denunciations.⁸⁷ One is strongly tempted to recall Bonivard's financial dispute with the magistrates as well as his regular appearances before the Consistory.

Apparently, the lack of spectacular anecdotes forced Bonivard to move on quickly. Perhaps, he also gave some fleeting thought to the official reaction

which such lines might cause. However, he is much more specific in attacking the preachers of this new faith.⁸⁸ Bonivard begins by holding up for viewing the image of the pristine primitive Church and the pure preaching of the Apostles. People left their sermons weeping, beating their breasts in repentance. Moved by pity and remorse these early believers sold their goods laying the purchase price at the Apostles' feet that it might be distributed to the poor as the need arose.⁸⁹ Then he muses, "mais come sortiz au commencement de l'Euangile du presche de l'Euangile nous euangelistes de tauerne?" The congregations of these latter day followers of Christ behave like audiences hearing Alexander the Great or Julius Caesar. Pouring out of the churches they storm forth, not beating themselves but "rouges et emflambez pour courir sus les ennemiz, les frapper, blecer, tuer, fourrager, saccager et faire touz les maux que a eux estoit possible."⁹⁰ They do not sell their goods but steal those of others; they do not give the money to aid the poor but keep it to enrich themselves. And who are the objects of this violence? Their rage, says Bonivard is directed "a ceux qui ne vouloient croire ou confesser de croire, ce que eux faisoient profession de croire, combien quilz ne crussent pas encor de cuer ce quilz confessoient de bouché."⁹¹

Bonivard is especially vivid in recounting these inflammatory sermons. The preacher denounces the clerics in a loud and fiery voice as thieves, brigands, murderers, then drops to a low tearful tone to describe the plight of Christ's poor Church. To Bonivard the resulting pillaging and looting comes from the advent, not of Christ's Gospel but of Mohamed's. "Ce predicant belliqueux faisoit difference des larronz, car les prebstres estoient les mauuays larronz, qui haoient desrobez les paouures gentz, les autres qui haoient desrobes estoient les bonz larronz, iacoit quilz neussent rendu le larrecin aux desrobez." Bonivard summarises the violence: "Et voyla vn bel auancement de l'Euangile."⁹²

This opposition to religious violence is understandable; Bonivard had firsthand experience of the consequences of such Gospel successes. His views on the hypocrisy of the preachers, the viciousness of the mob and the avarice of the rulers requires a more careful examination, however. There is little doubt that Bonivard strays perilously close to Anabaptist ideas here, or perhaps he shows that he never strayed very far from his monastic vows and religious outlook. Indeed, he says that one of the most powerful weapons in the Catholic arsenal is the image of the poor monk, faithful to his vows, giving his all to the poor, chaste, humbly obedient to Popes and Councils. Bonivard sees few who can be held up as greater counter-examples by the Protestants.⁹³

Rather than assess Bonivard's views systematically it might be useful to allow him to speak on his own behalf at some length.

Nous nous ventons toutes les deux parties de prescher Christ cruciffie et disons vray, car nous le laissons cruciffie et nud en l'arbre de la croix, et iouons a beaux dez au pied dicelle croix, pour scauoir qui haura sa robe, Coment diras tu? les paouures sont ceux qui representent Iesus Christ, come luy mesme dict parlant des paouuvres: Ce que vous ferez au moindre de ceux cy ie tiendrai pour fait a moy mesme. . . Lequel les prebstres et nous leurz aduersaires laissons bien cruciffie, cest a scauoir que nous laissons bien les paouures mourir de faim, de soif, de froit, touz nudz, et cependent nous combattons pour leurz biens, iouantz a beaux dez qui haura sa robe, non pas pour len reuestir c.a.d. les paouures. . . Nous hauons drecez quelques colleges; mais pourquoy? Pour ce que faysions a noz enfantz apprendre letres diuines et humaines; afin que les uns seruent a Dieu, a l'annonciation de sa parolle; les autres en administration de la chose publique, selon son commandment. Mais de quoi sert cela? . . . les ministres; telz, come se dict que se fait aux basses Allemaignes, que les Princes et magistratz retirent les reuenuz des eglises, puis constituent pour annonceurs de la parolle de Dieu des sellierz, des cousturierz, des brasseurz de ceruoise. . . Christ est loccasion du desbat, mais que non pas la cause, mais que ce ha este sa robe; cest cela pourquoy nous hauons receu l'Euangile, Ie ne charge pas de ce la doctrine de Luther ni de ses sectateurs, mais ie nexcuse pas les docteurz mesmes, qui les uns par leurz exemples hont guaste leur doctrine, les autres silz nhont ce fait par l'exemple de leurs personnes lhont par leur laschete comporte et comportent. . . nous desportons de tant crier contre le pape, les cardinaux, euesques, abbez, prebstres, et moynes etc les paignantz en regnartz, loupz et (que pys est) en dyables; veu que a bon droict ilz en pourroient autant faire de nous.⁹⁴

There is a great deal here to occasion comment. Before jumping to hasty conclusions it is essential to state that Bonivard believes that the Reformation in Geneva is of the best sort.⁹⁵ However, even this assertion is phrased circumspectly. He says, "Sil y ha reformation, elle est en Engroigne et a Geneve, ailleurz ie ne scay, sinon que lon dict que a Lion et ailleurs au royaume de France, ou l'Euangile ha germe, la vie ha este changee, quant et la doctrine."⁹⁶ This faint praise, written in the early 1560s, hardly represents an unequivocal, unambiguous endorsement of the Calvinist Reformation.⁹⁷

One is led to conclude that this is the work of a disappointed and disillusioned man though not one who has abandoned hope entirely. Bonivard had suffered tremendous loss in wealth and station as a result of the Reformation. Perhaps because of the drastic change forced upon his life he had developed equally grandiose expectations of the wider effect of the new faith. What he sees and deplores is the development of a new clerical *élite* and the passing of the old faith's wealth and power into the hands of greedy secular rulers. Here Bonivard

seems to draw very close to the peasants who (he says) adopted the Reform because they hoped the ecclesiastical burdens would be removed. To their horror, and his, the taxes remained, only the collector changed.⁹⁸

His aversion to religious violence, however, evokes Anabaptist ideas. Bonivard says that Christ commanded his followers “tu te ventes de prescher et annoncer, nha pas commande cela, que pour luy lon outrageast, moins frappast ou tuast, mais que lon souffrit estre outrage, frappe et tue.” Violence is not a part of the Law of Christ but of the Law of Mohammed and the Pope.⁹⁹ This image is vividly expressed in Bonivard’s most striking comment:

Ainsy est es affaires de relligion; lun veut estre sanctiffie par la loy mosaïque, lautre par la mahometique, lautre par le papistique, lautre par leuangilique et tout contre et rabattu. . . nous demeurons tousiours homes, enfantz et Adam et de peche consequemment ni ha difference que de la profession de creance.¹⁰⁰

Bonivard’s dual emphasis on poverty and the rejection of violence is expressed in a poem from his *Menues Pensees*,

Si Iesus Christ estoit si paouure
Come quant il marchoit sus terre
Nous ne mettrions pas en ouure
Pour faire en son nom tant de guerre.¹⁰¹

Later he said, “nous disons que les prebstres rongent les mortz et est vray; mais nous faysons bien pys, car nous rongeons les vifz.”¹⁰² It is difficult to avoid the temptation to consider Bonivard as an individual touched by Anabaptist thought. He certainly expresses concern for the poor, a religious pacifism, and an openness to toleration which recalls many of their beliefs. His brief remarks on them may strengthen this interpretation. Nevertheless, Bonivard’s continued residence in Geneva, his support for the city and its Reformation, and especially his high regard for the religious refugees from France would tend to argue against such an evaluation.

Elsewhere though, one can find other examples of his (ambivalent?) attitude towards the Anabaptists. For example,

Nouz compapefigues que nous appellons anabaptistes faignent bien aussy vouloir que tout soit en commun, mais silz se treuent les plus fortz, ils exercent bien ceste charite activement, mais non pas passiuement. . . Ainsy font bien nouz anabaptistes, car ilz veullent que Ihauoir dau truy leur soit commun, mais non pas pour la pareille, De quoy lexemple nous monstra bien le roy de Munster en Westphale come treuuez en Sledan. Aussy en son lieu

nous monstrerons la bone charite de telles gentz par lexemple de ij freres de S. Gal, appellez les Schuckers desquelz lun couppa la teste a lautre.¹⁰³

Interestingly but hardly surprisingly for Bonivard, the aspect of their belief which is highlighted is their common ownership.

There is reason to wonder, therefore, just how far Bonivard's views inclined beyond the pale of normative, magisterial Protestantism, especially when addressing the issues of toleration and poverty. For example, his seemingly easy use of Sebastian Franck — which one accepts is not wholly surprising in an historian.¹⁰⁴ However, his list of linguists (from *Des Langues*) who have helped in recovering the Biblical languages is fascinating and deserves to draw this examination of Bonivard's *Difformes Reformateurs* to a close:

[For the Germans] Luther, Melanchthon, OEcolompade, Zwingli, Suiterus, Capito, Miconius, Buecerus, Grynaeus, Sareosius, Bibliander, Eberus, Musculus. . . [for the French] Cauuin, Wiret, Beze, S. Pol, Rubitus, Coelius Secundus, Casteleo, Enoch.

To find someone listing Castellio and Calvin together without comment in 1563 is both indicative and instructive of Bonivard's innermost thoughts.

Bonivard's closing admonition ("veu que a bon droict ilz en pourroient autant faire de nous") brings to mind the cautionary preaching of many ministers.¹⁰⁵ Perhaps in this, one can see an interpretation of Bonivard's writings which protected him from the heavy hand of Genevan justice. Satire — and surely any work entitled *Des Difformes Reformateurs*, must be seen as such — is always open to various interpretations. To Geneva's magistrates (so recently triumphant over the "ungodly" Perrinists) and the city's ministers (well-educated refugees all) this could easily be read as a thorough and necessary rebuke of the Lutherans as well as many (Zwinglian) Swiss ministers who too easily accepted the dictates of their ruling councils. Those apparently anti-Genevan attacks, such as the mention of *colleges* (Geneva's was fully established as recently as 1559) and the cautious appraisal of the city's reform may have been perceived to be necessary, and welcome, admonitions to humility and watchfulness on the part of the faithful and godly in the city.¹⁰⁶ There is no overt reason to reject this interpretation other than a feeling that such a view probably would have only served to confirm Bonivard's most pessimistic assessment of the narrow-mindedness of many of his co-religionists.

Apart from a positive reading of this treatise, why would a man of Bonivard's views be tolerated? A number of possibilities occur. The city's leaders may have viewed him as an elderly man, deranged by his many years

in captivity during the 1530s. However, they would have been unlikely to have sought such a person's assistance in preparing a defence of Geneva's historic rights and liberties in the 1540s. Moreover, the extensive range of Bonivard's writings throughout the 1550s and early 1560s show a man in full possession of an impressive array of mental faculties. Apart from his critiques of the religious protagonists of his day, he also wrote on linguistics, the philosophical and Biblical source of sin, as well as Genevan polity and history.¹⁰⁷

The most reasonable explanation would seem to be that Bonivard was protected by his age, his fame as a Revolutionary hero and, perhaps, the very solitary and eccentric nature of his opinions. Also, the city was fairly confident of its ability to control Geneva's literary output. Its censorship laws were extensive and usually effective.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, one should not view a failure to publish as a sign of official contempt or popular disregard (or lunacy). Froment and Roset — the latter, eventually hailed as Geneva's *père de la patrie* — also wrote officially commissioned chroniques which also (for the same political reasons) languished in manuscript until the nineteenth century. Thus, the simplest overall conclusion would seem to be that Bonivard was not perceived to be a threat to anyone, though he may well have been a nuisance to many.

What one can say, in conclusion, is that Bonivard appears to combine many of the best ideas of humanism and the Reformation with the pastoral concerns of a conscientious, ethical abbot. Touched by all these influences in the course of his life, recipient of many disasters and much violence, Bonivard never gave in to the raging emotions and confessional tribalism so common in his day. The war-trumpets of religious hatred, the hammers of iconoclasm, the roaring fires of the martyrs' pyres, and the cries of the massacred undoubtedly drowned out the calls for peace and compromise but this does not mean that no plea for humanity and Christian charity was made. One can only wonder how.

University of Manchester

Notes

1. Not all these people had the same thing in mind when they discussed peace, concord, or tolerance. Castellio and Franck were the lone figures advocating genuine, lasting toleration — in any modern sense recognisable. Most only supported a lack of violence in the hopes that discussion and persuasion would produce religious unity. Cf. M. Turchetti, "Religious Concord and Political Tolerance in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century France," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 22, 1 (1991): 15-25 (esp., pp. 15, 19, 21) and his "Une question mal posée: Érasme et la tolérance. L'Idée de sygkatabasis," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 53, 2 (1991): 379-95; G. Remer, "Rhetoric and the Erasmian Defence of Religious Toleration," *History of Political Thought*, 10, 3 (1989):

- 377-403; M. Derwa, "L'influence de l'Esprit irénique sur le contenu doctrinal de la pensée de Castellion," *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 58, 2 (1980): 355-81; M. de Kroon, "Martin Bucer and the Problem of Tolerance," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 19, 2 (1988): 157-68 (esp., p. 166); R. H. Bainton, "Sebastian Castellio, Champion of Religious Liberty," in *Castellioniana* (Leiden, 1951). 2 (1991): 379-95.
2. For more on toleration see: J. Lecler, *Histoire de la tolérance au siècle de la Réforme*, 2 vols (Paris, 1955), esp., 1: 9, 312-42; H. Kamen, *The Rise of Tolerance* (London, 1967), esp., 7; H.R. Guggisberg, *Religiöse Toleranz. Dokumente zur Geschichte einer Forderung*, in *Neuzeit im Aufbau*, 4 (Stuttgart, 1984), esp., 9; M. de Kroon, *Studien zu Martin Bucers Obrigkeitsverständnis. Evangelisches Ethos und politisches Engagement* (Gütersloh, 1984): esp., pp. 8-21; S.E. Ozment, *Mysticism and Dissent: Religious Ideology and Social Protest in the Sixteenth Century* (New Haven, 1973), esp., 168-202; R.H. Bainton, *Studies on the Reformation* (Boston, 1963), esp., 22-33; R.H. Murray, *Erasmus and Luther: Their Attitudes to Toleration* (New York, 1972); and, esp., Turchetti, *Concordia o tolleranza? François Bauduin (1520-1573) e i "Moyenneurs"* (Geneva, 1984).
3. This tension in Protestantism — balancing doctrinal concerns and the upholding of morals with the juxtaposition of reforming religious institutions and social behaviour — was a problem and concern often exploited by Catholics. C.E. Maxcey, "Why do Good? Dietenberger's Reply to Luther," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 75 (1984): 93-112; P. Blickle, "Communal Reformation and Peasant Piety: The Peasant Reformation and its Late Medieval Origins," *Central European History*, 20: 3-4 (1987): 216-28; M. Hoffman, "Faith and Piety in Erasmus's Thought," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 20: 2 (1989): 241-58 (esp., 254f).
4. On Bonivard's life see M. Godet, et al., *Dictionnaire historique & biographique de la Suisse*, 8 vols. (Neuchâtel, 1921), 2: 235. For greater detail see: H. Bressler, *François Bonivard* (Geneva, 1944); J.E. Berghoff, *François Bonivard. Sein Leben und Seine Schriften* (Heidelberg, 1923); J.J. Chaponnière, "Notice sur François Bonivard, prieur de Saint-Victor, et sur ses écrits," *Mémoires et documents publiés par la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève*, 4 (1845): 137-304.
5. On the ecclesiastical institutions of the pre-Reformation diocese of Geneva see Abbé Besson, *Mémoires pour l'histoire ecclésiastique des diocèses de Genève, Tarantaise, Aoste, et Maurienne, et du décanat de Savoye* (Nancy, 1759), especially pp. 93-4. The family-controlled benefices at Pignerol and Payerne reverted to Savoyard control with Urbain's — perhaps explaining Bonivard's antipathy to Savoy.
6. Although speculative it is worth considering the importance of Bonivard's legal training as well as his local connections within Geneva. R.M. Kingdom, in his "The First Calvinist Divorce," in R.A. Mentzer, ed., *Sin and the Calvinists. Moral Control and the Consistory in the Reformed Tradition* (Kirksville, MO., 1994): 1-14, esp., 7, and his *Adultery and Divorce in Calvin's Geneva* (Cambridge, MA., 1995): 32f., 44 convincingly posits a close relationship between Pierre Ameaux (a leading opponent of Calvin) and Bonivard. Ameaux was also known to have been linked to Trolliet (a close associate and supporter of Castellio during the early 1540s) see Naphy, *Calvin and the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation* (Manchester, 1994), 94 and "The Usefulness of Calvin's Letters for the Study of Genevan History," in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (1996, forthcoming).

ing). Since Geneva was a very small city (ca. 10,000 inhabitants), there is every reason to suppose that Bonivard knew Castellio and may well have been drawn to some of Castellio's ideas. If there is a link between Bonivard and Ameaux-Trolliet then Bonivard may also have been in contact with their later associate, Bolsec, the great critic of Calvin's doctrine of predestination. Clearly, Bonivard had contacts who were less than enthusiastic about Calvin.

7. In the interim, the Pope stripped Bonivard of his post. The Savoyard appointee (Leonardo Tornabuoni) died in the Sack of Rome (1525) and the post reverted to Bonivard.
8. Antoine de Beaufort, Chillon's governor, kept Bonivard under house-arrest for two years but then moved him to a dungeon and had him chained to a pillar.
9. For information on the important, yet complicated, relationship between Geneva, France and Berne see S. de Ziegler, "L'Alliance perpétuelle entre les confédérés suisses et la Roi de France," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 6 (1984): 553-61 and E. Dunant, *Les relations politiques de Genève avec Berne et les Suisses* (Geneva, 1894). A fear of offending Berne was responsible for stopping the publication of all contemporary chronicles of Geneva's Revolution and Reformation years.
10. Naphy, *Calvin*, 12-15. On other clerics remaining in Geneva see G. Cahier Bucelli, "Dans l'ombre de la Réforme de l'ancien clergé demeuré à Genève (1536-1558)," *Bulletin de la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève*, (18, 4): 367-89.
11. Bonivard *et femme(s)* were regular visitors to the Consistory. His last marriage (aged over 70) to a former nun in her twenties was the worst; she was convicted of adultery. Cf., M. Bossard and L. Junod, *Chroniqueurs du XVI^e siècle* (Lausanne, 1974), 13-17.
12. Despite his early claims (1519) to have been Geneva's poet laureate, his verifiable career begins in the 1540s with translations from Stumpf: *Histoire des Dominicains de Berne brûlés avant la Réforme*; *Chroniques des Liges*; *Du concile de Constance*; *Des Jacobins de Berne*. One (*Traité de la noblesse*) was later reworked. See the comments below on *Advis et devis de l'ancienne et nouvelle police de Genève*.
13. The magistrates read the work with interest and then refused to publish it. When Bonivard sought to reclaim his manuscript he was told that it was lost. Annoyed, he began to prepare a clandestine version which eventually carried Geneva's history to 1562 which was discovered this century in Turin and is now being prepared for publication [I express my sincerest thanks to M^e Micheline Tripet, City Archivist of Geneva, who kindly gave me access to her (as yet unpublished) transcription of this valuable document which reworks the material in the *Chroniques de Geneve* and the *Nouvelle police* (see below). It is also, as M^e Tripet agrees, much more critical of Geneva's magistracy and, especially, complimentary of Calvin's earlier co-worker, the reformer Guillaume Farel]. The earlier draft was later published as: Bonivard, *Chroniques de Geneve* (Geneva, 1867), 2 vols.
14. These are: *Des diverses opinions que se treuvent du nom et de la fondation de Geneve*, a now lost work written early in the 1550s which may have been no more than a working treatise designed for incorporation elsewhere; *Advis et devis de l'ancienne et nouvelle police de Genève* (Geneva, 1865), which contains the material from Stumpf mentioned above in the form of *De noblesse et ses offices*. *Police* was completed c. 1556, *Noblesse*.

- c. 1549; *Advis et devis des Langues* (Geneva, 1865), containing, in addition to the title essay (c. 1563), the essay, *De lamartigenee, cest a dire de la source de peché* (c. 1562); *Advis et devis de la source didolatrie* (Geneva, 1856) — the title treatise (c. 1566) is preceded by *Advis et devis de l'estat ecclesiastique et mutations d'icelluy* (c. 1566), and followed by *Advis et devis des difformes reformateurs* (1562), *Advis et devis de meconge* (1563), and *Advis et devis desquelz sont les vrayz ou les faulz miracles* (1563).
15. Although one can certainly engage in a discussion about just how “humanistic” Bonivard actually was, his works, their scope, their themes, his educational background, etc., all argue for a man deeply and decisively touched by humanism (albeit of the Italian variety).
 16. Bonivard, *Didolatrie*, 133 (henceforth, references from the *Difformes Reformateurs* will be given by page number only): “Aussy Ciceron en la querre citoienne . . .”
 17. p. 141: “car [Henry VII] hauoit receu celluy de Cupido, pour espouser sa putain; celluy de Robin pour desrober la capse de S. Tomas.” Note that “Robert” and “Robionet” (or “petit Robin”) are common French names for Satan. However, in Savoy, the names usually apply to the King or chief of sorcerers, A. van Gennep, *La Savoie* (Voreppe, 1991), p. 485.
 18. p. 142: “Come de laudience de la harengue de lun de ces ij tyrans, Alexandre le grandt, ou Iulle Cæsar.”
 19. p. 142, marginalia: “predicatz de l'Euangile de Mars.” This violence was capable of producing various responses. Beatus Rhenanus was so repelled that he abandoned his initial enthusiasm for the reform and returned to Rome. Erasmus also began to see the Papacy as the one power capable of preventing anarchy. Others, for example Pellican, deplored the excesses but remained committed to change outside the Roman Church. Cf., J. F. D'Amico, “Beatus Rhenanus, Tertullian and the Reformation: A Humanist's Critique of Scholasticism,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 71 (1980): 37-63 (esp., pp. 42, 59); H. J. McSorley, “Erasmus and the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff: Between Conciliarism and Papalism,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 65 (1974): 37-54; P. L. Nyhus, “Caspar Schatzgeyer and Conrad Pellican: The Triumph of Dissension in the Early Sixteenth Century,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 61 (197): 179-204.
 20. p. 145, marginalia: “Euangile de Bacchus en Saxoigne.”
 21. *Didolatrie*, p. xi.
 22. *De Meconge*, 170f., 173.
 23. *Des langues*, pp. 4, 16, 39f.
 24. p. 135: “troubles et seditions sanglantes, ce que luy mesme prophetisa par une epistre quil enuoya a son prince.”
 25. pp. 135-7, 141, 158: “Ien nen ferai pas long proces, car Sleiden en has asses escrit.” The work in mind was first published in 1555 but was frequently re-issued and translated into various vernacular languages, cf., J. Sleidan, *Commentariorum de stutu religionis et reipublicae, Carolo V. Caesare*. It was published in Geneva the following year as *Histoire de l'estat de la religion et république* (J. Crespin, 1556).
 26. pp. 145-6: “Ihai veu vn double de ceste letre impriméen alleman.”

27. pp. 147-8: "que Bocace en ses cent nouuelles raconte."
28. pp. 153-4: 160: "que dict Marot de Monsr labbe et Monsr son vallet." Perhaps it recalled his earlier religious career.
29. pp. 155-6: "quill y haie des putains errantes come hauoit le roy Artus ses cheuallierz errantz."
30. For Rabelais see *De Meconge*, p. 170 and *Faux miracles*, p. 180; for Marot see *Amartigenee*, p. 81.
31. *De Meconge*, pp. 170f; *Des Lengues*, pp. 8, 11, 35, 38. This includes reference to specific named works by some of these authors, for example, Bibliander's *Livre des Lengues* (or *De Linguis*), Erasmus' *De rerum et verborum copia* and Stumpf's histories of Switzerland and France.
32. *Des Lengues*, p. 40; *Amartigenee*, p. 78; *De Meconge*, pp. 170f.
33. p. 133.
34. p. 134.
35. p. 142: Bonivard also quotes (and renders into French verse) some Greek in *Des Lengues*, p. 1.
36. p. 142.
37. pp. 145, 149-50 (Plato, *Symposium*, Arist., *Ethic*, ad *Eudemem*, Bk., 7); "Deux cheuaux ne sont pas daccordt en vne mangeoire, ni deux chiens en vn os."
38. In addition to the above references see p. 154: "mais Ciceron dict que celluy qui veut autruy reprendre doit estre luy irreprehensible"; p. 156: "Aristote mesme en sa philosophie morale disant que des pecheurz sont de peche differentz."
39. p. 156.
40. p. 151: "car ien hai amplement escrit en mes chroniques."
41. p. 157: "come ihai dict en mes menues pensees." See "Si Jesus Christ . . ." below.
42. p. 151: "ie fus prisonnier ou ie demeuray a lenuiron de vj ans."
43. p. 134: "Deuant lan 1440 Wickleff Angloys sen essaia; apres la dicte annee deux Bohemiens, a scauoir Iohannes Husz et Hieronime de Praga."
44. p. 134: "qui ne la voulut pas purger soubdain."
45. *Didolatrie*, pp. vii-ix.
46. *Didolatrie*, p. 8.
47. *Didolatrie*, p. 82.
48. A. Froment, *Actes et gestes merueilleux de la cité de Genève* (Geneva, 1854), pp. 70f. Cf., his "ont heu la lumiere evangelique par laquelle voyr clerement de present" (p. 168). See also, the sources for this wordplay in J. Grimm and W. Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*

(Leipzig, 1885: 6. col. 380 ("der ist der lauter schwan, darvon Husz zuvor 100 jaren geweizaget," in J. Mathesius, *Sarepta* [Nuremburg, 1587], 93a) and col. 381 (*lauther* for *lauter*, clear, in F.L. von Soltau, *Einhundert deutsche historische Volkslieder* [Leipzig 1836], no. 278 from the sixteenth century). New High German and Middle High German both have *luther* for *lauter*.

49. p. 139, see below: "Pourquoy le roy Henri iadis . . ."
50. pp. 143-4, see below: "rouges et emflambez . . ."
51. p. 160: "des sellierz, des cousturierz, des brasseurz de ceruoise . . . ilz ne scauent fors vn peup lire et escrire en leur language."
52. p. 160: "come faisoient en Espaigne los iios dArgos y los Villanos, qui sentrebattoient et entretuoient maugre le roy et ce neantmoins crioient touz deuz: Viva il rey." Erasmus was also wont to condemn the fratricidal wars of Christian princes. J.M. Headley, "Gattinara, Erasmus, and the Imperial Configurations of Humanism," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 71 (1980): 64-98, esp., pp. 78f.
53. pp. 144-5 (Matt. 7: 3; 28: 19); 152 (e.g., Prov. 22: 15); 159 (Matt. 25: 35-40; 161 (James 2: 18-20).
54. pp. 144-5: "se faisoit du commencement de l'Euangile de Mahomet . . . Cela nest pas la loy de Iesus Christ mais de Mahomet et du pape"; p. 148: "par la loy . . . mahometique." One is not surprised to discover that attitudes to Turks played apart in the debates between Castellio and Calvin. R. White, "Castellio against Calvin: The Turk in the Toleration Controversy of the Sixteenth Century," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 46, 3 (1984): 573-86. On wider attitudes to Turks and Islam in Renaissance thought see R. Schwoebel, *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaissance Image of the Turk* (Nieuwkoop, 1967). On the humanism of Calvin see, Q. Breen, *John Calvin: A Study in French Humanism* (Hamden, 1968).
55. *Didolatrie*, p. 1.
56. *Faux miracles*, pp. 184f.
57. In any case, a fairly wide definition for "humanism" was allowed even by contemporaries. Headley, "Gattinara," pp. 64f.
58. p. 134: "leglise peu a peu sestoit accumule de mauuayses humeurz."
59. p. 133: "nous hauons dict par cy devant beaucoup de maux des papes et des leurz et aussy beaucoup de veritez," in the previous treatise, *Advis et devis de la source didolatrie*.
60. p. 134: "sest on bien essaie de y remedier, mais coment?."
61. p. 137.
62. pp. 134-5: "mais quel bien ha il mis au lieu de ce mal."
63. p. 133.
64. pp. 137, 145, 155, 159.

65. p. 155: "que noz subiectz abandonnent leurz institutions anciennes pour embrasser les vostres et voz meurz et conditions, que ne sont pas meilleures que les nostres."
66. p. 145. This is very similar to Engelbrecht's complaint against Bucer that a new form of "papacy" was replacing the old. De Kroon, "Tolerance," p. 165.
67. p. 146: "et ha amplement descrites les meurz des Saxons Lutheriens."
68. p. 146.
69. pp. 146-7.
70. p. 147: "que nous hauons hereditaire de nostre premier pere." There was a near universal dislike of the geometric proliferation of sects. See Tuchetti, "Concord," p. 17; Remer, "Rhetoric," p. 380; D'Amico, "Beatus," pp. 42, 58.
71. p. 157: "par ambiytion assés et vaine gloire."
72. On Anabaptists, Bonivard was at one with his age which was united in its condemnation of the radicals. For both Catholics and Protestants, "baptist" very quickly became synonymous with "subversive (obrigkeits-feindlich)." De Kroon, "Tolerance," p. 166. As will be seen, however, he was slightly more ambivalent about some elements of their teaching.
73. p. 139.
74. p. 141.
75. p. 141; "se saisit des biens fondez pour dire la messe; mais il laissa la messe en son entier."
76. pp. 139-41. Bonivard returns to Henry briefly at 157-58: "Nous hauons parle du roy dAngleterre."
77. p. 141, see note 24 above.
78. p. 141.
79. p. 137: "mais par quelle rayson deffendrez vous, quil soit permis aux mariz dhabiter avec autres femmes que les leurz?"
80. pp. 138-9.
81. p. 139: "mais que Sledan lha supprime a la faueur du Landgraaf." There may be personal reasons to explain this apparent fixation on the marital peccadilloes of leading Protestant princes. Bonivard himself was notorious for his unsuccessful marriages (see above). It may also explain his gentle treatment of Calvin. Calvin had, for whatever reasons, occasionally appeared "on Bonivard's side" in the latter's marital affairs. Moreover, Calvin (like Bucer) had a fairly tolerant attitude towards divorce. Cf., Naphy, *Calvin*, p. 99; De Kroon, "Bucer," p. 167; Kingdon, "Divorce."
82. p. 158.
83. p. 158: "[il] recoit beaucoup sus les ecclesiastiques des biens quil disoit quilz occupoient es paouures."

84. p. 158: "entre les mains dun enfant qui ne se scaura pas moucher."
85. p. 157: "pour hauoir le bien dau truy, qui sont les magistrautz, autant hereditaires come esleuz."
86. p. 152: "en appellissent des autres." For details on the Geneva's polity see H. Höpfl, *The Christian Polity of John Calvin* (Cambridge, 1982). the best, broad survey of the Genevan situation remains, E.W. Monter, *Calvin's Geneva* (London, 1967).
87. p. 143: "faisantz mention de ses larrecins."
88. The Genevan Protestant ecclesiastical personnel were not always models of moral rectitude. See, Naphy, "Renovation of the Genevan Ministry," in A.D.M. Pettegree, ed., *The Reformation of the Parishes: The Ministry in Town and Country* (Manchester, 1993): 113-32; and Calvin, 75-79, 219f. Also, Kingdon, "The Economic Behavior of Ministers in Geneva in the Middle of the Sixteenth Century," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 50 (1959): 33-39; his "Calvin and 'Presbytery': The Genevan Company of Pastors," *Pacific Theological Review*, 18: 2 (1985): 43-55; and his, "Calvin and the Establishment of Consistory Discipline in Geneva: The Institution and the Men who Directed It," *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, 70 (1990): 158-72.
89. p. 142: "quil fust par eux distribue ou seroit necessaire aux pauoures freres."
90. He was certainly able to draw on Genevan experiences for these images. See, Naphy, "Baptisms, Church Riots, and Social Unrest in Calvin's Geneva," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 26 (1995): 85-95.
91. p. 142. Here one sees an explicit stress on a definition of religious correctness which is very behavioural and, indeed, visual. A "good Christian" is marked by certain behaviour which can be seen as much as by doctrine and belief which is internal. A similar understanding is apparent early in the French Reformation when Catholics can readily identify a "Lutheran" by actions and seem to have had little interest in beliefs. See, Naphy, "Catholic Perspectives on Early French Protestantism: The Maisonneuve Heresy Trial in Lyon, 1534," *French History* (1996).
92. p. 144.
93. p. 161: "vn pauoure prebstre ou moyne, qui haura toute sa vie obserue la regle." This echoes many of the pro-Catholic comments found in J. de Jussieu, *Levain de calvinisme, ou commencement de l'herésie de Genève* (Geneva, 1865) and G. Pierrefleur, *Mémoires de Pierrefleur* (Lausanne, 1865), esp., relating to monks and nuns in and around Geneva. See also Naphy, "'No History can satisfy everyone': Geneva's Chroniclers and Emerging Religious Identity," in F.B. Gordon, *Protestant Identity and History in Reformation Europe* (Aldershot, 1996).
94. pp. 159-62, passim. This interest in the poor was certainly apparent in Geneva, overrun by poor religious refugees. Bonivard's positive comments on these refugees (157: "les vns hont abandonnez leurz biens propres, voire leurz persones a mort pour suyure l'Euangile, come beaucoup de Francoys et autre estrangerz, qui sont venuz demeurer a Geneue") may, in part, derive from their obvious desire to care for the poor in their midst. See W.C. Innes, *Social Concerns in Calvin's Geneva* (Allison Park, PA, 1983) and J. Olson, *Calvin and Social Welfare. Deacons and the Bourse Française* (Sellingrove, PA, 1989).

95. He generally supports Calvin. See Naphy, *Calvin*, pp. 134, 184, 192, 196, 198, 230.
96. p. 162.
97. Nevertheless, Bonivard was part of the committee selected to translate the treaty with Berne which settled the differences between that city and Geneva after Calvin's political triumph in the mid-1550s. Naphy, *Calvin*, p. 216.
98. pp. 136-7: "car il faut quilz paient aux princes come ilz faisoient aux prebstres." Cf., Blickle, "Communal Reformation," pp. 217f.
99. pp. 144-5.
100. p. 148.
101. p. 157.
102. p. 159. Cf., his description of Apostolic Christianity in *Didolatrie*, viii: "Du commencement, questoit du temps des apostres, les conuertiz a la foy, obseruantz le commandement de Chrisst, disoient: Va et cendtz tout ton bien et le donne aux paouures; ilz vendoient leurz biens et gectoient le pris es piedz des apostres pour le distribuer ou leur sembleroit necessaire").
103. *Amartigene*, p. 166.
104. *Didolatrie*, p. xiii; *Denoblesse*, p. 375.
105. p. 162.
106. On Geneva's troubled educational system see, Naphy, "The Reformation and Evolution of Geneva's Schools," in B. Kümin, *Reformations Old and New: Essays on the Socio-Economic Impact of Religious Change c.1470-1630* (Aldershot, 1996).
107. Also, Geneva's rulers would not have appointed a madman to the panel commissioned to translate the city's all-important defensive treaty with Berne in 1557. Naphy, *Calvin*, pp. 215f.
108. For details on Genevan publishing see: P. Chaix, *Recherches sur l'imprimerie à Genève de 1550 à 1564. Étude bibliographique, économique et littéraire* in *Travaux d'humanisme et renaissance*, 16 (Geneva, 1978); H.J. Bremme, *Buchdrucker und Buchhändler zur Zeit der Glaubenskämpfe. Studien zur Genfer Druckgeschichte 1565-1580* (Geneva, 1969); J.F. Gilmont, *Jean Crespin, un éditeur réformé du XVIe siècle* (Geneva, 1981).