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Exiles for Christ:
Continuity and Community among the Marian Exiles

According to John Foxe, Katherine Willoughby fled her London home for the continent on New Year’s Day 1555 to escape religious persecution. She and a loyal group of servants braved hostile informants, endured lost luggage, and survived shipwreck before they arrived safely in the Netherlands. Her decision to forsake her ‘possessions, lands, and goods, your worldly friends and native country’ to become ‘an exile for Christ’ won the praise and admiration of the godly community.1 Yet, Foxe’s account of Willoughby’s escape and historians’ retelling of it often distort the circumstances of her flight and exile. The duchess and her husband delayed their relocation for eighteen months after Mary I’s succession while they made extensive arrangements for their resettlement. She kept her friends informed of her plans, and the news of the public sale of her furniture at Grimsthorpe circulated in Lincolnshire and London. Her departure could hardly have been a surprise to Marian officials.2 Like other exiles, Willoughby and her family continued to rely on their kinship and patronage ties to find a residence abroad, transmit revenue from their English estates, and establish a religious community with other English exiles after their resettlement.

The evidence of Marian exiles’ experiences raises questions about Reformation scholarship that views the restoration of Catholicism in 1553 as creating a crisis in the evangelical community, pushing some of its members in a more radical direction. The reign of Mary I has often been depicted as a seminal moment in the development of two distinct groups of Protestants: conformers who remained in England and reconciled themselves to Catholicism, and exiles who fled abroad rather than compromise their beliefs. After Elizabeth I’s succession, conformers served as the primary architects and supporters of the Elizabethan Religious Settlement while exiles acted as some of its most virulent critics. More recent scholarship has argued for a more complex understanding of

1 Foxe, Acts, vol. 8, 571–2; Latimer, Sermons, 324.
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Protestantism under Mary I. Historians such as Andrew Pettegree and Diarmaid MacCulloch have stressed that both conformers and exiles shared a sincere commitment to the restoration of Protestantism even if they disagreed over the details of that settlement. Moreover, these studies often emphasize the influence of Reformed theology on evangelicals during Edward VI's reign rather than suggesting that exiles were molded into Reformed Protestants by their experiences abroad.  

This chapter argues that the experiences of Willoughby and other exiles further demonstrate the continuities in exiles’ beliefs throughout the 1550s. The views that distinguished more forward evangelicals, or the ‘godly’ as they called themselves, from more moderate reformers developed during Edward VI’s reign, rather than during their residence abroad. In fact, a small group within the evangelical community demanded more extreme changes in the church’s view of communion and greater simplicity in clerical dress and worship practices than Edward VI’s government favored. After the restoration of Catholicism under Mary I, the religious differences that had divided godly men and women from other reformers crystallized. They adopted a rigid stance that made religious conformity under Mary I untenable. While many evangelicals conformed to Catholicism, other evangelicals relocated to Europe. During their exile, these men and women continued to be influenced by the theology and Reformed associations that had shaped their views in the early 1550s.

This chapter also emphasizes the importance of exiles’ kinship and patronage networks during their resettlement. Studies of Marian exiles frequently focus upon the clerical leadership of the English exile communities and the theological debates that divided English congregations. In doing so, such scholarship often neglects the laity’s experiences and the importance of their kinship and patronage ties during their relocation. Laymen and women vastly outnumbered ordained clergy among the exiles, yet they receive far less attention in Reformation historiography. Moreover, these studies often overlook the importance of women’s

3 The foundational study on Marian exiles is Christina Garrett’s The Marian Exiles. For more recent discussion of Protestantism during the reigns of Edward VI and Mary I, see MacCulloch, Tudor Church Militant, 183–91 and Later Reformation, 18–29, 60; Pettegree, Marian Protestantism, 1–7, 86–117, 129–50; Brigden, New Worlds, 206–17, 243; Collinson, Elizabethan Puritan Movement, 33. For a more recent study that examines the impact of exile on English Protestantism, see Dan Danner, Pilgrimage to Puritanism: History and Theology of the Marian Exiles at Geneva, 1555–1560 (New York, 1999).


5 See, for example, Pettegree, Marian Protestantism, 1–7, 10–38, 86–117; Brigden, New Worlds, 207–11; MacCulloch, Later Reformation, 70–8.

contributions in the English exile communities. Christina Garrett’s foundational survey of the exiles, for example, includes individual biographies of nearly 472 men, but not a single woman. Later historians largely perpetuate the marginalization of women among exiles. 7 Similarly, Reformation scholars have emphasized the separation of English immigrants on the continent from those who remained in England. 8 Yet, during their resettlement both the clergy and laity depended upon their bonds to each other and to those who remained in England. Men and women traveled abroad accompanied by an extensive network of family, friends, and neighbors. Households figured prominently in the development of English congregations in Emden, Frankfurt, and Strasbourg. 9 This examination of Willoughby’s kinship and patronage networks in exile demonstrates the continued importance of these ties.

The Development of Evangelicalism in the Reign of Edward VI

In the 1540s and 1550s, evangelicalism focused on two key concepts: the centrality of scripture and justification by faith alone. Reformers insisted that Christian doctrine proceeded from principles ‘manifest in the scripture’. Moreover, scripture rather than papal authority or church tradition remained the ‘rule of faith’ that governed the lives of Christians and the practice of their religion. 10 Ministers encouraged believers to meditate on the Bible to discern true doctrine from false teaching. 11 Many laity embraced these views, insisting that the Word of God alone, not the ‘vanities’ of men, was ‘sufficient for our learning and salvation’. 12 Clergy and laity alike denounced papal authority and condemned vain superstitions unsubstantiated in scripture. 13 For example, John Bradford sent an elaborate refutation of the pope’s authority to his friend Elizabeth Vane. Elizabeth Longsho compared the images of saints that adorned Catholic churches to ‘strange gods’. Godly men and women also underscored the importance of the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Willoughby and other members of her

9 MacCulloch, Tudor Church Militant, 176–7, 183; Pettegree, Marian Protestantism, 10–38, 55–85, 118–28. Lyndal Roper illustrates the usefulness of the household as a focal point in Reformation studies in her study, The Holy Household.
10 Latimer, Remains, 318–19.
12 Bradford, Writings, vol. 2, 227. For further discussion of evangelicalism in this period, see the following surveys: MacCulloch, Tudor Church Militant and Alford, Kingship and Politics.
circle acknowledged the wickedness of their sins and declared that their salvation depended upon God’s grace and mercy rather than their own actions. Devotion to the Word of God and rejection of salvation through good works remained the defining principles of evangelicalism.

During the reign of Edward VI, however, differences emerged among reformers about the nature of communion and ceremonialism in the church. A small group increasingly moved beyond mainstream reform and advocated a more Reformed view of communion and purity in worship. While virtually all evangelicals opposed transubstantiation and Catholic rituals such as churcheings, pilgrimages, and processionals, many of them had a complex view of the Eucharist and accepted customs such as kneeling at communion, ornate chapel furniture, and elaborate clerical dress—practices that offended the godly. Moderate evangelicals like William Cecil sponsored a series of debates on the nature of the Eucharist between teams of reformers and Catholics. Thomas Cranmer refused to alter the English liturgy when godly evangelicals objected to the undue ceremonialism surrounding the Eucharist. Similarly, he expressed frustration with those who objected to clerical vestments like the rochet and chimere or kneeling at communion.

Godly men and women, however, adopted a more rigid religious stance and strenuously objected to any service that treated the communion elements as physical idols. In their view, undue reverence of the bread and wine subverted the adoration that belonged to Christ alone and constituted idolatry. Similarly, they rejected any ritual not explicitly found in scripture. Willoughby’s mentor, Hugh Latimer, attacked transubstantiation as a ‘horrible blasphemy’ and emphasized communion as an act of spiritual nourishment through which believers remembered Christ’s sacrifice for their sins. Willoughby and other reformers, however, were far more caustic in their attacks on their contemporaries’ veneration of the elements. In 1548, the duchess sponsored a publication by George Bancroft that attacked the ‘dangerous abuses’ rampant in government-sanctioned communion services. Instead of accepting communion ‘in remembrance of Christ’s passion’, participants showed their devotion to the elements by ‘ducking, kneeling, licking, kissing, or crossing’, practices which godly men and women thought mocked the divinity of Christ.

The immigration of foreign reformers such as Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, and John a Lasco to England during Edward VI’s reign fueled the development of Reformed views within the evangelical community. Their beliefs on the Eucharist, cle

18 Foxe, Acts, vol. 8, 570; Bancroft, Answer, Aii–Aiiii. Willoughby’s evangelical client John Day published the text, and her coat of arms figures prominently in the pamphlet. See also NA SP 12/3/9 for Willoughby’s view of the celebration of mass.
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Eucharist, clerical dress, and the doctrine of election influenced many aristocrats, including Willoughby, Jane Grey, and Anne and Jane Seymour, to adopt Reformed views. Willoughby's friendship with Bucer clearly shaped her view of the Eucharist. Jane Grey, her step-granddaughter, acknowledged Bullinger's influence on her beliefs. Many of the godly, including the duchess and her friends Anthony Cooke and John Cheke, admired the purity of worship in Reformed churches and hoped that its example would inspire change in the Church of England. Like other continental theologians, Lasco, minister of the Strangers' Church, adopted a hard line against elaborate clerical dress that gained the support of Willoughby and other reformers.

By the early 1550s, some evangelicals had also embraced the doctrine of predestination, and their intense focus on the idea of election and the cultivation of a godly lifestyle became the centerpiece of their piety. Willoughby proclaimed her belief that neither illness nor persecution could endanger election, but rather such trials were intended to strengthen faith and draw believers into a closer relationship with God. Similarly, John Bradford and John Philpot discussed the doctrine with many of their correspondents, including women such as Margery Coke, Elizabeth Vane, and Anne Warcup, who incorporated it in their beliefs. Their emphasis on their identity as the elect, like their Eucharistic theology and anti-ceremonialism, created a community of believers which distinguished itself from moderate evangelicalism during Edward VI's lifetime. By 1553, many of them found it increasingly difficult to abide either the 'papists' who welcomed the return to Catholicism or the moderate evangelicals who conformed under Mary I.

The intensity of godly men and women's opposition to the mass exhibited a narrowness that many moderate reformers found unconvincing – particularly after Mary I's succession in 1553 created troubling questions about the boundaries of belief. During Edward VI's reign, clergy and laity alike hotly debated the nature of the Eucharist and the rituals surrounding it, but reached no consensus.

20 NA SP 10/9/58 and SP 10/13/6; Ascham, _Letters_, 191; Coverdale, _Remains_, 528. For Willoughby's views of communion, see chapter 2 of this monograph. As Diarmaid MacCulloch notes, Bucer's own views of the Eucharist remained extremely complex and certainly cannot be reduced simply to memorialism. See MacCulloch, _Cranmer_, 614.
22 Petegoe, _Foreign Protestant Communities_, 31.
The restoration of the mass in December 1553 forced evangelicals to recognize the extent of their differences.26 A vocal minority maintained that participation at mass constituted idolatry.27 Elizabeth Longsho, for example, objected strenuously and described the mass as an ‘abominable idol’. She insisted that God did not dwell in ‘temples made with hands’. Rather, she believed, God was spirit and should be worshipped ‘in spirit and in truth’.28 More moderate evangelicals questioned the narrowness of such views. They declared that no outward ceremony could negate their inward worship of Christ. Their understanding of communion permitted them to attend mass and worship Christ in their hearts with a clear conscience, whatever the doctrine of the restored Catholic Church taught. One moderate evangelical approved of his wife’s attendance at mass, encouraging her to ‘keep her religion as she may in this realm’ and trust that God would accept her attendance at mass and blame others for the theological errors of transubstantiation.29

Similarly, Protestants disagreed over the degree of corruption in the rituals and services of the Marian Church. Moderate reformers pointed out that matins and evensong differed little from the rituals conducted during Edward VI’s reign. While the godly railed against them and attacked Catholic priests for speaking ‘to the wall in a foreign tongue’ rather than preaching the Gospel, many other evangelicals found the reinstatement of bells, candles, holy water, and precious vessels into church ritual distasteful, but bearable.30 Some, like Elizabeth I, even preferred elaborate rituals and ornate church furniture, which bewildered and angered Reformed Protestants.31 They responded to the restitution of ‘holy water … hallowed bells, palms, candles, ashes’ with searing condemnation. Such ‘foolery’ epitomized the ‘teaching of the devil’ and contradicted the Word of God.32 One godly reformer called conforming to Catholicism ‘spiritual fornication’.33 Mary I’s restoration of Catholicism, then, only heightened the differences between moderate and godly reformers that had emerged in Edward VI’s reign.

The situation for godly men and women became progressively worse after Mary I began a concerted effort to find and punish heretics. The government had already evicted foreign Reformed communities in September 1553. Shortly after, it burned the first Protestant martyrs.34 At this juncture, evangelicals faced a difficult conforming to onment or de Reformed con his congregat another large; reformers foll organized thei, Geneva, ‘views on con guished them
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faced a difficult set of choices. They could remain in England with the options of
conforming to Catholicism or opposing the religious changes and facing imprison­
ment or death. Some chose instead to flee abroad and seek refuge among
Reformed communities on the continent. Several of them joined John à Lasco and
his congregation when they departed for Denmark in 1553. In March 1554,
another large group of refugees settled at Emden.35 Other families and individual
reformers followed intermittently throughout Mary I’s reign. Once abroad, they
organized themselves into religious communities at Aarau, Basel, Emden, Frank­
furt, Geneva, Strasbourg, Weinheim, and Wesel. Their churches incorporated
the views on communion, ceremonialism, and predestination that had first distin­
guished them from the other reformers in the evangelical community in England.

Religious Continuity and Change in the English Exile Church at Wesel

Studies of Marian exile communities typically emphasize their religious innova­
tions. Unquestionably, they did develop distinctive views on church government
that would later shape the Elizabethan Religious Settlement.36 At the same time,
their doctrine and practices attest to much continuity in their beliefs. A close
study of the exile community which formed around Willoughby and her house­
hold at Wesel, for example, shows that godly evangelicals incorporated their
earlier views on the Eucharist and ceremonialism into their church even as they
altered other sacraments, devised a new order of confession, and adopted Lasco’s
model of church polity.

Like other Marian churches, the English church at Wesel owed its existence to
the close association between a group of godly Englishmen and women and
foreign Reformed Protestants, specifically the French Strangers’ Church in
London.37 After the eviction of foreign Protestants from London in 1553,
members of the French Stranger Church joined a small community of Walloon
weavers in Wesel. By 1554, they had successfully petitioned the city council for
the right to worship as a distinct congregation and selected François Perussel,
minister to the French church in London, as their pastor.38 Katherine Willoughby
knew Perussel well and had supported him financially and politically during his
residence in England in the early 1550s. In 1554, she and her husband contacted
him and asked him to obtain the magistrate’s permission for them to settle in
Wesel. The town officials granted their request in February. The presence of
Willoughby and her household attracted other English exiles. Soon they

35 Garrett, Marian Exiles, 328–9; Pettegree, Marian Protestantism, 13.
36 MacCulloch, Tudor Church Militant, 176–7, 184–5; Pettegree, Marian Protestantism, 10–38, 144–8;
Garrett, Marian Exiles, 18–22; William Whittingham, A Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frank­
furt (London 1642), 53–85.
37 Foxe, Acts, vol. 8, 572–3; Whittingham, Troubles begun at Frankfurt, 1–2; Robinson ed., Original
38 Pettegree, Marian Protestantism 65.
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established an English church which numbered nearly 100 individuals at its height. Its members included clerics such as Miles Coverdale and William Barlow, and gentlemen and gentlewomen such as Edward and Clare Boyes with their three children and servants, the brothers John and Thomas Turpin and their families, and John Pretie and his wife Alice. Subsequently, Richard Playsto, a physician, and his wife joined them, as did Robert Pownall and his family, John and Anne Baron, Thomas Lever, and merchants such as Richard Springham and John Bodley with their families, servants, and apprentices.

In November 1555, the English church created an order for worship and church governance that reflected its beliefs. The congregation had secured a separate worship space, the Augustinerkirche, the previous month, so they would not be forced to attend the established Lutheran services. They decided instead to retain the communion service instituted in the 1552 Prayer Book with its commemorative language: ‘Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.’ Moreover, to clarify further their opposition to the doctrine of Christ’s physical presence and adoration of the elements, they insisted that members receive communion while standing around a communion table.

The English church at Wesel also incorporated its opposition to the Latin mass and associated rituals in its order of worship. Its members insisted that the collect, lesson, or portion of scripture be read in English. Moreover, they demanded that any reading must be accompanied by a short explanation to help the congregation understand its meaning. They further directed the minister to employ no ‘such exterior ceremony’, including the use of candles and the practice of crossing, which might suggest the vain superstitions that they associated with Catholic idolatry. In place of the general confession instituted in the Book of Common Prayer, they substituted a confession devised by their first minister, Miles Coverdale. They also reserved the right to alter the worship further as ‘most fitly standeth with this time, place, and persons’. Yet, like the English churches in Frankfurt and Strasbourg, the Wesel congregation did not adopt the Genevan liturgy. Presumably, like other English congregations, they considered it an affront to their own distinctive religious heritage. They remained committed to the 1552 Book of Common Prayer, the most radical liturgy published by the Edwardian government. When they altered the liturgy, they did so in accordance with their views on communion and simplicity in worship.

Kinship and Community in Wesel

While they claimed the English church at Wesel was connected to the reform movement in England, it was also a community that was part of the larger religious landscape of Early Modern Europe. It illustrates the complex interplay between local, national, and international religious beliefs and practices.

40 Lambeth Palace, Lambeth Palace MS 2523 f. 2; LAO 10 Anc Lot 313; Whittingham, Troubles begun at Frankfurt, 158; Garrett, Marian Exiles, 80, 81, 95–6, 132–4, 252, 259, 292–3, 315–16; Robinson ed., Original Letters, vol. 1, 166–70.
41 Pettegree, Marian Protestantism, 68.
43 Lambeth Palace, Lambeth Palace MS 2523 ff. 3–3v.
44 Lambeth Palace, Lambeth Palace MS 2523 ff. 3–3v; Whittingham, Troubles begun at Frankfurt, 30–9.
The Wesel congregation also adopted John à Lasco’s guidelines for church government. Following Lasco’s plan, the Wesel congregation appointed one minister, William Barlow, former bishop of Bath and Wells, and a governing council of nine elders – two ‘co-auditors’ and seven ‘ancients’. As Diarmaid MacCulloch observes, Lasco’s vision of church polity emphasized communal discipline. The English exile churches, like the Stranger congregations in London, required a flexible church organization that better suited the needs of a refugee community. Many churches, including Wesel, instituted self-government supervised by their ministers and groups of elders. The members of the Wesel church directed Barlow to administer the sacrament, edify parishioners, and, when necessary, rebuke his flock. The council of elders worked with him to enforce church discipline, but also possessed the authority to censure him for religious errors or inappropriate behavior. The church continued these practices until 1556 when a clash between the English congregation and the Wesel city council resulted in civic authorities revoking the privilege of autonomous worship and insisting that the English refugees attend Lutheran services. In response, Willoughby and many other English exiles left Wesel rather than compromise. They settled at the Castle of Weinheim where a local ruler, Otto Heinrich, permitted them to worship according to their own rites. Although some historians have depicted English exile churches as communities where members quickly replaced old religious forms with new practices, the English church at Wesel shows the continued importance of the English liturgy and earlier rite of the Eucharist and anti-ceremonialism in shaping the community’s worship.

Kinship and Patronage Ties among Marian Exiles

While they were on the continent, Marian exiles depended heavily upon the kinship and patronage ties that bound them to each other as well as to friends and family in England. Many evangelicals initially resisted exile precisely because of...

46 Lambeth Palace, Lambeth Palace MS 2523 ff. 1–4v. By this time, Coverdale had departed Wesel to accept a position at Bergzabern.
47 MacCulloch, Tudor Church Militant, 183.
48 Lambeth Palace, Lambeth Palace MS 2523 ff. 1–1v. Such duties were not inconsistent with his former obligations as bishop. Hugh Latimer encouraged bishops to ‘feed their sheep with the food of God’s word’ and ‘admonish’ them with scripture – instructions that he followed in his own diocese of Worcester. Latimer, Sermons, 63 and Remains, 120, 195, 328. For Latimer’s emphasis on preaching in his diocese of Worcester, see Wabuda, ‘Fruitful Preaching’, 59–74.
49 Lambeth Palace, Lambeth Palace MS 2523 ff. 1–4v.
50 For a discussion of the tension between foreign congregations and the Wesel city council, see Pettegree, Marian Protestantism, 65–75.
the perceived threat of relocation to their family obligations and duty to the king and queen. Reformation narratives abound with stories of husbands separated from wives, parents from children, brothers from sisters, and masters from their apprentices and servants. Exile separated Joyce Hales from her husband Humphrey, Richard Bertie from his mother Alice, Rose Hickman from her brother Thomas Locke, Anthony Meres from his brother Laurence, and William Salkyns from his master Richard Hilles. Nonetheless, many men and women emigrated in family groups and their kinship and patronage ties within the exile community and in England enabled them to maintain themselves and their dependents during their residence abroad.

The experiences of exiles demonstrate that the choice of immigration was often a family decision. Once abroad, they relied on an extended network for practical assistance. The evidence from Willoughby and Richard Bertie’s marriage shows how couples cooperated in arranging their relocation. Willoughby first employed Richard Bertie as one of her gentlemen ushers in the 1550s. She relied on his advice in household matters and legal disputes, and he became a close friend. Despite the difference in their social rank, she married him in 1552 – in large part because of their shared evangelical zeal. Unwilling to conform to Catholicism, they made detailed plans to resettle on the continent after Mary I imprisoned prominent reformers including John Hooper, Hugh Latimer, and Thomas Cranmer. Bertie obtained a license to go abroad in 1554, ostensibly to collect debts owed to the duchess’s first husband, Charles Brandon. In reality, he used the trip to collect funds for their impending departure and secure a place of residence. During his absence, Willoughby supervised the sale of their furniture, arranged for the administration of their estates by a trusted servant, and orchestrated the family’s departure to Europe where they joined Bertie in 1555. Bertie eloquently defended the couple’s shared commitment to evangelicalism and devotion to each other in a letter to Stephen Gardiner, one of Mary I’s chief ministers. To Gardiner’s condemnation of Willoughby’s heresy, he replied that he considered her ‘errors’ no more serious than his own and promised to maintain those beliefs with her as ‘all the rest in her I love, embrace, and honor even unto the grave’.

Couples such as Robert and Lucy Harrington and Anthony and Rose Hickman, who belonged to the same godly circle as Willoughby, also collaborated in

52 Pettegree, Marian Protestantism, 86–117.
54 NA SP 10/14/47; Latimer, Sermons, 168, 237; Folger, Hatfield House MS 157 f. 52; GEC vol. 12, pt. 2, 674; BL Additional MS 33271 ff. 9v–10; LAO 1 ANC 5/B/8k.
55 LAO 3 Anc 8/1/3 f. 24; See also LAO 3 Anc 8/1/3 ff. 58, 79, 81; 1 Anc 11/C/1c f. 1; 2 Anc 14/3; 2 Anc 3/C/5; APC vol. 7, 57; Foxe, Acts, vol. 8, 571–6; Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, vol. 6, pt. 3, p. 1644; NA SP 11/4/35.
56 BL Additional MS 33271 ff. 9v–10.
planning their family’s departure from England. After Mary I’s succession, Robert and Lucy Harrington agonized over whether to conform or “adventure their goods and life for Christ’s sake.”\(^ {57}\) Although opposed to Catholic mass and its associated rituals, they wrangled with each other and other reformers about the corruption of the mass, the innocuousness of Catholic rites, and even the necessity of martyrdom.\(^ {58}\) Before their departure, they supported the religious prisoners, John Bradford and Laurence Saunders, and sent money to exiles already on the continent. By November 1555, however, Robert and Lucy Harrington agreed to flee; they settled in Frankfurt with their child and a female servant.\(^ {59}\) Similarly, Anthony and Rose Hickman’s shared opposition to Catholicism made them zealous supporters of ministers like John Hooper and John Foxe. At first, they sheltered a small group of evangelicals who met in their home to read the Bible and celebrate the Lord’s Supper together. But as conditions worsened, they too agreed on exile and moved to Antwerp, which offered a safer haven for their family than London.\(^ {60}\)

Widows such as Anne Hooper, Anne Warcup, and Jane Wilkinson made key contributions to their families’ relocation. Anne Hooper, the German wife of godly minister John Hooper, led her family into exile in 1554 as part of the exodus of foreign Reformers who left England shortly after Mary I’s succession. Mistress Hooper, a staunch supporter and close friend of Heinrich Bullinger, had been a prominent member of the foreign Reformed community in England and provided crucial support for the refugee community during Edward VI’s reign. She too strenuously objected to the restored Catholic rites as idolatrous. She compared Phillip II and Mary I to ‘Ahab and Jezebel’, the Israelite king and queen who led their subjects into idolatry, and even sent Bullinger a coin with their effigies to prove her point. Although Hooper agonized over whether to remain in England after her husband’s imprisonment, she eventually led their family to Frankfurt where Joanna and Valerand Poullain provided shelter for them in token of her earlier assistance when they were exiles in England. They later acted as her children’s guardians after her death in December 1555.\(^ {61}\) Similarly, Warcup, an Oxfordshire gentlewoman, opposed the mass and its associated ceremonies when Mary I reintroduced them. Before her departure from England, she gave spiritual and financial assistance to imprisoned ministers such as John Bradford, Hugh Latimer, and Nicholas Ridley and protected John Jewel and Augustine Bernher when they fled persecution. She clearly influenced her family’s decision to move to Frankfurt in 1556. She even provided refuge for other women, including Joan Wilkinson and Elizabeth Brown, who accompanied her into exile.\(^ {62}\)

---

57 Bradford, *Writings*, vol. 2, 64.
60 Dowling and Shakespeare, ‘Recollections of Rose Hickman’, 98–100.
Joan Wilkinson, like her associates Willoughby and Warcup, resisted religious conformity under Mary I, but only reluctantly decided to go abroad. Despite the urging of her godly friends, she remained in England after others had left so that she could support imprisoned reformers such as Latimer and Ridley. By remaining, Wilkinson also had access to substantial funds that she used to assist the exile community. By 1556, she resolved to flee and arranged for her family’s relocation to Frankfurt. She brought with her an income of several hundred pounds, which she used to sustain other exiles. In her will, she provided a £10 legacy for Anne Warcup’s four children and bequeathed £4 each to Elizabeth Brown and Elizabeth Kelke. Her generosity even extended to women outside her immediate circle. She left a further sum of £6 to fund the marriages of six poor maids who belonged to the Frankfurt church, and £100 to be distributed among the English congregations at Frankfurt, Emden, Geneva, and Wesel for the ‘sustenance and relief of the poor English congregations’ there.63

Exiles depended on family members and friends in England, Protestant and Catholic alike, to support them after their departure. Willoughby asked her cousin Francis Guevara for a loan of £400 to assist with resettlement.64 She entrusted her estates to Walter Herenden, a conformer and experienced Willoughby administrator, and her mother-in-law Alice Bertie, a devout Catholic. Their religious views did not prevent them from carefully managing her property and sending her funds to repay her foreign debtors.65 As we have seen, Joan Wilkinson acted as a key financial supporter for Marian exiles in the early years of Mary I’s reign. By 1556, she too had settled on the continent and asked her friends in England to ship her library, one of her most prized possessions, to Frankfurt. She later entrusted it to another exile, Richard Chambers, to ‘use to the profit of Christ’s church’.66

Anne Hooper relied on friends in England to care for her son Daniel, a student, who remained after her departure. She later arranged for a female friend to escort Daniel to Frankfurt to join her.67 Of course, familial bonds did not prevent some from exploiting the absence of their relatives for their own profit. Willoughby’s nephew Lord William Willoughby of Parham took advantage of his aunt’s departure for the continent to reopen an old inheritance dispute between them. He


64 LAO 3 Anc 8/1/3 ff. 51, 58 and 2 Anc 14/12. Francis de Guevara and Katherine Willoughby were first cousins through their mothers, Inez and Maria de Salinas. BL Harleian MS 807 f. 120.

65 Foxe, Acts, vol. 8, 570; LAO 3 Anc 8/1/3 ff. 24, 68, 69, 81, 88; 1 Anc 5/A/1 f. 7; 1 Anc 5/B/6.


introduced a bill in Parliament that claimed several manors belonging to his aunt and nearly succeeded in winning them. 68

Most exiles relied chiefly upon their own households for financial support and practical assistance. Although exile necessarily altered the environment in which they existed, noble and gentry households continued to perform many of the economic, social, and political functions associated with them in England. 69 The households of Willoughby and Francis Russell, earl of Bedford, for example, continued to display their wealth and political power and attracted men and women into their service. When the duchess left England, she took a gentle servant, Robert Cranwell, a gentlewoman, Margaret Blackborne, four male servants, and a laundress with her. 70 Their residence at Wesel attracted a large group of 100 exiles, many of whom the duchess placed in her service. When she relocated to Weinheim Castle in April 1556, her entourage included gentlemen John and Thomas Turpin; merchants John Bodley and William Gosling; George Christopher, former servant of William Parr, marquis of Northampton; and William Barlow, deprived bishop of Bath and Wells, who acted as Willoughby's chaplain. Like her estates at Grimsthorpe and Eresby in England, her residences at Weinheim and Wesel fulfilled an important economic function as a center of consumption and distribution of resources. 71

Willoughby's establishment embodied both the continuity and permeability of the aristocratic household in exile. Some of those in her service, such as Cranwell and Blackborne, had served her parents. Others, like Gosling, who had sheltered the duchess during her flight to the continent, were recent contacts. 72 Willoughby's accounts after her return to England show that many of her fellow exiles later rejoined her service when they returned home. Her household at Grimsthorpe in the 1560s included members of the Blackborne, Cranwell, and Turpin families, as well as John Pretie and his wife, all of whom had been with Willoughby at Wesel. 73

The encounter between Willoughby and John Brett at Weinheim demonstrates the importance of the household as the basis of aristocratic power in exile. 74 Through the political favor of the local ruler, the duchess had secured a residence at Weinheim Castle where she provided for the material needs of her dependents and protected them. In 1556, John Brett, a servant of Mary I and Phillip II, arrived in Weinheim with a commission to deliver warrants for the immediate return of

68 LAO 1 Anc S/B/3a; Bindoff, Commons, vol. 3, 631.
69 For further discussion of the economic, political, and social functions of aristocratic household, see Harris, Edward Stafford, 76.
70 Foxe, Acts, vol. 8, 571.
71 Brett, 'Narrative', 125; Whittingham, Troubles begun at Frantfort, 158–9; Garrett, Marian Exiles, 80, 120, 164, 315–16; Lambeth Palace, Lambeth Palace MS 2523 ff. 14–15v; LAO 10 Anc Lot 314.
73 LAO 1 Anc 7/A/2 ff. 1–3, 13, 14–14v, 27, 30, 32v, 52v, 53, 58, 63v, 175 and 2 Anc 14/9. See chapter 6 for further discussion of how exile shaped the membership of Willoughby's household.
74 Harris, Edward Stafford, 92.
Willoughby and her family to England. To defend their patron, her entourage mounted a physical attack on Brett and his servants. When she learned of the situation, she sent Barlow and other representatives to negotiate with Brett. When that failed, she used her influence with local civic officials to strip Brett of his warrants and force his immediate departure from the area. Willoughby’s successful confrontation with Brett illustrates her considerable power even in exile and shows the solidarity of her household.

The household of Francis Russell, earl of Bedford, also acted as a center for the exhibition of wealth and authority. Like his friend Willoughby, Russell used his power and financial resources to maintain an entourage of English exiles. John Bradford praised Russell as a ‘worthy member of Christ’ who supported reformers such as Bradford and Edward Underhill during the Marian persecutions and held firmly to the ‘true religion’ despite his own incarceration in 1553. After his release, Russell secured a license to go abroad and departed in 1555 with eight servants, eight horses, £200, and considerable baggage — a visible indication of his social status and wealth. His large retinue included gentlemen such as John Eustace, Thomas Fitzwilliam, William Godolphin, Henry Kingsmill, John Morley, Thomas Rayme, and John Rugge. Their numbers and social rank reflected his exalted social status. During his travels, Russell often bestowed lavish gifts, such as a large stag, on his continental hosts, who included the Imperial court and Venetian officials. Later, he traveled to Zurich where Bullinger and his parishioners offered him their hospitality. Russell delighted in theological discussions with his hosts and acknowledged their conversations were ‘more dear’ to him than ‘all other things’. He promised to aid Bullinger and his associates if circumstances allowed.

Members of the gentry also recreated their households, albeit on a more modest scale. These households supported and protected dependents and acted as centers of political unity and religious identity for their members. Robert and Lucy Harrington’s establishment at Frankfurt included their child, a maid, and three dependents — two students, Nicholas Carvell and Thomas Horton, and a widow, Joanna Saunders. Saunders, the wife of martyr Laurence Saunders, joined the household in 1555 after her husband asked Lucy Harrington to be a ‘mother and mistress’ to his wife. After Lucy’s death, Robert Harrington married Joanna. In the religious debates that divided the Frankfurt congregation, the Harrington family was unified in their refusal to sign the ‘new discipline’ in 1557, asserting the Frankfurters' adherence to the new church government. They participated in religious services and religious discussions, while Lucinda managed the household and arranged for an annuity for Bertie’s daughter. Robert and Lucy Harrington maintained their residences in England and abroad. Before their legal troubles, they managed an estate in Kent and appeared in the House of Commons. While in exile, Willoughby and her family traveled to Venice and the Imperial court to negotiate political and religious matters.

---
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The Frankfurt congregation’s political and religious autonomy. Christopher and John Hales settled in Frankfurt with their extended family and several servants. They participated actively in religious debates within the congregation over church government. In contrast to the Harrington household, the Hales and their two servants, Richard Mason and Peter Sade, supported the ‘new discipline’ in 1557.81

Heads of households required considerable revenue to support their large establishments. Exiles, regardless of their status, complained about the financial hardships of life abroad, even though many continued to receive income from their English estates and from generous benefactors on the continent.82 The emphasis on the fiscal woes of Marian exiles often neglects the fact that many used their kinship and patronage ties to secure revenue from their property. Willoughby’s financial records illustrate how the aristocracy raised funds and managed their estates while abroad. In May 1554, she and Bertie granted Guevara an annuity of £200 from their estates in repayment for his loan to support their relocation on the continent. In November, they placed their lands in trust to Bertie’s parents and Herenden, one of Willoughby’s administrators, in exchange for an income of £700 per year.83 They continued to receive revenue from their estates and directed legal proceedings concerning their property while they were abroad. Bertie corresponded regularly with Herenden and Cuthbert Brereton, their lawyer, about property, and the best means of sending funds without provoking the crown’s ire.84 In 1555, in fact, Mary I’s government attempted to enact a bill that would prevent exiles from receiving revenue from their estates. Members of the House of Commons led by William Cecil, William Courtenay, and Anthony Kingston, all of whom had friends and family abroad, defeated the bill.85 In June 1556, Willoughby and Bertie still controlled their income and directed Herenden and Alice Bertie to repay creditors for debts accrued during their exile.86 Although government attempts to seize their income did reduce their resources, Willoughby and Bertie continued to receive revenue from their estates while in exile.87

Willoughby and Bertie also supervised the management of their property from afar. Before their departure, they placed their court rolls, legal contracts, rentals, and title deeds in the custody of Herenden and Cuthbert Brereton.88 Their arrangements proved fortuitous. In January 1555, Lord Willoughby of Parham challenged the inheritance settlement that his father had reached with his aunt and grandmother Loach, Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor (Oxford, 1986), 147–55; Loades, Mary Tudor, 260–1; Bindoff, Commons, vol. 1, 605–6, 718–19 and vol. 2, 468–70.
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claimed several manors in her possession. The duchess’s counsel used the records of the earlier settlement to convince Parliament to reject her nephew’s claims.

Bertie’s notes on his correspondence with Herenden and Brereton demonstrate that he and the duchess received regular updates on the state of their property during their exile.

Other members of the governing classes made similar arrangements to maintain their revenue and protect their property during exile. Russell, for example, left England with the considerable sum of £200, as well as horses, baggage, and supplies for himself and his household. Like the duchess of Suffolk, he relied on his friends and family to oversee his legal affairs, entrusting his estates to Nicholas Bacon. William Cecil performed similar duties for Anthony Cooke.

Gentlemen like John and Christopher Hales and Robert Harrington and gentlewoman Jane Wilkinson also amassed funds to support themselves and their families and relied on friends in England to supervise their property during their time abroad.

Clerical contacts, like ties to other refugees and links with family and friends in England, were vital to exiles during their relocation and attest to the continued importance of kinship and patronage bonds during their resettlement. Marian exiles utilized clerical contacts on the continent to obtain financial assistance and political protection from local authorities. They found that the foreign ministers who had enjoyed their patronage during Edward VI’s reign now reciprocated by helping them to secure financial assistance or political protection. During the early 1550s, for example, Willoughby provided generous bequests to foreign reformers such as Francois Perussel and John à Lasco. She helped the London Stranger churches secure religious autonomy from the Edwardian church.

In return, Lasco and Perussel functioned as her representatives on the continent. At Wesel, Perussel helped her to obtain permission for her household to settle in the town, rent a large house, and secure a writ of protection.

Willoughby also employed her clerical contacts to secure patronage and protection from a local ruler when her household relocated to Weinheim and, later, to Poland. When religious differences compelled her to leave Wesel, for example, she asked Miles Coverdale to convey her plight to Otto Heinrich, elector of the Palatinate. With Coverdale’s help, Willoughby obtained a residence and an order of protection from him. The award of Weinheim Castle carried with it the usual provisions, and she successfully confronted her confrontations in 1557. She reinvigorated Sigismund of Poland’s religious autonomy.

This study challenges assumptions about the role of patronage relations during the Marian exiles in 1553 as a period of religious and political challenges: confessions began during the reign and its successor, and their attempts to secure religious autonomy. As a result, this chapter examines the 1550s and its decisions to an examination of the households and used the political standing of beliefs and.
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it the usual privileges associated with property grants: hunting rights, household provisions, and the assistance of its steward, Christopher Landschade. Later, she successfully enlisted Otto Heinrich’s help in challenging Brett’s warrant. After her confrontation with Brett, Willoughby decided to move her household again in 1557. She resettled in Poland where her former client Lasco had petitioned the king, Sigismund Augustus, to secure a residence and a limited degree of political autonomy.96

This study of Willoughby and her circle demonstrates the need to re-examine assumptions about the impact of relocation on the beliefs, kinship ties, and patronage relationships of Marian exiles. Her experiences and those of her associates challenge Reformation scholarship that treats the restoration of Catholicism in 1553 as a watershed in the development of two opposing evangelical communities: conformers and exiles. As we have seen, the creation of a godly minority began during the reign of Edward VI. Their association with the Reformed church and its supporters in England influenced their views and encouraged many of them to seek refuge in Reformed communities on the continent during Mary I’s reign. As a study of the Wesel community illustrates, their Eucharistic theology, anti-ceremonialism, and Reformed sympathies continued to shape their beliefs. Chapter also shows the resiliency of kinship and patronage bonds throughout the 1550s. Family ties and patronage bonds were influential in shaping exiles’ decisions to relocate and in supporting them during their resettlement. Moreover, an examination of aristocratic exiles demonstrates that they reconstructed their households abroad, maintained contact with their family and friends in England, and used their foreign associates on the continent to secure financial favor and political protection. A study of Willoughby and her circle broadens our understanding of Marian Protestantism by emphasizing the continuities evident in the beliefs and social ties of those who chose exile rather than religious conformity.