The Family of Love and the Church of England

MARK KONNERT

The Family of Love is one of the relatively obscure groups of the Reformation which has attracted a fair bit of historians' attention in recent years. Founded by a Dutchman, H.N. (a pseudonym for Hendrik Niclaes), it has nevertheless been asserted that the Family of Love attracted its greatest following in England. So great was this following, apparently, that the Family of Love was singled out for persecution in a Royal Proclamation of 1580, the only sect to be so singled out.¹

This proclamation was preceded and accompanied by a substantial body of polemical literature which reflected a widespread concern with the Family of Love. This literature, and the Royal Proclamation, assume that the Family of Love was indeed large and growing, and was therefore a threat. This assumption has persisted through the centuries and is now reflected in a considerable body of historical literature. Is this assumption founded on historical fact? Did the Family of Love indeed pose such a threat? If, as this article will show, the historical evidence does not support this assumption, if the Family of Love posed no real danger and was neither as large nor as important as perceived at the time, then why did it provoke such a vehement reaction?

The assumptions of English authorities in the sixteenth century towards the Family of Love in England have influenced modern historiography in several ways. The paucity of hard documentary evidence on the Family in England has forced historians to rely on the anti-Family literature surrounding the Royal Proclamation. Specifically, these works are: *The Displaying of an horrible Secte of grosse and wicked heretiques* (1578) by John Rogers; *A Confutation of Monstrous Heresies Taught by H.N.* (1579) by John Knewstubb; and *A Confutation of Certain Articles delivered unto the Family of Love* (1579) by William Wilkinson. Together, these three works dictated the attitude of the Church and the government towards the Family of Love,

and their reaction to it. Through the works of earlier generations of historians, the views expressed in these works have been transmitted to modern historians. Although modern historians have recognized the polemical nature of these works, and have weighed their charges against the Family of Love very cautiously, they are still accepted as historical evidence in very suspect ways.

I

The facts of H.N.'S life are shrouded in mystery.² Born probably in Munster in 1501 or 1502 he lived for a time in Amsterdam and Emden, being forced to flee both places when suspicion of heresy was cast upon him. From his flight from Emden in 1560 until his death in Cologne in 1580 or 1581, he apparently led a peripatetic existence.

Niclaes wrote frequently and voluminously. His chief work, *The Glass of Righteousness* (*Den Spiegel der Gherechticheit*) runs to over 800 folio pages. His style is difficult and obscure, laden with Scriptural references and mystical allegories. At the core of his doctrine is the concept of *Vergottung* or "begoddedness," a mystical infusion of the Spirit of Love of Jesus Christ in which the will of the believer is subsumed in the will of God. While the purpose of this article is not to examine his teachings in any great detail, one point is crucial: these concepts are not unique to Niclaes and the Family of Love. These spiritualist/mystical ideas have been common in Christianity from the Early Church right down to the present. They were available to Niclaes in such medieval sources as Joachim of Fiore, Tauler, Eckhart, a Kempis, and the *Theologica Germanica*.³ Thus, there is an absolutely crucial distinction between "familist" and the "Family of Love;" that is, between people and groups who exhibit certain of the same characteristics and those who actually belong to the sect called the Family of Love. To identify the two, as many have done, is to greatly magnify the sect's numbers.

It is a common assertion in the literature on the Niclaes and the Family of Love that they found their greatest following in England. According to this standard view, at some time during the 1560's or 70's, the sect began to expand in England under the dual impetus of the translation of several of H.N.'s works and the missionary activity of one Christopher Vitell (or Vitel, Vittell, etc.).⁴ Eventually the sect grew to such an extent that it attracted official notice and repression, culminating in the Royal Proclamation of 1580. Though persecuted, the sect survived underground, for in 1604, its members addressed a petition to the newly acceded James I. The sect attracted more followers in the seventeenth century, as borne out by frequent hostile refer-

ences to it, including a Middleton farce called *The Family of Love*. During the Civil War, H.N.'s works were reprinted, evidence of yet further growth. Sometime in the later seventeenth century, the sect died out, possibly as a result of its members joining other groups such as the Quakers.⁵

II

Yet what actual historical evidence is there to support his view of the Family's history in England? The evidence for the history of the Family of Love in England is of three major types: actual documentary sources (confessions of Familists, government records, and the like); works attributed to members of the Family of Love, including translations of H.N. himself; and works written by authors hostile to the Family of Love.

The actual documentary sources for the history of the Family of Love in England are very few. The first we come across is a confession taken in Guildford in Surrey on May 28, 1561 by William More.⁶ This confession was given by Thomas Chaundeler and Robert Sterete and included by John Rogers in his *Displaying* of 1578. In it, the two men describe a group of sectaries complete with secret conventicles, passwords, and an ethical code. Many of the articles to which the two subscribed sound very much indeed like the teaching of Niclaes. Significantly, however, neither the Family of Love nor H.N. are once mentioned by name. However, in one article (omitted by Rogers) there is a passing reference to "Henrike, a Dutchman, the head of all the congregation."⁷ This, for some, is conclusive evidence that this Surrey group was a cell of the Family of Love.⁸ The two men also allude to connections that their Surrey group had with other cells "in divers places of the realm ... as in the Isle of Ely, Essex, Berkshire, Sussex, Surrey, Hampshire, Devonshire, and London."⁹ The references to the Isle of Ely and London are especially tantalizing for, as we shall see, in these places there is evidence that the Family of Love was active.¹⁰

Were these two men and the groups they describe Familists? Perhaps, in the sense alluded to above: they did exhibit certain characteristics which are similar to Niclaes' teachings. Were they members of the sect called the Family of Love? Probably not. Tempting as it is to identify the "Henrike" of the confession with Niclaes, in the absence of more conclusive evidence, the connection cannot be made. For one thing, the time frame is wrong. Niclaes' works were not translated into English until the mid 1570's. The Surrey sectaries are characterized by More as "all unlearned, saving that some of them can read English and that not very perfectly."¹¹ So it seems impossible

that they could have read Niclaes in English, let alone in the original Low German.

Additional evidence has been adduced by Joseph Martin to try to show that this was indeed a cell of the Family of Love.¹² Following the career of Thomas Allen of Wonersh, identified in the confession as an elder, he concludes that this must have been the Family of Love. Looking into the later papers of Sir William More, Martin discovers that the Surrey magistrate found that Allen possessed " ... a booke of h n prevelye hidden at the verye time of my comynge for i sawe his wyfe when she dyd secretlie covere hit."¹³ Nevertheless, this episode occurred some twenty years after 1561, and there is no evidence that "Allen" (even if it is the same person—no Christian name is given for the later Allen) was a member of the Family of Love in 1561. In addition, Christopher Vitell, when confronted with this 1561 confession by John Rogers in 1578, denied that they were at that time members of the Family of Love: "of H.N. his doctrine at that time they knew not."¹⁴ What is, of course, entirely possible is that in the meantime they had become acquainted with the Family of Love and become followers of H.N. This would account for "Allen's" possession of H.N.'s books. Indeed, Alastair Hamilton seems to be right on the mark when he says, "[t]he most we can say there fore, is that the sectarians were ready to receive the Familist doctrine."¹⁵

Then there is the case of Family of Love activity at Court. On September 28, 1578, the Privy Council sent a letter to Aylmer, then Bishop of London, "requiring him to call unto him Robert Seale, Thomas Mathewe, Lewes Stewarde, Anthony Enscombe and William Eling, Yeomen of the Garde, persons noted to be of the secte called the Familie of Love, and to conferre with them for their reformation in Relligion. ..."¹⁶ However, a week and a half later Aylmer informed the Council that "those of her Majesties Gard suspected to be of the Family of Love ... are in all pointes of Religion verie sound." Two years later, however, on October 9, 1580 (the Royal Proclamation was issued on October 3), two Yeomen of the Guard identified as—Seale and Mathewe—(obviously the same Robert Seale and Thomas Mathewe) were "committed to the prison of Marshallsea, refusing to subscribe unto certain erroneous and false articles gathered out of the bookes of one H.N., supposed to be the author of a certaine Secte called the Familie of Love, whereof they were vehemently suspected to be, and order geven to the Clerke of the Checke to take her Majesties coate from them."¹⁷ Shortly there after Anthonie Ediscombe (obviously the Anthony Enscombe of 1578, "being suspected to be one of the sect of the Familie of Love, denied the same before ther Lordships. ..."¹⁸ On November 30, 1580, Thomas Seale (a relative of

Robert Seale?) "charged before their Lordships with certen lewde and irreverent speeches of a certen person ... being of the Secte called the Familie of Love," was committed to Marshallsea, "there to remayne to be further examine and proceded with all as shold appertaine."¹⁹ The only other bit of evidence regarding this case is a undated manuscript among the Harley manuscripts in the British Museum which would seem to be a confession of the accused guards.²⁰ These men were almost certainly members of the Family of Love, and we shall have occasion to refer to them again.

That the Family of Love's center of activity was Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely becomes apparent in several other confessions. In December of 1574, Dr. Andrew Perne, the Dean of Ely, alarmed by reports of private assemblies in the parish of Balsham, examined six villagers, among whom were Robert Sharpe, parson at Strethall, in Essex, Edmund Rule, and two members of the Lawrence family.²¹ Perne was apparently satisfied with their answers and no further action was taken.²² However, some six months later Robert Sharpe, along with five others recanted their belief in the Family of Love at Paul's Cross.²³ That Sharpe, and by extension the Balsham group, were members of the Family of Love, there is little doubt. Sharpe admitted in his recantation that he had "heretofore unadvisedly conceyved good opinion of certaine books of an author, otherwise unknown, save only that he noteth himself by the letters H.N."²⁴

In 1580, Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely, at the urging of William Wilkinson, who had dedicated his *Confutation* to the Bishop, embarked on a campaign to hunt down the Family of Love in his diocese. As a result, a group of people from Wisbech were examined by the Bishop between October 3 and 5, 1580. Again, note the timing: Cox's campaign is simultaneous with the promulgation of the Royal Proclamation. The leader of this group appears to have been John Bourne, a glover. All nine people examined recanted their belief in H.N. and the Family of Love.²⁵ What happened to this group afterwards is unknown. Certainly, they may have, as Felicity Heal suggests, returned to the sect.²⁶ This would be quite consistent with the behavior alleged as typical of the Family of Love. There is, however, no evidence for it.

There is one other bit of evidence concerning the Wisbech group. This is a confession dictated to "Thomas Barwicke, minister," by Bourne's apprentice, Leonard Romsey.²⁷ Apparently Romsey had escaped questioning with his master and made his confession at some later date. Romsey describes how his master brought him into the sect and touches on their beliefs. Most interesting from our point of view, however, is his allusion to their connections at Court:

for it being reported upon a time that a commission was granted forth against us of Wisbech we had letter from the Family of Love in the court, from one Dorrington and Zeale, wherein we were advertised how to behave our selves before the commissioners and charged that we should deny that we had seen any of the books of H.N., whereupon all the books were conveyed.²⁸

Here is the only evidence of any connections between different groups of the Family of Love. It appears that "Dorrington and Zeale" (either Thomas or Robert Seale), acting upon their inside information, had informed their co-religionists at Wisbech of the upcoming persecution.

The possibility remains, however, that Romsey's confession was somewhat manufactured. Alastair Hamilton believes that the confession played too perfectly into the hands of the authorities to be as voluntary as advertised.²⁹ There is also the possibility that Romsey had been embittered against his employer and purposely sought to damage him. In his confession, Romsey states that the sect was planning an armed uprising "when they are of sufficient number to undertake the matter."³⁰ Certainly H.N. would never have approved of this. Perhaps this was an idiosyncratic belief of the Wisbech group, or maybe the interrogators asked the questions in such a way as to lead to this statement, or perhaps Romsey was trying to make himself seem more important in the eyes of the authorities.

The second category of evidence for the history of the Family of Love in England consists of written works attributed to members of the Family. Chief among these, of course, are the translations of H.N.'s own works.³¹

In addition to the English translations of Niclaes' works, there are several other English translations of continental Familist tracts. One of these is *A Good and fruitfull Exhortation unto the Family of Love* by "Elidad," identified only as a "fellow elder with the elder H.N.;" *A distinct declaration of the requiring of the Lord*, by "Fidelitas," a "fellow elder with H.N. in the Famelie of Loue;" *Mirabilia Opera Dei: Certaine wonderfull works of God which hapned to H.N.* by "Tobias," a hagiographical account of H.N.'s life and works; and *A Reproofe Spoken and Given against all False Christians* by "Abia Nazareus." Julia Ebel has speculated that this is a pseudonym for Vitell himself, but this is without substantiation.³²

What do these works tell us about the Family of Love in England? Apart from the preface to *A Reproofe*, England or English people are not mentioned at all. Yet the very fact that these works were translated from "base-almayne" or "nether-Saxon" into English indicates that somebody thought the task was worthwhile. The expense and labor of translating, printing, and (after 1580

surreptitiously) transporting them into England, indicates that they were not shots in the dark, so to speak. Somebody was on the receiving end; there had to be a demand for them, however small. That these works actually found their way to England and were read by English members of the Family of Love is borne out by other sources. In the confession of the Family of Love at Wisbech, John Bourne admitted that among the works of H.N. which he possessed were also the works of "Elidad" and "Fidelitas."³³

From time to time, English members of the Family of Love took it upon themselves to defend themselves in print. The first of these defenses is the anonymous *Brief Rehearsall*, printed in 1575. As might be expected, the thrust of the *Brief Rehearsall* is that the Family of Love is no threat. Throughout, the author or authors protest their loyalty, obedience, and peacefulness. As also might be expected, the *Brief Rehearsall* downplays the foreign origins of the sect and its heterodox nature.

The significance of this document is not easy to assess. It does show that there were definitely members of the Family of Love sufficiently literate to pen it, sophisticated enough to couch it in the proper language, and powerful enough to have it printed. Who these people were, in the absence of further evidence, must remain a matter of speculation.

Another anonymous document attributed the Family of Love is *An Apology for the Service of Love*. This work is in the form of a play, a discussion between three characters: Exile, a member of the Family of Love, Citizen, and Countryman. Again, this is an attempt on the part of the Family of Love to answer the charges against them. However, rather than, as in *A Brief Rehearsall*, where only general statements are made about the group's loyalty and orthodoxy, in *An Apology*, charges are answered in specific:

Citizen: Wilt thou deny the Sacrament of Baptisme?

Exile: Though I speak of the true Baptisme of regeneration through repentance, and newness of life, yet do I not deny the holy sacrament of Baptisme, which signifieth regeneration in Christ and is ministered unto Infants, though some have most unjustly reported to us.³⁴

The question of authorship, here as with *A Brief Rehearsall*, must remain in the realm of speculation. However, in the case of *An Apology*, we are at least given a clue. In the preface, the author describes himself as "one of her Majesties menial servants, who was in no small esteem with Her, for his known wisdom and godliness."³⁵ The category of "menial servants" would seem to fit the Yeoman Guards, among whom, as we have seen, the Family of Love was popular.

The only other document we have which definitely is a work of the Family of Love is a petition addressed to James I in 1604, shortly after his accession.³⁶ This petition, couched in the subservient language of humble subjects addressing their monarch, seeks to correct His Majesty's view of the sect. The petitioners

doe beseech your Princely Majesty to understand that the people of the family of love, or of God, doe utterly disclaime and detest all the said absurd and self-conceited opinions and disobedient and erroneous sorts of the Anabaptists, Browne, Penry, Puritans, and all other proud minded sects and heresies whatsoever, protesting upon paine of our lives, that wee are not consenting with any such brainesicke preachers, nor their rebellious and disobedient sects whatsoever, but have been, and ever will be truly obedient to your Highnesse. ...³⁷

Their only offense, they say, is that "we have read certaine bookes brought forth by a Germane authour under the characters of H.N."³⁸ They also claim, probably somewhat dishonestly, for they must have known of the 1580 Proclamation, "Against which Authour and his books we never yet heard nor knew any Law established this Realme by our late gracious Sovereigne."³⁹ They have been victimized by "malicious and slanderous reports," and by magistrates who "have framed divers and subtle articles for us, being plaine and unlearned men to answer upon our oaths, whereby to urge and gather somethings from our selves, so to approve their false and unchristian accusations to be true. ..."⁴⁰

Their request is that the King only read H.N.'s works for himself and meet with elders of the Family of Love to discuss them. Interestingly, they offer

to procure some of the learned men out of that Country (if there be any yet remaining alive that were well acquainted with the Author and his works in his life time, and which likewise have exercized his works ever since) to come over and attend upon your Majesty at your appointed time convenient, who can much more sufficiently instruct and resolve your Majesty in any unusual words, phrase, or matter that may happily seem darke and doubtfull to your Majesty than any of us in this land are able to doe.⁴¹

The 1604 petition is the last direct evidence we have for the existence of the Family of Love in England. No more is heard from the sect. All we get from now on are hostile accounts and innuendo. It does indeed seem likely that the 1604 petition represents the sect's last gasp, or at least its last attempt at justifying itself before the authorities. If there were any members after this,

they probably kept their beliefs to themselves, giving up any hope of evangelization or vindication.

The third type of evidence concerning the Family of Love in England is certainly the most plentiful and the most misunderstood: hostile writings against the sect. Besides the major works of Rogers, Knewstubb, and Wilkinson, there are a number of minor and incidental attacks. Almost everyone who set pen to paper on the subject of religion found space to attack the Family. The crucial point, however, is the repetitiveness of the charges and their origin. Virtually every accusation against H.N. and the Family of Love can be traced back to the works of Rogers, Knewstubb, and Wilkinson.⁴²

When the Family of Love vanished from the historical record after the petition to James I, the attacks upon it did not cease. After all, what could be easier than attacking a group that would not or could not defend itself? If we go on the assumption that the number of hostile references to the sect are an accurate guide to its fortunes, then obviously we could conclude that the Family of Love maintained its existence and even grew during the first half of the seventeenth century. However, this view is a result of faulty methodology. In Hamilton's words, "the numerical power of the Familists in the seventeenth century was very far from corresponding to the ever more frequent complaints against them."⁴³ In fact, if we look at the complaints against them, we see that those being called Familists, even if they shared H.N.'s mystical views, even if they had read and approved of this works, were not members of the Family of Love. They were called Familists because that was one of the worst names their critics could think of.⁴⁴

The reprinting of many of Nicolaes' works in the 1640's and 1650's has been seen by some as evidence of a resurgence in the Family's fortunes. However, most of these editions were printed by Giles Calvert, who also printed many Quaker and Leveller works, as well as translations of Jacob Boehme, of whose works he published just as many as he did of Nicolaes.⁴⁵ This indicates a renewed interest in Spiritualist religion and radical mysticism, but not a new period of growth for the Family of Love.

Throughout the Civil War period and even into the Restoration, the name "Familist" was a term of abuse. It was used because of its connotations of libertinism, perfectionism, anti nomianism, and deceit. It was quite simply one of the worst things to be called.

One of the last, tantalizing references to the Family of Love is contained in the diaries of John Evelyn. He recounts that several people of the Family of Love had presented a petition to James II in 1687. When the King asked about their form of worship, they described themselves as "a sort of refined

Quakers ... not above three-score in all ... chiefly belonging to the Isle of Ely."⁴⁶ Perhaps, after all, a small group had managed to survive in Cambridgeshire for eighty years or so. This would accord with Strype's statement in 1725:

"I remember a gentleman, a great admirer of this sect, within less than twenty years ago, told me, that there was but one of the Family of Love alive, and he an old man."⁴⁷

If, however, this group did survive, it was only because they were so insignificant as to escape official notice and repression. A far cry indeed from the view which hostile writers (and some modern historians) have presented. On the other hand, there may be no genetic connection at all. With the reprinting of H.N.'s works in the 1640's and 50's, there may have been some kind of small revival, or an already existing, but unconnected group may have appropriated the name for themselves.⁴⁸

III

The view of sixteenth and seventeenth century commentators of the origins and growth of the Family of Love have found their way into modern historiography, transmitted by Church historians such as Thomas Fuller and John Strype.⁴⁹

More recent treatments of the Family of Love fall into two general categories. One of these is the condemnation of the fanatical persecution of harmless mystics who posed no danger to the state or the social order.⁵⁰ The other is parallel to the first, but has more to do with a "quest for roots" on the part of modern groups, especially the Quakers.⁵¹

Combining both categories is Rufus Jones' interpretation. Jones, as a Quaker, identifies many of the beliefs of the Family of Love with the original Quakers of the late seventeenth century. His tone is admiring. Here was a group that was "at its best the exponent of a very lofty type of mystical religion," whose founder "was a very extraordinary character, and his voluminous writings contain spiritual insights and religious teachings which deserve to be rescued from the oblivion into which they have largely fallen." Jones especially commends their emphasis on an inward transformation, their pacifism, their "concern that the life should be put above forms," their insistence "on spiritualizing this life rather than on dogmatizing about the next life," and their desire for moral rectitude. Jones is also concerned with intolerance and fanaticism, thus bringing together both streams of historical

treatment mentioned above. He castigates H.N.'s critics as not penetrating "the meaning of his deep mystical teaching," as writing in a "spirit of bigotry and intolerance and in ignorance of the real teachings" of the Family of Love.⁵² However, Jones' ultimate purpose is to show that the Family of Love influenced George Fox and the earlier Quakers, as well as the Seekers and Ranters, in an effort to place the Quakers in a longstanding and honorable, if widely misunderstood, tradition.

Jones' treatment of the origins and history of the Family of Love in England is entirely standard. Nowhere has he attempted to re-examine the historical evidence relating to the Family of Love; indeed to do so is unnecessary, for the standard view accords very nicely with his own thesis. His view is dependent on the Family of Love surviving into the late seventeenth century and beyond, in order for them to have influenced the Quakers. Indeed, he goes so far as to state that "many Familists must have joined with Friends," although he does admit that "there is little positive proof of the fact that they did."⁵³

Emerging from these streams of historical treatment are attempts to describe and explain the Family of Love not so much in terms of being an ancestor of this or that group or of its suppression as an example religious bigotry and fanaticism; rather, they try to describe and explain the Family of Love as a concrete historical phenomenon.

Of course, these two historiographical streams are interdependent and intersect at a number of points. The more recent stream has had to rely on what has gone before, and herein lies its chief failing. For in relying on previous research and interpretation, the standard outline of the history of the Family of Love in England has assumed the proportions of a received truth, or at least of conventional wisdom. What no-one has thought worthwhile is to re-examine the conventional wisdom, particularly as regards the nature and extent of the Family of Love in England.

Typical of this tendency is the work of Herman de la Fontaine-Verwey.⁵⁴ De la Fontaine-Verwey, as do most recent commentators, approaches the Family of Love as being more important than previously thought. Indeed, this is the basic preconception that runs through all recent accounts. If it cannot be shown (as indeed it cannot, though some have tried) that the Family of Love was a widespread underground movement with a large number of adherents, then it becomes important

in the greater understanding which has developed of the significance of the smaller churches, groups, and sects of the sixteenth century for the history

of ideas. It is becoming increasingly clear that these movements ... had considerable influence on the crisis of European consciousness at the end of the seventeenth century and the emergence of the modern world. For an understanding of this fact the study of sects in the sixteenth century provides on the keys.⁵⁵

One might already guess what his approach to the history of the Family of Love in England might be. It is unnecessary to again repeat the standard view, but a few quotations will suffice to show de la Fontaine-Verwey's adherence to it:

there were Familists as early as 1553, at the beginning of Queen Mary's reign. Their leader was a cabinetmaker from Delft, Christopher Vittel. ... In the 1560's the sect expanded considerably. ... Despite persecution the sect endured. ... At the beginning of the Civil War ... [the] Familists, too, now appeared on the scene of opposition to the church.⁵⁶

There have since been other lengthy treatments of the Family of Love. Jean Dietz Moss, in her 1969 Ph.D. dissertation states:

there are many contradictory statements about the Familists in modern histories of the period. ... there is considerable confusion among modern historians as to who and what Familists were. The few studies which have investigated the society have focused on one or another aspects of it, and none has examined in depth the Family's teachings, as expressed by the founder, and their impact upon Englishmen.⁵⁷

This work, and another later article,⁵⁸ may then be seen as works of synthesis, attempts to reconcile the contradictions and state definitively the origins, history, and doctrines of the Family of Love. Unfortunately, she too accepts without question the conventional wisdom. The accounts of various hostile writers are taken at face value in the sense that they describe accurately the origins of the Family of Love in Vitell's missionary activity, the practices of early English Familism, and its subsequent spread and repression.⁵⁹

In the last fifteen years or so there have been numerous other works on the Family of Love in England. It is unnecessary to go through them all and show how they have all, with minor variations, followed the same approach. There has only one other lengthier treatment of the Family of Love.⁶⁰ In it Alastair Hamilton provides the most useful and concise account of Niclaes and the Family of Love to date. In his account of the Family's history in England, however, he too accepts the standard view, albeit with some minor qualifications. Thus, he doubts that the 1561 Surrey confession was really one of

devoted followers of H.N. and he concedes that "the numerical power of the Familists in the seventeenth century was very far from corresponding to the ever more frequent complaints against them."⁶¹ At no time, however, does he apply this methodological incisiveness to the history of the Family in England in the sixteenth century.⁶²

Here we are at the heart of the problem. As we have seen, there is very little objective evidence about the Family of Love in England. Of necessity, historians have had to base their accounts on hostile sources. There is nothing wrong with this in itself, as long as the hostile and polemical purposes of the writers are kept in mind. Of the recent commentators on the Family of Love, not one has taken the accounts of Rogers, Knewstubb, or Wilkinson at face value. There are lengthy passages to show that the early critics misinterpreted either unknowingly or wilfully, H.N.'s writings and doctrines. Thus we have seemingly endless quibbling about various aspects of Niclaes's doctrines on the Mass, baptism, and Scripture. While admitting that Niclaes' critics were motivated by polemical purposes, and pointing out that the particulars of their attacks must be carefully weighed, the sheer volume of these attacks must serve as some sort of guide to the rise and fall of the Family of Love. The underlying assumption is that even with the paucity of actual documentary sources, one can follow the fortunes of the Family of Love by looking at its critics and at governmental attempts to suppress it. This seems reasonable enough. Or is it? The great failing of this approach is that it assumes a constant attitude on the part of intellectuals, churchmen, and governmental authorities. If these people were always equally concerned with stamping out such sects, then this approach would be justified. But in fact they were not. It is as if an historian several centuries from now were to examine the United States in the early 1950's. Using this sort of approach, he would inevitably conclude, on the basis of Senator McCarthy and the House Un-American Activities Committee, that the Communist Party of the United States was attracting a large number of members and was actually about to overthrow the government.

Thus we see that the standard view of the history of the Family of Love in England is an optical illusion based on small core of truth. The small core of truth is that there were groups of the Family of Love in Cambridgeshire and London. At no time, however, were these large or significant. Although the Family vanishes from sight after the petition to James I, it *may* have survived (but just barely) in the Isle of Ely into the last half of the seventeenth century. This core of truth was distorted by the general prevalence of "Familist" ideas, in no way unique to the Family of Love. More importantly, the standard historical view is based on the volume and vehemence with which the Family

of Love was attacked and repressed in England. It has already been shown that the response was out of all proportion to the threat. What remains is to explain why such an insignificant and harmless sect provoked such a violent reaction at that particular time.

IV

In order to answer these questions, we shall have to examine more closely the three writers who initiated the official reaction to the Family of Love, and whose works dictated the course of that reaction, and whose assertions have colored modern historiography of the Family of Love in England. These writers will be put in the context of Elizabethan religious politics, and we shall see that they were all inclined to the "puritan" side of the debates within the Church of England, and that this inclination influenced their attitudes towards the Family of Love, attitudes which dominated the official reaction to the Family.

The earliest printed attack on the Family of Love was John Rogers' *The Displaying of an horrible Secte of grosse and wicked Heretiques* (1578). Unfortunately we are considerably less well-informed about his life than we would like. Most likely, he attended Oxford, where he graduated B.A. from Merton College in 1569–70 and M.A. from St. Alban's Hall in 1576.⁶³ Sharing a common theme that runs through all attacks on the Family of Love, Rogers identifies the Family of Love with the Anabaptists, stating that H.N. was the disciple of David Joris:

David George was the hatcher of this heresie, and layde the egge, but H.N. brought forth the chickens.⁶⁴

Henrie Nicholas ... after the death of David George tooke upon him to maintaine the same doctrine, not in the name of David, but in his owne name.⁶⁵

As Stephen Batman mentions in his preface to Rogers' *Displaying*, action must be taken against the Family of Love, "or else wil assuredly follow the like plague on us, as was at Munster."⁶⁶

Many of the accusations with which the Family of Love were charged in subsequent years seem to have originated with Rogers. These include the Family's purported libertinism and licentiousness,⁶⁷ their duplicitousness,⁶⁸ and that its members are really secret papists.⁶⁹

Throughout the *Displaying*, Rogers is very conscious of firing the opening shots in an ongoing campaign:

No man hitherto (that I can learne) hath endeavoured to confute them in writing.⁷⁰

He is also very conscious that others must carry on the battle:

Notwithstanding, so many as either by the doctrine of Henrie Nicholas, or by conference I haue learned, I have setdowne, to the ende that some good man might be encouraged to confute so impious an author, and such horrible errors, and perfourme in some learned worke that which my want and capacitie is not able to supply. ...⁷¹

It is enough for me to beginne the skirmishe, to display the Familie, to make readie the way, and discrie their force, that others may come after and overthrow their camp. ⁷²

It was not to be long before Knewstubb and Wilkinson accepted the challenge laid down by Rogers.

John Knewstubb, author of *A Confutation of Monstrous Heresies taught by H.N.* (1579) was the most prominent of the three. Born in Westmorland in 1544, he went up to Cambridge where he graduated B.A. in 1564, M.A. in 1568, and finally B.D. in 1576.⁷³ We see, therefore, that Knewstubb was at Cambridge at the same time that Rogers was at Oxford.

V

Knewstubb's *Confutation* is a longwinded and involved theological polemic in which he takes various of H.N.'s doctrines and refutes them with the same passages with which Niclaes had supported them. The theological intricacies do not overly concern us here. There are, however, several significant aspects of Knewstubb's attack. First is his identification of the Family of Love with "the Papists, Anabaptists, [and] Libertines ... for as much as they will have the word subject to their spirite."⁷⁴ The sins of England are so great that God has sent not only Papists as a judgment, but also Ariens, Anabaptists, and the Family of Love. Though the Papists profess to hate the Family, they do not suppress it, for they have a great deal in common with it.⁷⁵ Though the Family is not Protestant, Protestants must share the blame for it, for they have not combatted in fiercely enough.⁷⁶ In order to better combat such enemies, Knewstubb claims, the true church may no longer be satisfied with external conformity only. Those who

submit to the Church outwardly while secretly maintaining another faith are the greatest enemy and must therefore be brutally dealt with according to the Scriptural injunction of Deuteronomy 14.⁷⁷

William Wilkinson, author of *A Confutation of Certain Articles delivered unto the Family of Love* (1579) was a contemporary of John Knewstubb at Cambridge. He matriculated a sizar of Queen's College in 1568, and graduated B.A. in 1572, M.A. in 1575, and B.D. in 1582.⁷⁸

Wilkinson's book is the longest of the three, and also the least organized, consisting in large part of sections culled from other sources and contributions from others. The core of the work is "Articles which I exhibited unto a frend of mine, to be conuained unto the Familie of loue, that I might be certified of the doubts in them contayned. Which for my further instruction one Theophilus sent me a letter, and an exhortation, in the following manner." It appears that somehow Wilkinson was able to contact some members of the Family of Love and confront them with his charges.

Even more strongly than Knewstubb and Rogers, Wilkinson affirms that the Family of Love is a type of Anabaptist sect. In Rogers' work, we had the affirmation that H.N. was a disciple of David Joris, and Batman emphasized that England must suppress the Family or suffer the fate of Munster. Wilkinson, however, states the relationship quite boldly: "Therefore are they [the Family of Love] Anabaptists and David Georges Schollers."⁷⁹ Indeed, sprinkled liberally throughout the text are references to Heinrich Bullinger, that Swiss scourge of Anabaptists. The clear implication is that the Family of Love are really Anabaptists and should be dealt with according to the same rules. As if to hammer the point home, Wilkinson includes "Certaine profitable notes to know an Heretique, especially an Anabaptist. With the opinions, the behaviour of them out of various authors." Chief among the "various Authors" is Bullinger himself, but Calvin and Zwingli are also liberally excerpted. The idea, of course, is to "know your enemy," and who better to perform this task than three pre-eminent continental theologians, all of whom had had extensive dealings with and struggles against Anabaptists.

Lest we think, however, that identification of the Family of Love with the Anabaptists exonerates them from charges of Popery, it must be stated that to many Protestants, Anabaptism and Rome were working hand in hand. In Wilkinson's paraphrase of Bullinger: "Anabaptists were hartned by those which desired the overthrow of the Gospell and the restoring of Popery."⁸⁰

VI

One certainly hesitates to use a term as overworked and misunderstood as "puritan." Yet, so long as the term is carefully defined and used, we shall see that it does indeed apply to Knewstubb, Rogers, and Wilkinson, and furthermore, that their puritanism was an important factor in their attacks on the Family of Love.

In its most basic definition, the term "puritan" denotes one who believed that the Church of England was "but halfly reformed," retaining as it did popish vestiges in doctrine, practice, and government that denied it the status of a truly "Reformed" church.⁸¹ This basic definition, however, needs to be refined somewhat, for if we define "puritan" as those who wished to see the English church further reformed, we would have to include almost all of the church leadership in the early years of Elizabeth's reign. If we are to make this our definition of "puritan," we shall have to include such widely divergent characters as the cautious, conservative reformers Grindal, Sandys, and Cox, firebrands such as Cartwright, Sampson, and Humphrey, and out-and-out rabble-rousers such as John Field, Thomas Wilcox (authors of the *Admonition to Parliament*) in the same category. We obviously need finer categories of analysis if we are to understand Elizabethan religion and politics and to tie the attack on the Family of Love into a general context.

In essence, there were almost as many kinds of Protestantism as there were Protestants. For the sake of analysis, however, it is possible to define several broad categories. In the first place there were cautious, conservative reformers, such as most of the first Elizabethan bishops, with the notable exception of Matthew Parker, Elizabeth's first Archbishop of Canterbury. Drawn almost exclusively from the ranks of returned Marian exiles, this includes such prominent figures as Edmund Grindal, Edwin Sandys, and Richard Cox. In general, these men, while not entirely satisfied with the Elizabethan settlement, recognized that a Protestant Queen, even if not as Protestant as they would have liked, was infinitely preferable to the more plausible alternatives: civil religious war, or foreign invasion and the restoration of the Roman Church. They hoped to further reform the church by slow increments, gently nudging the Queen in the right direction. This indeed was their reason for accepting positions of leadership in the church when many of their "hotter" Protestant colleagues urged them not to have anything to do with a semi-papistical church. At the time, of course, they had no way of knowing that the settlement of 1559 was to be permanent, and their chances of success must have seemed very high indeed.

At the other extreme were radical preachers, especially in London and East Anglia, who were very outspoken about Popish remnants in the church. In this category we would include the radical Londoners Field and Wilcox, Wiburne, Anthony Gilby, and Robert Fitz. It was, in fact, to puritans of this stripe that the name was first applied in the vestiarian controversies of the 1560's.

Somewhere between these two extremes, one suspects, were the majority of educated, articulate, and Protestant Englishmen. If they were dissatisfied with the pace of reform in the 1560's and 70's, neither were they able to condone the radical nonconformity, and ultimately the separatism, of "London's Protestant Underworld."⁸²

It should be emphasized, however, that the situation was extremely fluid. There were no party lines, only floating coalitions which coalesced and disbanded as circumstances dictated. As Elizabeth moved the church more in her own direction under Archbishop Whitgift in the 1580's and 90's, the situation became less fluid and puritan opposition more cohesive. However, in the 1560's and 70's, the situation remained fluid and the "puritans" remained within the embrace of the Church of England.

It should also be emphasized that underneath such seemingly divisive questions as the vestiarian controversy, the form of church government, and the "prophesyings" or "exercises," there was substantial agreement on the essentials of faith: the doctrines of justification by faith, and the Eucharistic question, the single most burning doctrinal issue of the time. Though the Queen herself was probably more inclined to a Lutheran view, it is significant that the question of Real Presence versus Memorial Supper was very rarely a bone of contention. Virtually the entire church was united behind the Swiss/German view.⁸³

One of the things which stands out when we look at the three authors who initiated the attack on the Family of Love is that not only were they all university men (Knewstubb and Wilkinson at Cambridge, Rogers at Oxford) but they were also almost exact contemporaries. Knewstubb graduated B.A. in 1564, Rogers in 1569 and Wilkinson in 1568. That these three men, similar in age, background, education, and religious conviction all undertook to attack the Family of Love within two years of each other is no accident. Rather, it was the result of their education, the way they had been taught to view the world, especially the religious situation and the church. To understand these men and their writings, we must go back to their days at university, when their ideals and convictions were formed.

Cambridge University, of course, had acquired a reputation as a hotbed of Protestantism as early as the 1520's and the meetings in the White Horse Inn. From William Tyndale on through Cranmer and Ridley, the University had provided English Protestants with models, heroes, and martyrs. Under Edward, Cambridge was much more the royally favoured university. And it was under Edward and his Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Cranmer, that the man who, more than anyone else influenced the next generation of English churchmen came to England. This man was Martin Bucer.

Bucer arrived in England in the spring of 1549 at Archbishop Cranmer's invitation and was shortly appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. Though only at Cambridge a short time (he was to die in 1551) and ill much of the time he was there, he left a lasting impression. His influence was to be felt for generations. Among those who sat at his feet were a number of future bishops: Grindal, Sandys, Parker, and Pilkington. Thus we can see that Bucer's influence survived in a direct way, affecting church and state under Elizabeth. Grindal especially was a favourite of the reformer, and Bucer was the dominant influence in the life and thinking of the future Archbishop of Canterbury.⁸⁴ Besides these luminaries, hundreds of other subsequently prominent leaders must have listened to and been taught by Bucer. According to contemporary observers, one never forgot having been taught by Martin Bucer.⁸⁵

Bucer enjoys a deserved reputation as one of the more tolerant and eirenic of the reformers, working ceaselessly for concord among Protestants. Yet there were limits to his tolerance. For all his efforts at concord, he would not compromise on the core of his faith, on justification by faith, for instance.⁸⁶ Diversity of practice was also not to be tolerated. Granted he was fairly indulgent when it came to drawing the line, and his view of *adiaphora* was especially generous. But diversity of essential religious practice was something not to be tolerated. This is based on his view of the essential unity of church and state, or rather, their symbiosis, as a *societas christiana*.⁸⁷ His concern for the essential unity of church and state is reflected in his attitude towards the Anabaptists. His arguments condemned not so much their denial of infant baptism as their tendency to withdrawal and separation, thus rending the unity of the Christian community. He urged stringent measure against the Anabaptists in Strasbourg during the Peasants' Revolt and had Carlstadt expelled from the city.⁸⁸ As an advisor to Philip of Hesse, he suppressed Anabaptism there.⁸⁹ At the Smalkald Conference, he took the lead in drafting a petition to suppress various Anabaptists and Separatists.⁹⁰ Though more inclined to persuade than to burn, he nevertheless was not above using

physical force when he deemed it necessary.⁹¹ This then was the dominant intellectual and theological influence at Cambridge for years afterward, and it could not have helped but to shape Elizabethan religious politics, both directly through men such as Grindal and Sandys, and indirectly through the lasting impression which Bucer left on the University.

Cambridge in the 1560's must surely have been an exciting place for a young man. Not only was there a new regime which would further pursue the reformation begun under Edward (or so they thought), they were to be the leaders of it. The early 1560's saw a considerable increase in the university population.⁹² By a statute of 1559, the regents were given considerable authority within the university by virtue of their control of the Senate.⁹³ That these young dons should incline more to the puritan side is not surprising, since there was certainly a intergenerational component to the religious conflicts of the day.

Cambridge was consistently on the cutting edge of puritanism in the early years of Elizabeth's reign, from Fulke's denunciation of clerical vestments to Cartwright's more serious opposition to episcopacy, leading eventually to his being deprived of his chair and a self-imposed exile in Geneva, as well as to a revision of the statutes of the university, placing effective authority in the hands of the Vice-Chancellor and the Heads of Colleges.⁹⁴

Nevertheless, it is easy to exaggerate the divisiveness of these conflicts. There were many, for example, who supported Cartwright not out of sympathy for his religious convictions, but to protect the ancient liberties of the university. In large part, the whole affair smacks of academic intrigue and factional politics. In many ways, this controversy resembles the row over Greek pronunciation in the 1530s, with its mixture of personal, factional, academic and political motives, rather than a life and death struggle over the future of the church.⁹⁵ Only in rare cases, when someone proved as outspoken and intractable as Cartwright were such severe measures taken.

The prominence of Cantabrigian puritans has sometimes obscured the significant if numerically smaller Puritan movement at Oxford. In the several years following Elizabeth's accession, staunchly Catholic Oxford was gradually purged and Protestants put into positions of authority. Most notably, the Earl of Leicester was appointed Chancellor in 1564 and took an active role in the university's administration.⁹⁶

There was also the influence of the Italian reformer Peter Martyr Vermigli, who, like Bucer had been invited to England by Cranmer after the death of Henry VIII. Indeed, as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, Martyr was Bucer's direct counterpart, though the Italian seemingly had a much harder

row to hoe, consistently coming up against Oxford's Catholic and conservative prejudices.⁹⁷

Reformed influences were also brought to Oxford by the presence of numerous foreign Protestant students particularly from Switzerland. Swiss presence at Oxford began in the 1530s when Rodolph Gualter, Bullinger's foster son and later his son-in-law, paid a short visit. Under Edward, there was a virtual exchange program between Oxford and Zurich. Among the Swiss who studied at Oxford were John ab Ulmis, John Stumphius, and Thomas Blaurer. The briefest glance at the *Zurich Letters* confirms the lasting friendships and enduring influences formed by both sides.⁹⁷

The crucial point is that even though Oxford has justly acquired the label "Catholic," puritan influences were not lacking. Continental reformed theology was brought to the university through Peter Martyr, foreign students and the influence of Zurich, and later on through Elizabeth's purge of the university. And those puritans which Oxford did produce tended to be of a more radical stripe, "brought up, it may be, in a harsher school." Field and Wilcox were both Oxonians.⁹⁸ Thus, John Rogers could very likely have been exposed to continental theology and puritan influences during his time at Oxford.

Not knowing very much about John Rogers, we must extrapolate from his writings to gain any idea of his religious convictions. Throughout his *Displaying* he uses many concepts and phrases which would seem to put him on the side of the "hotter" Protestants. There is his constant castigation of the Roman Church. Granted, this was commonplace, but his continued repetition of the charges against the Papists would lead one to believe that there is more to it than literary fashion. There is also his black and white view of the religious situation. Not for him were Parker's "mediocrity" or an Elizabethan *via media*:

with the bloudie Papistes with their fire and fagot, continual warre, with horrible murders on the one side, and the Anabaptistes, Free will men, Arrians, Pelagians, and the Famelie of Loue on the other side, Christes Church hath little rest, and small favour in the sight of man, but spurned on euery side. ⁹⁹

Besides the *Displaying* and the subsequent *Answer unto a wicked libel made by Christ. Vitel, one of the Chief English elders of the pretended Family of Love* (London: 1578), the STC attributes only one other work to our John Rogers. This is *The Summe of Christianity* ... (1578). As its title suggests, this is a sort of primer in the basics of Christian theology. Its very existence

suggests that Rogers was more inclined to the "hotter" Protestants. It implies that the Prayer Book is not enough, that it needs a "brieve and plaine" supplement. In particular, Rogers' emphasis on the ultimate authority of Scripture, on preaching and discipline, and on a godly life, would seem to put him on the puritan side of things.¹⁰⁰ It is not a question of theology: anyone but a Catholic would have to agree with his theological assertions. Rather, it is a question, and the judgment is admittedly subjective and speculative, of tendency and emphasis. There is only one clear reference to the religious controversies of the day: This would seem to be a reference to the vestiarian problems the question of "lawful" versus "offensive" was at the heart of religious debate.

John Knewstubb was what we might call a radically-tinged moderate. No friend of vestments and square caps, in his days at Cambridge he had petitioned in favour of Cartwright.¹⁰² He had also taken part in "prophesyings" or conferences of ministers designed to elicit the true meaning of Scripture and instruct unlearned clergy.¹⁰³ It was Grindal's refusal to suppress the prophesyings, and worse yet, his attempt to justify his disobedience to Elizabeth herself, which led to his fall from favour. Yet for Knewstubb, there was no question of separation. The conclusive, damning evidence of the falseness of Arians, Anabaptists, and others' was that they removed themselves from the church.¹⁰⁴ The question was not one of whether there ought to be an authoritative church coterminous with the nation, but rather, what form that church ought to take. Viewing Knewstubb's career in retrospect, one might think that he would have been anathema to authorities. He was after all one of the leaders of the crypto-Presbyterian Dedham conference in the 1580's, the leading puritan preacher in Suffolk, and took the nonconforming side in 1604 at Hampton Court.¹⁰⁵ Not the sort of man we would expect Elizabeth or her Council, which had to answer to her, to entrust with much responsibility. Yet we find him preaching at Paul's Cross on Good Friday, presented to the living of Cockfield in Sussex, and, most relevant for our purposes, the Privy Council, at the height of the Familist "scare" in early 1581 (1580 o.s.), appointed him as a sort of consultant to the bishops in the repression of the Family of Love.¹⁰⁶

That William Wilkinson, like Knewstubb and Rogers, was a puritan, is evident not only from his *Confutation*, wherein he made prodigious use of Bullinger and other Reformed theologians, but also from his other writings. In 1580, while residing in London, he published *A very godly and learned treatise of the exercise of Fastyng, described out of the word of God, very necessarye to bee applyed unto our churches in England in these perillous*

times. Again, as with Knewstubb, one notices that even though one would place him in the "puritan opposition," this did not prevent him from advancing his career within the Church of England. In 1588, though a layman, he became prebend of Fridaythorpe in York Cathedral, which post he was to hold until his death in 1613. Thus, again we see that even though on some issues he and the "Anglicans" were on opposite sides, this did not hinder his preferment within the church, nor did this opposition prevent the sides from cooperating on the really important issues: the Catholic threat, and sectarianism, the threats from right and left, as it were.

It is apparent that it was Englishmen more inclined to the puritan side in religious controversy who took the lead in the attack on the Family of Love. This fact is underlined very nicely by an episode in Parliament.¹⁰⁷ On February 15, 1581 a bill for the suppression of the Family of Love was brought in by "divers preachers ... commended ... from the Convocation." Subsequently, the bill seems to have been lost in the shuffle and presumably died at the committee stage.

What is interesting about this episode is the committee members responsible for the bill. Most of those whom we can identify are of pronounced puritan leanings, supporters of one or more of the great "puritan" issues of the day: the fate of Mary Queen of Scots, increased penalties for recusant Catholics, a more aggressively Protestant foreign policy, including concrete aid to the Dutch rebels and French Huguenots, and, of course, further purification of the Church, which for some meant its presbyterianization. One of the committee members, Sir Thomas Scott, had supported a bill to enforce the Act of Uniformity against Catholics only, leaving puritan ministers free to vary the Prayer Book as they wished. He was a chief enemy of Mary Stuart and consistently urged her execution.¹⁰⁸ Another, the diplomat Sir Henry Killigrew, was in league with Leicester and Walsingham in urging a more aggressively Protestant foreign policy on the Queen.¹⁰⁹ A third, Robert Beal, Clerk of the Privy Council, was chosen to carry Mary's death warrant to Fotheringay.¹¹⁰ Thomas Norton, Cranmer's son-in-law and translator of Calvin's *Institutes*, was a consistent advocate of Mary's execution and a keen supporter of the anti-Catholic bill of 1581.¹¹¹ Edward Lewkenor was constantly in trouble for his anti-episcopal views and landed in the Tower in 1586.¹¹² There was also Sir William More, the same More who twenty years earlier had taken Chaundeler and Sterete's confession, indicating a continued interest in the Family of Love.

Thus far, we have seen that it was the "hotter" Protestants who initiated the attack on the Family of Love. Even so, this was an issue on which everyone

could agree. Puritans and their erstwhile "enemies" in the official church establishment cooperated wonderfully in this arena. As we have seen, Bishop Cox of Ely hunted the Family of Love in his diocese. Among those who aided him in his questioning of the villagers at Wisbech was the same William Fulke who had stirred up so much trouble at Cambridge over clerical vestments. On the other hand, Andrew Perne, who had conducted the earlier investigation, could hardly be considered a puritan. He had conformed under Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth. As Master of Peterhouse, he had taken the official side in the vestment troubles at Cambridge. Under Mary he testified against Bucer at his posthumous trial for heresy. Under Elizabeth, he participated in his rehabilitation. All of which gave rise to the derogatory term "Pernecoat."¹¹³ Yet on the Family of Love, he was foursquare in agreement with his puritan "enemies." The point is that underneath the seeming division, underneath the vestments controversy, Cartwright, and the prophesyings, there lay a solid bedrock on consensus: separatists and sectarians must not be tolerated and must be made to conform. Even the Queen herself shared this opinion, as witnessed by her Proclamation, despite her "not wanting to make windows into men's souls."

This underlying consensus was the result of a number of causes. Everyone, puritans included, agreed that church and state were inseparable and coterminous. There was no question of separate and competing churches. Here is the influence of Bucer and continental theology which coincided very nicely with the requirements of Tudor monarchs. There was also substantial agreement on the Eucharist, though puritans were very sensitive to anything which might imply worship of the host. Puritans also recognized that a "halfly reformed" church was better than one not reformed at all. If the English church was not yet what it should be, neither was it what in once had been. For the vast majority (as yet) there was no question of separation: the only church they could envision was a church of England.

One is struck by the *pro forma* character of the attacks on the Family of Love. Again here, we see the influence on continental theologians. Despite the bitter disputes between Wittenberg, Zurich, and Geneva, one aspect was common to all: enmity towards and persecution of Anabaptists and sectarians. They were anathema precisely because their beliefs meant the end of coterminous church and state, a *societas christiana*. On the Anabaptists, there was solid agreement about ends, if not about means. One almost gets the impression that Englishmen felt left out. Having no real indigenous Anabaptists to hunt, they came up with a more than adequate replacement in the Family of Love. To be more precise, there was a small group of ambitious

Englishmen who were looking for a target to attack. Remember that Knewstubb, Rogers, and Wilkinson were all relatively young men (perhaps in their early thirties) when they wrote their anti-Family works. Their careers were really just starting. What better way to cut one's teeth than to write in a tried and true genre graced by such illustrious names as Zwingli, Calvin, and especially Bullinger. We have already seen how frequently the Family of Love is tied to Anabaptism by its critics. In Patrick Collinson's words, "There is ample evidence of a kind of informal agreement prevailing in many quarters that 'civil wars of the Church of God' would be abandoned in favour of an affirmation of those things in which all protestants assented, against papists, against such sectarian threats as the Family of Love. ..."¹¹⁴

There remains one large question to be answered: Why just then? Why did the attack on the Family of Love begin and reach its peak in the late 1570's and early 1580's? As we have seen, the standard historical answer will not do, that the Family of Love was attracting new members and constituted a real threat. The answer lies elsewhere.

The late 1570's represented something of a hiatus in the tensions within the church. In the past were the vestiarian controversies, Cartwright, and the *Admonition to Parliament*. The puritans had a sympathetic Archbishop of Canterbury in Edmund Grindal, whose great troubles still lay in the future, and whose primacy held high hopes for the godly.¹¹⁵ To a large extent this represents consolidation in the face of a common threat: resurgent post-Tridentine Catholicism and native recusancy. Here again is part of the bedrock of agreement. However objectionable some of the Queen's policies might be to the godly, she was, after all, a Protestant. A Protestant Queen, even if slow to purify the church of Popish vestiges, was infinitely preferable to a Catholic monarch and a restoration of the Roman Church. The year 1571 had seen the victory of Lepanto and Spanish dominance in the Mediterranean, 1572 the St. Bartholomew's Massacre, and 1578 the victories of Don John in the Netherlands. On every side Protestant Europe, and especially England, seemed threatened. The King of Spain's "English Enterprise" was thought to be imminent. In 1579 a Papal force had landed in Ireland and was soon reinforced from Spain. In 1580 the English Jesuits Edmund Campion and Robert Parsons arrived to bring succour to English Catholics. In addition the Queen had hinted once again that she was open to the matrimonial overtures of the Duke d'Alençon, the French King's brother. Then there was the perennial trouble spot of the Queen of Scots, a rallying point for English Catholics while she lived. It was a time indeed in which Laurence Humphrey could write to Switzerland:

These are the signs preceding the end of the world. ... Satan is roaring like a lion, the world is going mad, antichrist is resorting to every extreme, that he may with wolf-like ferocity devour the sheep of Christ.¹¹⁶

That the Family of Love should be the object of suspicion then is no surprise. There was, as we have seen, lingering suspicion of the Family of Love as crypto-Catholics, a Popish fifth column ready to revolt at any time. On a deeper level, there was the feeling that now more than ever concord and unity were essential. Wrote John Rogers:

How the wicked take occasion by these and like errors [the Family of Love], to speake euil of Christs Church, the eares of many godly doe heare, Especially the Papists: who speak and write, and nothing heard more common in the mouths, then these tearmes, ye are at variaunce amongst your selves: no unitie of doctrine is observed: ye are of diuers opinions and sectes.¹¹⁷

If euer there were disturbers of the Church ... I thinke that now is the time: For what with the bloudie Papistes with their fire and fagot, continuall warre, with horrible murders on one side, and the Anabaptistes, Freewill men, Arrians, Pelagians, and the Familie of Loue on the other side, Christes Church hath little rest, and small fauour in the sight of man, but spurned on euery side.¹¹⁸

This indeed is a theme which, if not always explicitly stated, was certainly always in the background. Now was not the time to engage in "civil wars of the Church of God;" now was the time to combat the Catholic threat and the best way to do that was to make sure your own house was in order and to display strength and unity, not division and dissension. This concern was fundamental to all Protestant Englishmen. That puritans took the lead in attacking the Family of Love is perhaps attributable to their greater sensitivity to the Roman threat and to their greater emphasis on a completely godly life as opposed to formal religious practice. Though they led the way, all joined in, attacking a threat which never really existed. That the attack was pursued with such gusto is perhaps attributable to those things which "puritans" and "Anglicans" had in common, especially their belief in an authoritative national church. It was only natural then that they should concentrate on those areas and issues in which they were in substantial agreement and leave the others to sort themselves out later.

There was also a careerist aspect to the origins of the attack on the Family of Love.¹¹⁹ It is surely significant that our three authors were all roughly the

same age: in the late 1570's they were just coming into their official maturity. John Rogers' three works were all printed within two years of each other. All of John Knewstubb's writings were published during an eight year period in the late 70's and early 80's. For the rest of his long career, he did not publish another thing. William Wilkinson's other major book was published in 1580, one year after his *Confutation*. The fact that these men's official careers were just starting, that they were looking for some issue with which to make their mark, when the Family of Love presented itself as a target, and when conditions within England and the church were most conducive to such an attack, only served to intensify the campaign against the Family of Love.

The Family of Love in England was unimportant and insignificant in the grand scheme of things. However, for the reasons outlined above, it provoked a response out of all proportion to any threat it presented. This vehement attack has magnified the marginal significance of the Family of Love in England beyond recognition. This has been transmitted to the present through historical writings which were more concerned with making an ideological or genealogical point than with establishing the real historical significance of the Family of Love. By a critical evaluation of sources, it has been established that the standard view of the Family's history in England is a vastly distorted version of the truth. The only reason it has become a subject of research at all is because a peculiar conjunction circumstances led certain Englishmen to attack it in a certain way. The Family of Love, and the attack on it, are a mirror in which we see reflected the concerns and attitudes of Elizabethan England.*

University of Calgary

Notes

* The research for this article was originally undertaken for an M.A. thesis at the University of British Columbia under the supervision of Professor C. R. Friedrichs and Professor M. Tolmie. I am also grateful to Professor L. Knafla of the University of Calgary for his advice and assistance.

1. P.L. Hughes, J.F. Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969), II, 474-75.
2. Accounts of Niclaes' life are numerous. The information here was taken largely from the following sources: Friedrich Nippold, "Heinrich Niclaes und das Haus der Liebe," *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, XXXII (1862); Charlotte Fell-Smith, "Henry Niclas," *Dictionary of National Biography*, XIV, 427-31. Jean Dietz Moss, "The Family of Love in England," Diss., West Virginia, 1969; Alastair Hamilton, *The Family of Love* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1981); F. Loofs, "Familisten," *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie*, V, 750-55; L. Knappert, "Hendrik Niclaes," *Nieuw Nederlandsche Biografisch Woordenboek*, V,

- cols., 367–70; H. de la Fontaine-Verwey, “The Family of Love,” *Quarendo*, VI (1976), pp. 219–271.
3. Hamilton, pp. 6–12.
4. Vitell, described by both Rogers and Wilkinson as the Family’s chief elder in England, first appears on the scene in 1555. Wilkinson includes in his *Confutation* the account of one Henry Crinell (or Orinell) recounting Vitell’s heretical views as expressed in that year in Colchester. However, neither H.N. nor the Family of Love are mentioned and it seems that Vitell became a follower of H.N. at some later date. (W. Wilkinson, *Confutation*, preface, iiiii-A1.)
5. The fortunes of the Family of Love on the Continent were somewhat different. One of its most interesting aspects is Niclaes’ connection with the great Antwerp printer Christopher Plantin and his humanist circle of friends and associates including the geographer Ortelius, Justus Lipsius, the Hebraicist Andreus Masius, Benito Arias Montano, and quite possibly Guillaume Postel and Guy Le Fevre de la Boderie. There was rift in the sect in 1573 in which Plantin and his circle deserted Niclaes for his erstwhile disciple Hendrik Jansen van Barrefeld, known as Hiel, or “the life of God.” On this aspect of the Family of Love, see Max Rooses, *Christophe Plantin, Imprimeur anversois* (Antwerp: Buschman, 1897), pp. 59–76; H. de la Fontaine-Verwey, *Quarendo*, pp. 230–43; Hamilton, pp. 70–78; Bernard Rekers, *Benito Arias Montano* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), pp. 70–114.
6. For the full text of the confession, see Moss, “‘Godded with God’: Hendrik Niclaes and His Family of Love,” *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 71, part 8 (1981), pp. 70–74.
7. Moss, *APS*, p. 74.
8. J.W. Martin, “English Familists and other Separatists in the Guildford Area,” *Bulletin of the Institute for Historical Research*, 51 (May, 1978), p. 91.
9. Moss, *APS*, p. 74.
10. See above pp. 6–10. Chaundeler stated that his wife was “fetched out of the Isle of Ely by two of the congregation.” Chaundeler and his bride, however, apparently did not take to each other. This disgruntlement in itself ought to make us wary of accepting all of Chaundeler’s statement at face value. (Moss, *APS*, p. 72.)
11. Moss, *APS*, p. 70.
12. Martin, *BIHR*.
13. Martin, *BIHR*, p. 91.
14. Hamilton, p. 118; John Rogers, *An Answer unto a wicked libel made by Christ. Vitel, one of the chief English elders of the pretended Family of Love* (London: 1578), fols. K1-K2.
15. Hamilton, p. 119.
16. *Acts of the Privy Council*, vol. 10, p. 332.
17. *APC*, vol. 12, p. 231.
18. *APC*, vol. 12, p. 232.
19. *APC*, vol. 12, p. 269.

20. "The confesion of sele ely and mathew/beinge of the famely of Love &/of her maisties gard/ They must be deyfied in god & god in them/[T]he Jugement & resurexion is past already/ We are eylewmynated that is to saye of the [?resurexion] & restoryed to the perfection that Adam/[?had] before his fale/[Th]e Literall sence of the scripture they do not regard/[What] so ever they do is no syne/[Th]ey ought not to suffer their bodyes to be executed bycause/[they are] the temples of the holly gost/[The]y may lawfully deny religion of faith before any/[if]ther be any cause of persecusion/[Th]er ought not to be any maiestarts amongst crystyans."
(J. Hitchcock, "A Confession of the Family of Love," *BIHR*, 43 [1970] .p. 85.) The "sele" and "mathewe" mentioned are obviously Robert and Thomas Mathewe, while the "ely" could possibly William Eling of the group accused in 1578.
21. Felicity Heal, "The Family of Love and the Diocese of Ely," *Studies in Church History IX: Schism, Heresy, and Religious Protest*, ed. Derek Baker (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 218–19; Moss, *APS*, p. 28; Hamilton, p. 120.
22. Moss, *APS*, p. 28.
23. Moss, *APS*, p. 28.
24. Hamilton, p. 120. The next day, the Privy Council wrote to Bishop Sandys of London, "touching order to be taken with Anabaptists and those of the Family of Love." (*APC*, vol. 8, p. 338.)
25. Moss, *APS*, p. 75. A tenth person, Thomas Piersonne, "yeoman and the wealthiest of the company, before he was sent for conveyed himself away as it is thought to London. ... "
26. Heal, p. 220.
27. Jean Dietz Moss, "Variations on a Theme: The Family of Love in Renaissance England," *Renaissance Quarterly*, XXXI (1978), pp. 189–95.
28. Moss, *APS*, p. 81.
29. Hamilton, pp. 123–24.
30. Moss *APS*, p. 80.
31. *The Short-Title Catalogue* lists sixteen of H.N.'s works in English. Of these, the most important are:
 1. *Evangelium Regni. Ein Frolicke Bodeschop vam Ryke*. (Antwerp, 1555–62); in English, *Evangelium Regni. A joyfull Message of the Kingdom*.
 2. *Prophetie des Geistes der Liefsten*. (Antwerp, 1555- 62); in English, *The Prophetie of the Spirit of Love*.
 3. *Den Spiegel der Gherechticheit*. (Antwerp, 1562); the entire work was never translated into English. Rather, its two introductions were published separately under the titles *An Introduction to the holy Understanding of the Glasse of Righteousness* and *A Figure of the true and Spiritual Tabernacle according to the inward Temple of the House of God in the Spirit*.
 4. *Exhortatio. De eerste Vormaninge H.N. Tot syne kinderen, unde dem Husgesinne der Liefsten*. (Cologne, 1573); in English, *Exhortation I. The first exhortation of H.N. to his Children, and to the Family of Love*.

5. *Revelation Dei. De openbaringe Godes, und syne grote Prophetie.* (Cologne, 1573); in English, *Revelatio Dei. The Reuelation of God, and his great Prophetie: which God now; in the last Daye; hath shewed unto his Elect.*

6. *Terra Pacis. Ware getugnisse van idt geistlich Landschap des Fredes.* (Cologne, 1580); in English, *Terra Pacis. A True Testification of the Spirituall Lande of Peace; which is the Spirituall Lande of Promyse, and the holy Citie of Peace or the Heauenly Ierusalem.*

Only two of H.N.'s works make reference to his followers in England. The first of these is "An Epistle sent unto two daughters of Warwick." As Niclaes signed it "your unknown friend," it seems unlikely that he knew them personally. (Moss, *APS*, p. 16.) The second is "The Epistle of H.N. ... unto the right Reverent Bishops," which exists only in manuscript form in Lambeth Palace. (Hamilton, p. 129.)

32. Julia C. Ebel, "The Family of Love: Sources of Their History in England," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, XXX (1966-67), pp. 335-36.
33. Moss, *APS*, p. 76.
34. *An Apology for the Service of Love, and People that own it, commonly called the Family of Love*, quoted in Hamilton, p. 123.
35. *An Apology*, quoted in Moss, *Diss.*, p. 64.
36. This petition was published in 1606 with hostile notes by a Protestant critic under the title *A Supplication of the Family of Loue*, and again by Samuel Rutherford in his *Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist* (London, 1648).
37. Rutherford, p. 344.
38. Rutherford, p. 346.
39. Rutherford, p. 346.
40. Rutherford, p. 348.
41. Rutherford, p. 350.
42. For further examples of minor and incidental attacks on the Family of Love, drawn from Rogers, Knewstubb, and Wilkinson, see William Fulke, *A Defense of the sincere and true Translations of the holie Scriptures into the English tong ...* (London, 1583; rpt. Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1843), pp. 36-37; Thomas Rogers, *Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England* (London, 1585; rpt. Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1854), pp. 52, 79, 280, 320; William Whitaker, *A Disputation on Holy Scripture against the Papists, especially against Bellarmine and Stapleton*, trans. and ed. W. Fitzgerald (London, 1588; rpt. Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1844), p. 298; Edwin Sandys, *Sermons*, ed. J. Ayre (Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1842), p. 130.
43. Hamilton, p. 135.
44. For an example of one accused of "Familism" but who cannot be connected to H.N. or the Family of Love, see the case of John Etherington (or Hetherington) cited in Moss, *APS*, pp. 55-56. While he exhibited "Familist" characteristics, he is not connected to H.N. or the Family of Love and indeed, while he does admit to heresy in his younger days, he denies being a member of the Family of Love. (John

Etherington, *A brief discovery of the blasphemous doctrine of familisme* [London, 1645], quoted in Hamilton, p. 137.) See also the work of Stephen Denison, Etherington's accuser, *The White Wolfe; or, a sermon preached at Pauls Crosse* (London, 1623), pp. 33–34, 38–39, 46. Moss's assertion that "Denison may indeed have cornered as seventeenth-century Familist" appears unfounded. (Moss, *APS*, p. 56.)

45. Hamilton, p. 139. In addition, Calvert printed the first English translations of Hiel, H.N.'s schismatic disciple. For an interesting seventeenth-century parallel to the Familist "scare," see J.C. Davis, *Fear, Myth, and History: The Ranters and the Historians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986). Davis argues that the authorities' fears of the Ranters were manufactured out of whole cloth, that there were, in fact, no Ranters. They were invented because "it was necessary to believe that the Ranters existed in order to demonstrate the perceived and potential anarchy of *de facto* religious toleration. ... " The Ranters were "discovered" in 1970 by Norman Cohn and A.L. Morton, because it was "necessary to believe that they existed, as a movement of indeterminate size, in order to sustain the twin notions that the people have persistently attempted to make their own history and that such a potential history has been, in essence, the negation of capitalist culture and the Protestant ethic, which for three hundred years accompanied it." (pp. 135–36.) I would agree that the Family of Love has found its way into modern historiography in much the same way, although with some significant differences. There actually was a Family of Love, on which the authorities seized, and whose importance they greatly magnified; it was not invented, as Davis maintains the Ranters were. Neither was the Family of Love as dramatically "discovered." The reasons for the recent flowering of Familist studies have little to do with left-wing history, and more to do with the notion of a Radical Reformation, hitherto obscured by the looming bulk of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin.
46. Hamilton, pp. 140–41; Moss, *APS*, p. 69.
47. John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824), II, part 1, 561–62.
48. I owe this suggestion to Professor C.R. Friedrichs.
49. Thomas Fuller, *The Church History of Britain*, ed. J.S. Brewer (Oxford University Press, 1845), IV, 407–12; Strype, II, part 1, 556–64.
50. See, for example R. Barclay, *The Inner Life of the Religious Societies of the Commonwealth* (London, 1879), pp. 27–32; E. Belfort Bax, *Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1903), pp. 338–383; Ronald A. Knox, *Enthusiasm—A Chapter in the History of Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), pp. 140–41, 170–72; Champlin Burrage, *The Early English Dissenters* (Cambridge University Press, 1912), pp. 209–215.
51. Allen C. Thomas, "The Family of Love or the Familists," *Haverford College Studies*, XII (1893), and E.A. Payne, "The Family of Love," *The Chronicle*, XIV (1953).
52. Rufus Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London: Macmillan, 1909), pp. 428–448.
53. Jones, p. 448

170 / Renaissance and Reformation

54. "De Geschriften van Hendrik Niclaes," *Het Boek*, XXXVI (1942), pp. 161–221; "Trois hérésiarques dans les Pays-Bas du XVI^e siècle," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, XVI (1954), pp. 312–330; "The Family of Love," *Quarendo*, VI (1976), pp. 219–71.
55. De la Fontaine-Verwey, *Quarendo*, p. 221.
56. De la Fontaine-Verwey, *Quarendo*, pp. 259–260.
57. Moss, Diss., pp. 6–9.
58. Moss, *APS*.
59. Moss, Diss., pp. 23–30.
60. A. Hamilton, *The Family of Love* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1981).
61. Hamilton, p. 135.
62. For other recent accounts along the same lines, see J.W. Martin, "Elizabethan Familists and English Separatism," *Journal of British Studies*, 20 (1980), pp. 59–62; , p. 338; Jean Dietz Moss, "The Family of Love and English Critics," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, VI (1975), pp. 41–42, 44.
63. Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses 1500–1714* (Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1968), III, 1274; Anthony a Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses* (London, 1691), I, 156–157.
64. *Displaying*, fol. C8.
65. *Displaying*, fol. B4.
66. *Displaying*, fol. B1.
67. *Displaying*, fol. B6.
68. "If the doctrine of H.N. be a trueth, why is it taught in corners? Why dare none step forth to maintaine the doctrine of H.N. being euerywhere spoken against?" (*Displaying*, fol. E5.)
69. "And least the Papists should imagine that H.N. should be a professor of the Gospell, I will declare manifest causes to prove that he is a right chicken of the Church of Rome." (*Displaying*, fol. D3.) H.N., declares Rogers, agrees with Rome on the authority of the Pope, on the Mass, and on the efficacy of works. In the matter of confession, he exceeds even the Catholics, "for where the Pope requireth but a confession of [the acte?] committed, H.N. requireth a declaration of the thought." (*Displaying*, fol. D3.)
70. *Displaying*, fol. C3.
71. Ibid.
72. *Displaying*, fol. H5.
73. J.B. Mullinger, "John Knewstubb," *DNB*, vol. 11, p. 224; J. and J.A. Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigensis* (Cambridge University Press, 1922).
74. Knewstubb, fol. R4.
75. Knewstubb, Dedication to the Reader, p. 2.
76. Knewstubb, Dedication to the Reader, p. 3
77. Knewstubb, Dedication to the Earl of Warwick, pp. 2–3, 8.

78. E.I. Carlyle, "William Wilkinson," *DNB*, vol. 21, p. 278; Venn and Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigiensis*, pt. 1, vol. 4, p. 412.
79. Wilkinson, fol. J1.
80. Wilkinson, fol. X2.
81. Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1967), pp. 11–15. There is, of course, an enormous historiographical literature surrounding the term "puritan." Most of this literature surrounds the importance (or lack thereof) of puritanism in understanding the Civil War. Michael Finlayson, (*Historians, Puritanism, and the English Revolution: the Religious Factor in English Politics before and after the Interregnum* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983]) for example, points out that in fact the importance of puritans and puritanism in the build-up to the Civil War has been vastly overstated, in that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to identify as puritan any of leading figures of the political opposition between 1621 and 1641 (p. 161). Nevertheless, Finlayson does agree that there *were* puritans (pp. 11, 85, 160–61); he simply disputes the idea that they played a crucial role in the conflict between Crown and Parliament. There is thus no fundamental disagreement between his viewpoint and mine. Indeed, I see a good deal of congruity, inasmuch as he stresses the importance of anti-Catholicism for both "Anglicans" and "puritans" (pp. 118, 162), a factor which played an important role in the authorities' understanding of the Family of Love. If, in what I follows, I use expressions such as the puritan "side," this should in no way be taken to imply the existence of a party, or of a cohesive opposition within the church. Indeed, the foundation on which much of my argument rests is that the divisions within the church were much less important than what united "puritans" and "Anglicans."
82. The phrase is Collinson's. (*EPM*, pp. 84–91.)
83. Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1979), pp. 42–46.
84. Collinson, *Grindal*, pp. 49–56.
85. Collinson, *Grindal*, p. 49.
86. Hastings Eells, *Martin Bucer* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931), p. 394.
87. Collinson, *Grindal*, pp. 52–53.
88. Eells, pp. 54–64, 71.
89. Eells, pp. 238–40.
90. Eells, pp. 267–68.
91. Eells, p. 64.
92. H.C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge University Press, 1958), pp. 107–9.
93. Porter, pp. 163–64.
94. Porter, p. 176.
95. See W.S. Hudson, *The Cambridge Connection* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1980), pp. 43–60; Mullinger, *Cambridge*, II, 53–64.

96. Collinson, *EPM*, p. 129; Mark H. Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), pp. 191–193; C.E. Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford* (London: Methuen, 1924), II, 115.
97. Clare Cross, "Continental Students and the Protestant Reformation in England in the Sixteenth Century," *Reform and Reformation: England and the Continent c.1500-c.1750*, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford: Basil Blackwell for the Ecclesiastical History Society, 1979), pp. 44–45.
98. Collinson, *EPM*, p. 129.
99. John Rogers, *Displaying*, fol. F7.
100. John Rogers, *The Summe of Christianity, reduced unto eight propositions, briefly and plainly confirmed out of the holy worde of God* (London, 1578), pp. 10–12, 19–23.
101. *Summe*, p. 19.
102. Porter, p. 190.
103. Collinson, *EPM*, pp. 126, 215.
104. Knewstubb, *Confutation*, dedication to the reader, ii.
105. Collinson, *EPM*, pp. 218–19, 232; J.B. Mullinger, "John Knewstubb," *DNB*, vol. 11, p. 244.
106. *Acts of the Privy Council*, vol. 12, pp. 317–318.
107. *House of Commons Journals*, I, 127, 128, 129, 130.
108. M.M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 234; Sir J.E. Neale, *Elizabeth and her Parliaments* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1958), I, 250.
109. Knappen, p. 249; Collinson, *EPM*, p. 166.
110. Neale, I, 342.
111. Collinson, *EPM*, pp. 216–17; Neale, I, 252–53, 385–87.
112. Collinson, *EPM*, pp. 306–7.
113. Mullinger, *Cambridge*, II, 180–82; Porter, p. 177.
114. Collinson, *Grindal*, p. 287.
115. Collinson *EPM*, pp. 154–55, 159–61.
116. Neale, I, 369.
117. *Displaying*, fol. C2.
118. *Displaying*, fol. F7.
119. I am grateful to Professor Murray Tolmie for this insight.