

## PREFACE

“Saravia still lacks the biography which he certainly merits” (*NNBW*, IX, 938), declared the Dutch historian, A. A. van Schelven, 45 years ago and nothing has happened since to remedy this state of affairs. All we have are a few scattered articles not based on original research. The reason for the reluctance to undertake such research is obvious enough for, in the course of a long life, Saravia lived in very different parts of the world and set his hand to a wide variety of tasks. If we are accurately to fill in the hitherto fragmentary and partly unreliable picture of this Dutch Englishman’s life, we must follow him on his lengthy travels and search many archives, predominantly in the Netherlands and England but also in France and present-day Belgium. The author of this study has made a start and has gathered some material without, however, making any pretence at supplying what is necessary for a biography in the true sense of the word. Information about Saravia, especially about the first 27 years of his life, is still too scarce for this. Where ecclesiastical and civil archives contain richer material, as for example for the period 1582-1587, our account has become correspondingly more detailed. On the other hand, the biographical information for the period 1588-1595, in which Saravia wrote his most important works, is pretty scanty. All of which has meant that this study is somewhat unequally proportioned. The same applies to the impression left by Saravia’s theology. In his most important works he confines himself almost exclusively to two subjects, first, church government and church order, and, secondly, forms of civil government and their powers and the relationship between church and state. Meanwhile Dutch, English and French archives probably conceal material that would serve to throw into sharper relief the picture of the man whose life and work we here portray. If this study inspires others to follow up the search then the author will have achieved one important goal which he has pursued with this publication.

In spite of the limitations just mentioned we have thought this inquiry worth undertaking and that for three reasons. As a theologian, the author is fascinated by the fact that the man who is the subject of this book, a convinced Dutch Calvinist who served the Reformed church in his native land for many years, became the first in England to defend episcopal church order by an appeal not only to tradition but to the “*ius divinum*” and this without in any way denying his doctrinal convictions. At the same time as rejecting the Calvinist Puritan “new presbyter” (N. Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter*) Saravia created a “new bishop”, that is to say a figure whose office could be founded on the “*ius divinum*” every bit as much as could that of the Reformed elder. This theory was new to the Church of

England in whose post-Reformation foundation of the episcopate practical considerations had hitherto outweighed the theoretical.

Secondly, there is the ecumenical importance of the subject. The debate between Beza and Saravia about the ministry and structure of the church, presbyterian or episcopal, continues to our own day. To some extent it dominates discussion on Church unity in various parts of the world. Is Calvinism reconcilable with episcopacy? Is the figure of the "episcopus in presbyterio" conceivable? Must Reformed Christians reject on principle any more than local ecclesiastical office? Must Anglicans deny on principle the legitimacy of non-episcopal ordination? These questions have a historical background, springing as they do from sixteenth century England and Scotland. An enquiry such as the present one can go some way towards modifying the difference in the opposing points of view just outlined by shedding light on their historical origins. Calvinist though he was, Saravia opted for a hierarchical episcopal church structure, appealing frequently to the Genevan reformer. Episcopalian though he was, he never denied the validity or lawfulness of presbyterian ordination. Why must churches, which in the sixteenth century, despite different structures prized the maintenance of intercommunion, remain divided in the twentieth century? It seems to us that, even if he cannot accept Saravia's ecclesiological views, the ecumenist nonetheless has something to learn from him.

As a historian the author has been struck during this investigation by Saravia's role as liaison officer between the Netherlands and England: in the early sixties, the period of severe persecution, primarily in the ecclesiastical field, in the eighties predominantly in the political. After William of Orange's death, at the time when the revolt of the Low Countries, steadily suppressed by military pressure in the South, continued vigorously in the North, Saravia took part in the attempts to interest the English Queen in supplying political and military aid to the young republic. To be sure, as a cleric and university professor, he could not play a leading role on the stage of Anglo-Dutch relations, but an enquiry into his activities, prompted as they were by strong anglophile sentiments, brings to light many interesting details of this history.

It must be stressed that this study is purely historical and in no sense dogmatic. Its aim is to outline Saravia's life and his opinions in their historical context. Any assessment from the view-point of biblical or dogmatic theology has deliberately been left to others. Beside the autobiographical references scattered throughout the corpus of Saravia's published works, his correspondence is important for obtaining insight into his life and theological development. Hence a number of letters together with two of his memoranda (Document Nos. XXXIII and XXXIX) are included in the third part. 32 of the 49 documents presented here have never been published before. There are two reasons for giving sources

which have already appeared in print. In the first place, some of the earlier editions, especially that of John Strype's, required some correction. Secondly, it is convenient for the reader to have reproduced in one place all the material under consideration; at any rate, all that is known at present, since there is sure to be more hidden away in the archives.

This work could not have been written without the cooperation of numerous colleagues and learned institutions who at various moments in the research rendered invaluable service to the author both with written informations and advices and with personal assistance. As far as Great Britain is concerned, we are indebted to the Rev. W. A. Pembroke (Breaston), Mr Alastair Duke (Southampton), Prof. K. W. Swart and Prof. Geoffrey F. Nuttall (London). In the first stage of the enquiry Mr. Alain Dufour (Geneva) aided the author with useful advice. He is also obliged for informations to his colleagues J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, J. van den Berg (Leiden) who, just as his colleague G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes, read through the manuscript of this study, and C. van der Woude (Leeuwarden) as well as to Prof. J. Rott (Strasburg), Dr. G. Moreau (Liège) and Dr. J. Lenselink (Dordrecht). Dr. F. F. Blok (University of Amsterdam) never refused an appeal for the solution of linguistic problems involving Latin texts.

In numerous English libraries and archives we received helpful and expert guidance in the discovery and examination of the material here considered. The writer was greatly encouraged by the interest shown by the council of the Dutch Church, Austin Friars, London. He is further obliged to Miss Anne M. Oakley, archivist of the Cathedral Archives and Library, Canterbury, who always made it easy for him to work in that historic place. The staffs of the Manuscript Departments of the University Library, Cambridge, the City Library, Gloucester, the civil and ecclesiastical archives on the Island of Guernsey, the County Record Office, Lichfield, the British Library, London, the Greater London Record Office, Guild Hall Library and Lambeth Palace Library were all very helpful. Special mention is due to the Public Record Office where, besides many others, Mr. John Walford in the Search Department went to considerable trouble to solve a problem of biographical detail. Thanks are also due to Mr. N. H. MacMichael, Keeper of the Muniments of Westminster Abbey and to the staffs of the Kent Council Archives (Maidstone), the Bodleian Library (Oxford) and the archives of Worcester Cathedral. As historian of the town and its neighbourhood, Mr. F. H. Clayton (Lichfield) interested himself in Saravia's residence in Tatenhill.

In France, M. Marcel Boutte (Hesdin) made possible our research in the municipal library of Saravia's birthplace and the same is true for St. Omer of the custodian of the Bibliothèque Municipale in that town. The staffs of the Manuscript Departments of the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Library of the Sorbonne (Paris) have given as ready help as have those

of the Belgisch Rijksarchief (Brussels) and the Stadsarchief of Ghent in Belgium.

In the Netherlands we are first of all indebted to Her Majesty the Queen for permission to consult the Koninklijk Huisarchief (The Hague). In his own country, the author had every assistance from the Manuscript Departments of the University of Amsterdam, the Free University and the Universities of Leiden and Utrecht, from those in charge of the Municipal archives of Delft, Dordrecht, Leiden and Utrecht where some archives of the local church communities are kept, and also from the archivist of the Dutch Reformed Church and the Manuscript Department of the Gemeentebibliotheek in Rotterdam. Special mentions must be made of the trouble taken by the staff of the Koninklijke Bibliotheek (The Hague) during the years of this enquiry and to the consideration and expertise with which Miss R. Damstra of the Central Catalogue has time and again helped us.

During our research we have been able to make grateful use of H. J. Witkam's edition of *De dagelijkse zaken van de Leidse Universiteit van 1581 tot 1596*, 10 vls; Leiden 1969-1975 in which Saravia's name appears so frequently.

We acknowledge with gratitude the opportunity given us during the academic year 1974-5 to devote ourselves uninterruptedly to academic work in an international community of scholars at N.I.A.S. (Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Studies) at Wassenaar and thus to work out the results of our research.

The writer wishes to express his grateful thanks to Z.W.O. (Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research) who made it possible for him to make several journeys for research in England and France and to publish the results of his undertaking in this book. In his expressions of appreciation he naturally includes the translator, the Rev. Dr. J. E. Platt (Oxford). The author wants also to express his appreciation for the reception of this study into the series *Studies in the History of Christian Thought*.

We must now add a brief word about technicalities. In the notes and bibliography we have followed the rules of the Nederlands Historisch Genootschap (E. H. Kossmann and C.B. Wels, ed. *Aanwijzingen voor tekstbewerking en annotaties*, Utrecht, 1971). Quotations in the footnotes are given in the original text (Dutch, French or Latin) since this can contribute to a better understanding. For references to the works of Saravia included in the *Tractatus*, we adopt the pagination used in that collection.

In the documents we have not aimed at a uniformity in the orthography which is not present in the text itself. Only, for the sake of greater general ease in reading, has j been altered to i, the v used as a vowel to u and, vice versa, the consonant u to v. From the same consideration in some places the spelling has been corrected and the punctuation modernized. Ab-

breviation marks in the original texts have been altered by completing the words and where abbreviations, which were current in the sixteenth century, are likely to be unclear to the modern reader we have written them out in full.

Finally, the continental reader is alerted to two chronological peculiarities of English documents in this period. The Julian calendar was in use until 1 January 1752 which, during the time dealt with here, resulted in a difference of ten days (*vetus stilus*; old style). The calendar year began on 25 March (Annunciation of the Virgin Mary), almost three months later than on the continent (*stilus Angliae*; *mos anglicanus*).

Groningen, Easter 1979

Willem Nijenhuis