Like those of other leading seventeenth-century ministers, the death of Johann Heinrich Hummel (c.1611–1674), dean of Bern, was marked by publication of a collection of pious tributes from friends and colleagues, designed to celebrate the reputation of the deceased and to edify the faithful.¹ To a funeral oration delivered by Johann Heinrich Ott (1617–1682), at that date professor at the Académie de Lausanne, were added Epicedia contributed by 32 other scholars and ministers from across Protestant Switzerland, including several who had recently collaborated on the revision of the Zürich Bible.² The oration itself reveals a much wider circle of learned men whom Hummel had encountered during his life, many of them familiar names in the intellectual world of early modern Europe: among others, Henry Alting (1583–1644), Victorinus Bythner (c.1605–c.1670), John Durie (1596–1680), and Friedrich Spanheim (1600–1649).³ Yet in speaking of those whom Hummel had met on a youthful visit to England, Ott diverged from his catalogue of distinguished contacts to mention – in addition to London ministers Thomas Gataker (1574–1654, the high-profile vicar of Rotherhithe), and Jeremy Leech (1580–1644, the less well-known rector of St Mary le Bow) – two lay-people, with no visible pretensions to scholarship. The inclusion in the narrative of “Danieli Poeningtono, mercatori praediviti et pio”, and his wife “Elizabetha Risbi” arises from their generous sponsorship of a young student, acknowledged both here and in Hummel’s own account of his life, but the full nature and the long-lasting significance of this contact does not

¹ I should like to express my gratitude to Jan van de Kamp and to the anonymous reader of the draft of this article for their most helpful and constructive comments and suggestions, and in particular for the additional contextual references which they supplied.
³ Oratio Funebris, 18, 22–3.
emerge from either text, and has hitherto gone unremarked. When investigated it offers not only an unusual perspective on pious networks in Charles I’s London, but also an unexpected sidelight on longer-term Anglo-Swiss relations and a modification to the chronology of pietism in Switzerland.

The participation of English clergymen and scholars of the seventeenth century in European-wide networks of correspondence, their contact with visitors from the European continent and their own travels are all now much more widely recognised than they were fifty years ago. So too is the dissemination of their published works through Protestant countries abroad, and in particular the impact that made on the development of pietism. Thanks above all to major digital projects,

the sources for such intellectual and religious exchange are becoming more easily accessible to international study. This journal too has explored the implications of international interaction, tracing a web of connections beyond London to the English provinces.

Tracing careers across political and linguistic boundaries still has its challenges, however. Furthermore, certain lines of communication have been relatively neglected: while Anglo-German and (especially) Anglo-Dutch pathways are relatively well-trodden, Anglo-Swiss relations – whether religious, political, commercial or cultural – have been somewhat overlooked, particularly in England, and above all with regard to the seventeenth century. This is despite the place of Protestant city-states like Zürich and Basel in the sixteenth century English Reformation and an acknowledged engagement by English literary figures with Switzerland in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. What we have thus far is a series of scattered references which have not been aggregated. In 1599 medical student Thomas Platter of Basel stayed in London and noted in his diary performances of plays by Shakespeare.
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England with his friend and fellow scholar Johann Heinrich Hottinger (1620–1667) – as an evidently natural progression from university in the Netherlands. Education in England in the 1630s underpinned the negotiation by Baron Johann Jakob Stokar of Schaffhausen of peace between Britain and the Netherlands in 1653-4. Jean-Baptiste Stouppe from the Grisons was elected pastor of the French church in Threadneedle Street in 1652. Johann Zollikofer of St Gallen visited England in the 1650s, befriended Oxford academic and Independent minister John Owen, and subsequently translated works by English puritans like Joseph Hall. After the Restoration Guy Miege of Lausanne became a language teacher and Whig pamphleteer, while Huguenot refugee networks oiled and accelerated lines of communication between Britain and the Confederation.

Cumulatively, this suggests that for Protestant Swiss, just as for their co-religionists from France, Geneva, the Netherlands and Germany, England was a recognised destination for those seeking enlightenment and employment. It indicates that an attraction operated notwithstanding – as we shall see – the apparent reservations of some with regard to the Reformed credentials of a state that maintained an episcopal hierarchy and to a royal court containing Catholics and crypto-Catholics. The experience of Hummel, who left an autobiography to set alongside Ott’s oration, reveals how links were forged. The correspondence addressed to

---

13 Forster (ed.), Correspondence of J. H. Ott, ix.
him once he had returned to Switzerland demonstrates how long and how far they endured, and how significant they became.

Hummel was born in 1611 in Brugg, now in canton Aargau, then a subject territory of Bern.\(^{18}\) According to his own account, when aged about 20 he went to finish his education at the University of Gronigen; formally admitted in June 1633, he spent nearly two years there as a pupil of Henry Alting and encountered Victorinus Bythner.\(^ {19}\) Although his funds from the Anglo-Genevan banking family of Calandrini were running low, he moved on to England, arriving in London with physician Dr Heinrich Lavater.\(^ {20}\) There he initially got lodgings with a table-maker (ein Tischmacher) from Winterthur in Canton Zürich, who introduced him to “a large number of men with whom he worked”, including (on 28 August 1634) Wilhelm Thilenus, pastor of the Dutch church in Austin Friars. The latter, having “looked through my testimonies and books”, recommended him to biblical scholar Jeremy (sometimes Jeremiah) Leech, who in turn introduced him to Francis Taylor (c.1590–1656), vicar of Clapham, Surrey. He lodged with the latter for nine months, during which time he made the acquaintance of Thomas Gataker.\(^ {21}\)

\(^{18}\) Erni (ed.), ‘Histori des Lebens’, 26; ‘Johann Heinrich Hummel’, [link]. I am grateful to my daughter Elizabeth Larminie for assistance in translating Hummel’s autobiography.


\(^{20}\) Erni (ed.), ‘Histori des Lebens’, 32. His visit coincided with a spike in international interest in English piety: 1633 saw the petition from German scholars (encouraged by John Durie) for translations of English devotional literature; in 1634–5 there were visits from Palatinate scholars Peter Streithagen and Johannes Rulicius (previously a minister in Dorset). See Van de Kamp, ‘Ein frühes reformiert-pietistisches Netzwerk’, 192, 201–3.

\(^{21}\) Erni (ed.), ‘Histori des Lebens’, 32. Thilenus: Grell, Dutch Calvinists, 57–8; ‘Thomas Gataker’, [link]. The ‘table-maker’ was probably the same man as “your Countriman the Joyner”, named ‘John’ and later married to ‘Tabitha’ mentioned in correspondence: Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.56, ff. 1, 1v. Conceivably this couple were the John ‘Evanson’ and Tabitha Whitlocke married on 27 December 1637 (parish register of Holy Trinity, Clapham via [link]); the burial of Tabitha ‘Robenson’, wife of John, on 10 September 1639 (parish register of St Benet Sherehog, London) accords with the death date reported by Daniel Penington in his letter to Hummel (10 October 1639). Alternatively, Hans Ulrich, joiner of Bevis Marks, London, and a member of the Dutch church, Austin Friars, made a will in 1654 which referred to his kin in Switzerland: TNA PROB11/237/338.
That Hummel should come within the orbit of Gataker is not surprising. Thilenus was one of a sizeable number of foreigners who had benefited from the hospitality of the vicar of Rotherhithe. Gataker himself revealed that he had enlarged his house there in order to accommodate not only “mine assistant and scribe, and a student or two” preparing for ordination, but also “Strangers, that from forain parts came over, to learn our Language and observe our Method of Teaching”. He was “seldom without some, and might have had more, had my House been more capacious”. That Hummel was not accommodated there is doubtless testament to Gataker’s success, but it also highlights the similar, hitherto unnoticed, role of Leech and Taylor in the provision of household ‘seminary’ education – a phenomenon that had passed its heyday and of which Gataker had seemed the last practitioner.

Leech, a native of St Pancras, Soper Lane, London, and a graduate of Christ’s College, Cambridge, had been chaplain to the notably pious Thomas Knyvett, 1st Baron Knyvett (d. 1622), before becoming in 1617 rector of St Mary le Bow, at the heart of the City in Cheapside. Despite a printed sermon of 1644 (on Romans chapter 8, verse 31: “If God be for us, who can be against us?”) and mentions of him as a published classical scholar in works by others, little is known of him. Ott and Hummel refer to him as Dr Leech, but if he did hold this degree, it was not from Oxford or Cambridge, raising the possibility that he had studied abroad. Leech’s subsequent ministry can only be glimpsed from stray references, such as the legacies he received under the wills of some parishioners; the mention

24 Willem op ‘t Hof, ‘Learned at Household Seminaries’.
also in these sources of the church’s lecturer and reader hint at the tradition of ample preaching on offer to parishioners since at least 1570.\textsuperscript{28}

Francis Taylor is easier to pin down. Having graduated from Christ’s a few years after Leech, he became in 1615 rector of Clapham, Surrey, and remained there until he resigned in 1642; he had also become vicar of Yalding, Kent, three years earlier.\textsuperscript{29} At some date, probably in the later 1610s, he married one of the stepdaughters of Thomas Gataker, who marked the relationship in his 1654 will with legacies to Taylor, his wife, his son and his daughter.\textsuperscript{30} In the early 1630s Taylor published lectures delivered to the parishioners of St Magnus the Martyr near London Bridge, the dedication of which testifies to the wealthy community who had listened – among others, Lady Hester Pye (wife of Sir Walter Pye, attorney of court of wards) and her sons from her previous marriage including East India merchant Sir Nicholas Crisp (c.1599–1666) and Tobias Crisp (1600–1643), rector of Newington, Surrey, and their wives.\textsuperscript{31} As he was to reveal in another dedicatory epistle a few years later, Taylor was keen to re-establish the Church of England as the Reformed church he was convinced it had been intended to be at the Reformation. He aspired to “be a sho[eling-horne” , inspiring others – and in this particular context, Members of Parliament – to take action “against all new opinions of Arminianisme, Socianianisme, and Popery, which are thought to grow secretly among us, and shew themselves by fits in Preaching and Printing”. He desired to “regaine us a good opinion with other Churches abroad”, recently so compromised, he alleged, that “some” had “forbidden their young Students to come into England, as I have heard from a young man of excellent parts, who adventured to come hither, being sent from Berne

\textsuperscript{28} TNA, PROB11/157/393 (Christopher Hill), PROB11/185/332 (Elizabeth Thompson), PROB11/187/73 (Anne Trott); Paul S. Seaver, The Puritan Lectureships, Stanford 1970, 123, 156.
\textsuperscript{29} http://venn.lib.cam.ac.uk/acad/2016/search-2016.html; A.G. Matthews, Walker Revised, Oxford 1948, 53. Four miles south of London Bridge, the parish should have been moderately accessible to visitors on foot or by river.
into Holland”.\(^{32}\) Whether this young man was Hummel, or a compatriot, is unknown.

Hummel was sufficiently welcomed into the community to be invited to preach at Clapham. In his autobiography he does not say who chose the text, Psalm 10:1 (“Why standest thou afar off, O Lord? why hidest thou thyself in times of trouble?”), or explain its context, but it could stand both for the afflictions the godly perceived themselves to suffer as Archbishop William Laud presided over the church, and for his own difficulties.\(^{33}\) At first Hummel seems to have had a relatively comfortable existence around London, meeting fellow Bernese Sigmund von Erlach (1614–1699), who was soon to enter military service with Bernard of Saxe-Weimar, and who eventually became the most important man in Bern, and Albrecht von Erlach (1614–1652), later a commander in the Swiss guard in France.\(^{34}\) He was also met “other learned men”, including John Durie, and studied with Victorinus Bythner under Samuel Hartlib, although this last contact, revealed in Hartlib’s papers, goes unmentioned in his autobiography.\(^{35}\) Eventually, however, since his “funds were stretched and Mr Taylor’s housekeeping was very expensive”, he decided to return to Groningen. Leaving Clapham with only an unexchangeable foreign coin in his purse, he went to see Leech, who “took me in and enlisted me to writing”. At supper one evening Leech explained Hummel’s situation to “his trusted neighbours” Daniel and Elizabeth Penington, who then gave him a room in their attic, paid for him to visit the universities of Oxford and Cambridge and generally treated him as their son.\(^{36}\)

Hummel’s profound gratitude is plain, but what he did not explicitly record is that through his adoptive ‘parents’ he gained closer access to the beating heart of English puritanism, and did so at a time

\(^{32}\) Francis Taylor, *The faith of the Church of England concerning Gods work on mans will*, London, I. L. for Nicholas Bourne, ‘1641’ [1642], ‘Epistle dedicatorie’ to Sir Edward Dering MP.


\(^{35}\) Sheffield, University Library, Hartlib Papers, 4/3/25A. In the early 1630s Durie received public avowals of support from Thomas Gataker and from Josias Shute and William Gouge, mentioned below as being in Hummel’s circle of acquaintance: British Library [BL], Sloane MS 1465, f. 2. (I am grateful to the anonymous reader for this reference.)

when it was experiencing increasing pressure – adherents might call it persecution – from the conformist, ceremonialist and sometimes Arminian ecclesiastical establishment under Archbishop Laud. Such external forces were, moreover, provoking or exacerbating tensions within the community over antinomianism and Socinianism. Daniel Penington (d.1665) was a prosperous member of the Fishmongers’ Company who invested in the East India Company, like his elder brother Isaac Penington (c.1584–1661), the future MP and lord mayor. In the 1634 heralds’ visitation of London Daniel was recorded as living in the Cordwainer ward of the City; leases and other transactions of the later 1620s and 1630s reveal that he held substantial property in St Mary le Bow and around the Tower of London. On 14 December 1624 at the staunchly puritan church of St Antholin, Budge Row, London, he married Elizabeth Risby (1604/5–1642/5), whose family was if anything even wealthier and more tightly knitted into the fabric of London godly society than his own. Elizabeth’s grandfathers – Richard Risby, a Merchant Taylor, and Francis Bridges (d.1609), a Salter – belonged to London livery companies, as did her father William Risby (d.1625), a Draper. William’s will, apart from providing amply for his family, left about £1,000 in


38 E.g. see John Coffey, John Goodwin and the Puritan Revolution, Woodbridge 2006, 54-61.


charitable benefactions, divided among nine prisons, four hospitals, four London parishes (including St Mary le Bow and St Antholin), destitute artisans, and a range of ministers, preachers and parish officials. Among the beneficiaries were Richard Stock (1568/9–1626), rector of Risby’s native parish of All Hallows’ Bread Street, and Francis Taylor and his children, the last “for that their grandfather Mr Cooper sometime preacher of God’s Word was the first man by whom my spirit was illuminated, and [i] received comfort at and by his preaching of the Word”.

It was probably through Elizabeth’s maternal relatives that the couple also leased a residence at Clapham and were woven closer into the web of connection around its rector. The lord of the manor was Sir Henry Atkyns (d.1638), who left £10 to “my loving friend Mr Taylor” in his 1638 will. His brother was Edward Atkyns (1587–1669) of Lincoln’s Inn, defence counsel in two of the iconic religiously-driven prosecutions of the Charles I’s personal rule, those of puritan pamphleteer William Prynne (1600–1669) in 1633 and of the feoffees for impropriations (in 1632–3), who, until they were suppressed, sought to buy up church livings and place in them ‘godly’ preaching ministers. Another prominent parishioner was Elizabeth Penington’s uncle Francis Bridges (d.1642), who like their kinsman Charles Ofspring (1586–1660), rector of St Antholin, and Richard Stock, was among the feoffees. That the demise of that group in no way dinted Bridges’ ardour for promoting godliness is demonstrated by his will of May 1642. In addition to extensive charitable provision around London and legacies of £50 to Taylor and £3 to Ofspring, Bridges mentioned numerous other clergy and left to four New England ministers (including Hugh Peter, 1598–1660, also formerly associated with the

44 Elizabeth Penington told Hummel on 21 February 1637/8: “we are now upon remove to London your father hath sould the lease of his house in Clapham, and at Christ tide the house cometh into his hands the next doore to that which we formerly lived in”. As he knew, “I love not these changes” for “i did tell you I knew I should not be setled in Clapham, but my comfort is I shall one day have a restinge place, for which time I will waite”: Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 6.
45 TNA, PROB11/177/510.
feoffees) £50 “towards the enlargement of a college in New England for students there” and £20 to clothe the poor.\(^{47}\)

It is understandable that, having experienced the hospitality of this community, Hummel felt tempted to stay in England. The Peningtons’ welcome extended, he remembered, to their offering to marry him to their daughter, specified as Elizabeth.\(^{48}\) The gesture was almost certainly symbolic, and Hummel may have misremembered the detail: in the 1633 visitation the couple’s eldest surviving daughter was Mary, who had been baptised at St Mary le Bow only in April 1629, while their daughter Elizabeth was even younger.\(^{49}\) None the less, the gesture was powerful and sustained. After Hummel had returned home in the spring of 1636, the Peningtons maintained a correspondence with their ‘son’, thereby cementing him into their community.

In the context of the haphazard communications characteristic of early modern Europe, it appears that not all of the letters directed by the Peningtons to Bern survive. Hummel preserved five from Daniel (dated between March 1636/7 and March 1649/50) and effectively eight from Elizabeth (dateable between 31 May 1637 and 4 September 1640); Elizabeth also countersigned her husband’s letter of 21 February 1641/2.

Internal evidence, references in other letters, and sometimes Hummel’s endorsements of the date of receipt and/or acknowledgement more or less supply missing dates, and thus enable the historian to disentangle the confusing order in which the documents have been bound.\(^{50}\) Not all the “epistles” the Peningtons assumed had “miscarried” in transit actually did so, but quite clearly some did, adding to the insecurity of maintaining a

\(^{47}\) TNA, PROB11/189/406. Bridges also left £50 to his niece Elizabeth Penington.

\(^{48}\) ‘Histori des Lebens’, 34.

\(^{49}\) St Mary le Bow parish register, http://www.ancestry.com. They had had at least one previous child, Elizabeth, baptised on 5 July 1627 and buried on 20 December 1628. A daughter Judith, baptised on 26 September 1630, was also dead by the date of the 1633 visitation; that source additionally recorded another Elizabeth (baptised at St Mary le Bow, 2 February 1632) and Sarah: Howard and Chester (eds.), \textit{Visitation of London 1633, 1634 and 1635}, 152.

\(^{50}\) Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III. 63.49, 54, 56, 58, 79 (2 March 1636/7, 31 May 1637, 10 October 1639, 21 February 1641/2 and 1 March 1649/50); B III. 63.55, ff. 3–4v ([31 May 1637]); 1–2v ([summer] 1637); 63.53 (21 February 1637/8); 63.55, ff. 5–6 (18 July [1638]); 63.57, ff. 1–2 (after 4 December 1638 but ‘long’ before 23 April 1639); 63.57, f. 2 (23 April 1639, a postscript to the previous letter, which is described as a copy); 63.57, ff. 2–2v (4 September 1640, revealing both the preceding as copies).
relationship at such a distance. For example, in his first extant message to his “most deere & loving son” (2 March 1636/7), Daniel mentioned a letter sent by Hummel on 14 August 1636, soon after his return to Switzerland, which had arrived in Clapham on 13 December and been answered on 23 December; this has vanished. By the winter of 1638-1639 Elizabeth had sent so “many large espistells and could receive no answere, insomuch that I was weary of keeping ether the date or the coppie of them”, although she was reassured to discover from a recent letter to her husband that the loss was not as extensive as she had feared.

The agents employed to transmit and deliver the correspondence serve to illuminate the circles in which both Hummel and the Peningtons moved. In his letter of 2 March 1637 Daniel mentioned in passing his house guest that day, “your Countriman Mr Albertus Rutimeier”. According to Daniel’s second extant letter of 31 May 1637, this man had been given its predecessor to take home to Hummel. He must have been Albert Rütimeyer (1610–1659), son of the Aarau-born Swiss delegate at the Synod of Dort and subsequent rector of the Bern academy, Markus Rütimeyer (1580–1647). While the father was known in English puritan circles by virtue of the Synod, the visit to England by his son, who by that August was back in Bern to present his thesis on original sin, seems hitherto unknown this side of the Channel. Unlike other continental visitors to England, he seems not to have learned much English, thereby earning a frosty reception from Elizabeth Penington, if it was he to whom

51 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.54, f. 1; 63.55, ff. 3, 5, 5v; 63.56, f. 2; 63.57, f. 2.
52 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III. 63.49, f. 1.
53 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III. 63.57, f. 1.
54 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.49.
55 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.54.
she referred in her letter of 31 May. “Your country man did profes himselfe to be an intimate frind of yours and saide he had bin your bedfellowe, but I confes I did not like him well [...] nor did I say much to him”. He appears to have conversed largely or solely in Latin, which “Mr Tayler did interpret”. 57

Uncertain as to whether Albert Rütimeyer had delivered the March letter safely, Penington sent his May letter “by the conveyance of Mr Schennowerus Mr Buxstorfes Scholler of Bazill & a dweller there”. 58 The tutor in question was umistakably Johannes Buxtorf the younger, professor of Hebrew at Basel, but the student’s identity is unclear. 59 The most likely candidate is Bernese-born Johannes Huldrich Tschenus (c.1606–1652), admitted to the University of Basel in July 1632 as “nuper ex Anglia advantans” and previously a student at Herborn, Groningen and Leiden, although why he might be in England in 1637 is unexplained, and again apparently otherwise unremarked. 60 According to Elizabeth Penington, this was “your country man of Bassell Mr Shenuere[,] a close student here, and an honest <man> I thinke”, who had packaged up her letter for dispatch with his “owne letters and bookes” as went “first into the low countrieres”. 61 Once back in Basel, he too remained in touch with his English friends. 62

It is evident that a variety of networks, not only scholarly, sustained these networks. “Lookeing over the coppies of my letters sent to you”, Penington noted that he had sent four which, as far as he knew, had gone unanswered. Letters of July 1638 and May 1639 were sent respectively courtesy of “Mr Westeencious” and “your Countriman the Joyner” (previously encountered), while another of April 1639 went sealed “up in a packett which Mr Peter Shavan of Geneva sent to his father whoe dwells there”, via “Mr Burlamachy”, for possible forwarding by “Mr Spanheim of Geneva”. Three received from Hummel over roughly the same period arrived via “Mr Peter Shavan of Geneva”; a second via “Mr

57 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 2v (?31 May 1637); cf. Milton, ‘Puritanism and the continental Reformed churches’, 118.
58 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.54. Penington later called him ‘Mr Shenonerous’: B III.63.56, f. 1.
60 This man became a pastor at Bern Münster in 1647: Die Matrikel der Universität Basel, iii. 345.
61 Staatsarchiv Bern, B III 63.55, f. 2v (between 29 July-23 November 1637).
62 Staatsarchiv Bern, B III 63.58: see below.
Billingsley, secretarie to Sir Olliver Fleming”, Charles I’s ambassador to Zürich; and a third “by a Scotchman that came out of France and made noe staie here”.

Notwithstanding the “discouragement” of long silences, the Peningtons and their circle participated in meeting the insatiable desire of their Swiss friends for English books. The importance of Geneva as a staging post appears here as elsewhere, but much of the traffic was more direct. Penington conveyed to Hummel Billingsley’s report that Fleming took on his Zürich embassy “bookes both for our Mr Mayer a minister of yor Country & also for yor selfe”. Penington himself issued an open invitation: “if yow desire bookes lett us have A note of this yow have alreadie & thos yow wold have and Mr Tailer [seemingly distinguished later from ‘Mr Tailer of Clapham’] & my self will endeavour to furnish <them>”. However, he advised that Hummel identify a reliable supply route. One such had been established by February 1642, when Penington noted that in September 1640 the couple had sent “the chest of bookes that Mr Shenuvoro of Basill did writ to Mr Tailer to furnish him withall who hath since writ to Mr Tayler of the Receipt of them”. In the same chest, books destined for Hummel had included (from Daniel) “Parr upon the Romanes & a small book of [?sermons]” and (from “your mother”) “Doctor Gouge his booke, gods Arrowes & Mr Borroughs of the excellencye of a gratious spirit”. As Elizabeth explained on 4 September


66 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III 63. 56 (10 October 1639).

1640, Hummel had “writ to me long sence for the whole armour of God”, but she had been unable to obtain it, “it beinge out of print, for nowe they bind all docter Gouges workes together, but at <last> I found one though not new yeat as usefull”. She too mentioned “Mr Burrues booke the excellencie of a gratious spirit, I knowe you will like it”.68

In addition to books the Peningtons conveyed news which gives a window into the breadth and cohesion of the puritan fraternity to which Hummel had belonged in London, in which he was considered to have a lasting investment, but concerning the behaviour of which he might be in need of justificatory explanation. Although there was reassurance that “all yor ffriends & acquaintance are in health”, there was also contradictory intelligence that some friends had gone “to that place of perfection” where there would be “noe use of praier” but they would “spend all our tymes in praiseing of him from whome wee Receave all that both here wee enioye and there hope <for>”. “Mr Gardner [unidentified] is dead that married Mr Leech his youngest daughter at a liveing that was newly given him”, while “Tabitha that married John the Joyner god hath taken to him self the last month shee hath left a boye behind of her husbands name & was quicke of another but it pleased god to make her wombe a grave unto it & soe thei were buried & went to heaven togeather”.69

Alongside personal news was intelligence of the fortunes of ministers of their acquaintance under ecclesiastical authorities (often vaguely referred to as ‘they’ or ‘them’) with whom the godly had an uneasy existence.70 Noting that “Mr Walker the preacher is putt out of his liveing”, Penington could not account for it – “the cause I knowe not nor I think they that have done [it]” – but George Walker (?1582–1651), rector of St John the Evangelist, Watling Street, and the author of several published works, had already been under fire since 1631 from William Laud (initially as bishop of London), and was now under house arrest following a spell of imprisonment for allegedly factious and seditious preaching.71 On the other hand “Mr Carter hath laid downe his <lecture>

68 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III 63.57, f. 2v. Editions of William Gouge, The whole-armour of God had been published in 1616, 1619, 1627 and 1639.
69 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III 63.56, f. 1v (10 October 1639). See above n. 21.
to prevent their depr[iving] him of it”; “hee was much followed”, explained Penington, “& manie of them wold abide in the street till service was done & then wold come in rudely at the last psalme”. Resignation gave Carter “libertie sometymes to preach whereas if hee had staid for a putting downe that wold have denied him that”. Yet not all in their circle operated on the margins of acceptability. Penington also reported, without registering surprise, that “it hath pleased the lord of Canterbury to bestowe another liveing upon Mr Tailer of Clapham as an addition to his meanes which hee hath need of”. The living was Yalden, Kent; that Taylor resigned from Clapham in 1642 may have arisen from a stirring of conscience as to indulging in pluralism. In the meantime Taylor had manifested his gratitude to Laud by a generously-worded dedication to the archbishop in 1639 of a manuscript set of dissertations – an action which constitutes one of many manifestations of the complexity of contemporary religious life.

Throughout the letters there was an element of consulting a Christian brother living under a different dispensation for advice, as well as of comparing the workings of God in different societies. Thanking Hummel for his “good councell”, Daniel took “notice of gods open handes to yor Country <in> blessings <for> without which hee is requited wth sinfulnes the abuse of the Creature & unthankfell [word missing?]” and went on to “wish England had not as much cause for Complaine[t for] god will not give successe where his mercies are soe slighted & abused”. The (mutual) remedy was not to “bee wanting in sending up or prayers to the Throne of grace for a generall reformation both in orselves & others the commonwelth & the Church”. By March 1650 - more than a year after the regicide and inauguration of the republic – Penington was obliged to “confesse it is true that yow writ wee live in miserable & distressed tymes[::] the Lord grant us patience & a profitable improvement of the Rod that is upon us”.

72 Plausibly William Carter, who in 1640 was lecturing at St Mary le Bow and was reported by the authorities to be ‘not very conformable': ‘William Carter’, http://www.oxforddnb.com.
73 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III 63.56 (10 October 1639).
75 Lambeth Palace Library, Lambeth MS 468. I owe this reference to the anonymous reader.
76 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.49, f. 1 (2 March 1636/7).
77 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.79, f. 1.
Elizabeth Penington’s surviving letters are at the same time more expansive, more rambling, more physically damaged and more vivid than those of her husband, and give an even more intimate picture of London piety. As the outpourings of an Englishwoman of limited education in her thirties to a Swiss schoolmaster and minister only five or six years her junior, they are occasionally startling. Struggling to express the nature of her relationship with her “most sweet most lovinge and/ Not lesse beloved son”, she observed that it “often puts me in minde of the love of Jonathan and David” – doubtless seen by their circle as the most intense non-sexual bond imaginable. However, Elizabeth seems aware that this might be misinterpreted: “I will boast my love is not lese towards you, but in all points as sencere and harty, and hearin I shall desire also to aprove my selfe to God, ne, and my husband not careing what all the world besides may suspect.”

She advised Hummel about acquiring a wife, even though “I feare my councell will come to[o] late”, advocating “a Helvetian woman” not too “ould, nor to[o] younge for good reson, nor to[o] littell then you may have a race of pignies, nor to[o] bigge for other reason I know not how bigge your, beds be in your contry. nor a widdowe”. Once he was married, she “would find roome for you and your wife too, your sweet hart my daught[er]”; indeed, she offered to take her into her home for a year to teach her “good English” so that Hummel would not lose his facility in the language or his inclination to return to England. Elizabeth’s advice was indeed too late. When a few months later she first “read the news of my sons marriage” to the widowed Sarah Meier in a letter he had sent to Taylor, “it struck coulde to my hart”. This, however was “but selfe love”. Now in receipt of her own letter from Hummel in which he outlined the “inward beauties, which are indeed the best ornaments” of his bride, she recovered to congratulate him on God’s gift of “your pious Sarah. your meet companion, your lovinge yocke fell[ow]”; “I expect by your next to here of a granchild”.

---

78 Holes in the ms. Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III 63.55 make a complete transcription impossible, while throughout her letters the continuation to text to the side and foot of the folio can present problems.
79 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 3v (?31 May 1637).
80 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 3v.
81 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, ff. 1v–2.
Their established intimacy led Elizabeth to reveal her details of her poor health and frequent pregnancies.\textsuperscript{82} Like other pious women she struggled both with tribulations and their absence: “in one of mine the which I thinke you have received, I did writ that it was an affliction to me that I had so longe bin \textit{without} afflictions”. Since that time, “it hath pleased my good God to give me a large share of these, both on my selfe and mine”. God had “visited” her with an illness which sounds like migraine, although physicians could not identify it, “yet never did I feele more sweet comfort, then in my greatest extremity”. She saw it as “punishment” from “a just God”. This was “like the voice of thunder the which we read of, yet withal I heard the soft and still voice of mercifull refreshings and sweet comforts, here I saw my God indeed, much better to be in a firey furnes with these delights then in a paradise without them, no marvile good David saide in psalm the 4 and the 7 verse I se by experience that his lovinge with assurance is better then life”.\textsuperscript{83}

But such convictions did not prevent sufferings driving her to wish for death: “though I did labour with my owne hart, and divers good ministers <did perswade> me to it, yet I could hardly bringe me to the passe to be willing to live”. Even worse was to come. In a letter of mixed tidings on 18 July 1638 she wrote to Hummel of the death of her Clapham neighbour and fellow patron of Francis Taylor, Sir Henry Atkyns, but also of her “very frowward” and very much alive infant son Isaac, who had cut two teeth and “looketh so gravely” that he had already earned from his uncle Risby the nickname “Doctor Isaacke”.\textsuperscript{84} However, a few months later there was an epidemic of measles. “It was mortall to many, and of this disease our son died, the 4 of December <1638> ... my son my only son Isaac whome I loved – heare was a triall indeed yet not like Abraham for God to take him, thou Lord hast done it, I therefore wil not open my


\textsuperscript{83} Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.57, f. 1 (December 1638-April 1639). “Thou hast put gladness in my heart, more than in the time that their corn and their wine increased”: Psalm 4:7 (1611 Authorised Version). The previous letter containing the comment about afflictions does not seem to have survived.

\textsuperscript{84} Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.52, f. 1v (18 July 1638). Sir Henry was buried at Holy Trinity, Clapham, on 19 July 1638.
mouth.”

Although the child “did still want somthing of a yeare ould”, Jeremy Leech preached a funeral sermon on the text “out of the 1 kings 17 chap the last words of the 23 verse”, emphasising the hope of resurrection through reference to the story of Elijah and the son of the widow of Zarephath (in that case literally raised from the dead). In late June 1640 she received a consolatory reply from Hummel (dated 9 March), which she subsequently acknowledged (4 September): “my son Isaac laugheth in heaven as you say, and so shall I also when I am there”.

In the meantime, at Whitsun 1639 Elizabeth miscarried of “a duble blessing [...] of two perfect children” at “not above 9 weeks gone” while at Whitsun 1640 she had given birth to a healthy daughter, Rebecca. But now with five living daughters, and numerous miscarriages, stillbirths and infant deaths behind her, and with “a very weake body inclininge to a consumption if not already in it”, she was affected by melancholy and (apparently) by guilt that she had not managed to breast-feed her children. Observing that “we say that weake women are most apt for conception”, she announced her “feare I am againe with child”. That it was a dangerous calling, she had acknowledged, but not entirely come to terms with, on a previous occasion when she shared such news with Hummel: “I am now with child [...] this may be saide not to be my owne act, for though not undeserved in regard of that loyal subiection which I owe to my husband, yet undesired and unexpected, so that i was a meere patient in the busines”.

Pregnancy and illness might keep Elizabeth “3 weekeses together not being able to goe to church”, but when her strength allowed her again to “partake of his public ordinances” it appears to have been the obligation most likely to make her “sture out of our doores”. Moreover, neither bodily ailments nor consciousness of her own lack of education prevented her from full participation in the life of her godly community.

85 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.57, f. 1v (December 1638-April 1639). An allusion to Genesis 22:2, and the sacrifice of Abraham’s son Isaac, “thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest” (1611 Authorised Version).
86 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.57, f. 2. “See, thy son liveth” (1611 Authorised Version); “Behold, thy son liveth” (Geneva Bible).
87 Possibly an allusion to Genesis 18:2, when Isaac’s mother Sarah “laughed within her self” at the thought of having a son in her old age, although it does not quite work.
88 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.57, f. 2 (4 September 1640).
89 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 6 (21 Feb. 1637/8). Cf. 1 Peter 3:1, 5.
90 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 6 (21 Feb. 1637/8).
Aware that “I cannot iudge of a scoller”, she rated Hummel on other qualities: “of my learned and wise son, though not of his scollershipe, that I will only admire, but of his goddnes for my thinkes I know his hart”.  Yet she had a certain self-confidence: “I praise God my hart is fixed, but my desire is in these daies of peace to get such sure grounds to my selfe, that if I should live to se [erasure] change, through Gods assistance I may remaine unmovable”. This allowed her to write to Hummel on contentious spiritual matters without Francis Taylor’s knowledge: “Mr Tayler doth not know that I did writ to you any thinge about it, nor d[es]ire I that he should know, for he and I have had some hote dispute about it”. Taylor had uttered “words which I was sorry to here”, and which she did not care to repeat. She acknowledged he was “a good scoller and hath a nimbell wit”, but on this issue – which she did not specify, but which is perhaps most likely to have related to the controversy within the puritan community over grace – “so f[ar] as I can iudge I find him leane the wronge way”. She conceded that he might have done it “alone for argument sake, yet he spake to the simpell who had need of his direction”, and thus (she implied) risked leading them astray. “My leaders I hope”, she continued, “shall never cause me to ere”. Hummel had evidently enquired after the purity of the English ministry, to which she replied that “our fountaines are corrupt and they send forth bitter stre[ames]”, but there were those who “are not tainted with this rottennes, the bitter watter hath not entered into there bowells”.  

The godly congregations to which Elizabeth belonged were faced with numerous dilemmas, the solutions to which might divide them and alienate or mystify friends abroad. She apparently felt impelled to explain to Hummel how she and her circle sometimes justified acceding to the demands of Laudian ceremonialists. As she doubtless appreciated through comments made during his English visit and later (now lost), Hummel was accustomed to Zwinglian austerity in a republican oligarchical state: the communion service was simply a memorial of the Last Supper; unadorned music was acceptable in worship but visual distractions were not; funeral pomp was forbidden; it was unthinkable that an ecclesiastical figure could dictate practice to magistrates, still less to discipline the powerful élite through a court of high commission or

91 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, ff. 3, 3v (?)31 May 1637.
92 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 5 (21 Feb. 1637/8).
93 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 5 (21 Feb. 1637/8); Coffey, John Goodwin, 54-61.
consistories or exclusion from the sacrament.\textsuperscript{94} For example, Laudian initiatives to move communion tables and restore them to a pre-Reformation “altarwise” position, indeed, to call them “altars” and to demand kneeling at the rail and other manifestations of respectful behaviour might well seem outrageous.\textsuperscript{95} Elizabeth’s reasoning for acceding to such demands was subtle: “we say we bowe not to the alter but <to> God and towards the alter”. She went on to explain that “we say it is fit to shew some signe of reverence when we come into the house of God, for we doe and must shew reverence when we come into the presence chamber of a prince”. By extension, “what gesture more fit to expres our reverence then by bowinge”? Besides, “when the eye of my faith shall see God in a more spetiall manner present at the allter then els where, I shall then bowe toward the alter”. She anticipated, and perhaps had already received, a negative reaction – “son let it not truble you that you cannot exprese your selfe, for you have done it very well” – but invited him to consider further and “let me here what you think of it”. It constituted, she suggested, a necessary compromise: “let it not disturbe your patience, but rather provoke you to thankefulnes for yourselves, that God hath kept you free from these rudements, and also to prayer for us the more you here of our weakenes”.\textsuperscript{96}

Like her husband, Elizabeth sent news which both delineated their community and illustrated its public and private trials, especially in letters of 1637. John Goodwin (c.1594–1665), her brother-in-law Isaac


\textsuperscript{96} Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 5 (21 February 1638). If Elizabeth shared her opinion on this point with Taylor, then such compromise may explain the preference he received from Laud.
Penington’s pastor, had returned from the country to discover that the plague had entered his house in Coleman Street. He was kept from entering while it raged, only to be then hauled before the court of high commission for his nonconformity. Disquietingly, from there Elizabeth had heard that “the good man”, who was already beginning to part company with colleagues over his drift towards Arminianism, had “taken the oath ex officio [ex officio] which scarce any of our ministers will take, and it is much wondered at that he would doe it for hee must answere to whatsoever they ask him and against whomesoever”. Her prayer that God would “keepe his hart aright, and free him from these trubles in his owne time” was answered at least in the second case, as there is no evidence of further proceedings on this occasion.\(^\text{97}\) Dr William Gouge had lost a dearly-loved son, “a proper man, a batcheler he had bin two yeares a trader for himselfe”, who had gone “out in the morninge early” but “came no more home”, having encountered a disgruntled servant; he “was found stabd and thrown into the temes [Thames], no <man> can tell which way, or by whome”.\(^\text{98}\) “Mr Sedgwick” – either Obadiah Sedgwick (1599/1600–1658), lecturer at St Mildred, Bread Street, and friend of godly peer Robert Rich, 2nd earl of Warwick, or his brother John Sedgwick (1600/01–1643), rector of St Alphege, London Wall, and previously lecturer at St Giles, Cripplegate – had “buried his younge wife long sence” after she had “died in child bed of her first child”.\(^\text{99}\) Taylor had recently “buried his ould father”, while “Mr Oldseward” (Richard Holdsworth, 1590–1649, rector of St Peter le Poer, Broad Street), had become master of the unofficial puritan seminary, Emmanuel College, Cambridge.\(^\text{100}\) Elizabeth mentioned for special approbation “Mr Shut in lumber [Lombard] street which you and I did use to here”. Of several brothers who entered the ministry, this was probably Josias Shute (1588–1643), rector of St Mary Woolnoth and preacher to the East India Company,

\(^{\text{97}}\) Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 2 (summer 1637); TNA, SP16/339, f. 122; ‘John Goodwin’, Oxford DNB; Coffey, John Goodwin, 49-61, esp. 57.
\(^{\text{100}}\) Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 6 (21 February 1637/8); ‘Richard Holdsworth’, http://www.oxforddnb.com.
“preacher-general of the City of London”. This was a man whose sermons drew large crowds but whose principles stood in the way of ecclesiastical promotion: he was “so far from seekeing preferment the wronge way, that he doth refuse it being offered”. Elizabeth had heard that Archbishop Laud had sent for him “desireinge to prefer him, but he did not goe”. Approached again, apparently with an offer of whatever he wanted, “he did thanke his lordshipe, and saide he had enough, nether would he have any more”. The authorities would even have appointed him a member of the court of high commission, the same court which had pursued the feoffees for impropriations and others who fell foul of the Laudian establishment, “but he did refuse it, well knowing what be the snares that atend preferment”. As far as Elizabeth was concerned, “he doth approve himself a pious minister [:] I wish we had more of such”.

Elizabeth Penington did not live to see the fruits of the Westminster Assembly, called in 1643, to which Gataker, Taylor and other ministers in her circle were summoned. Some time between the making of her uncle Francis Bridges’ will in May 1642 and 1 September 1645, when Daniel Penington re-married, Elizabeth died. With his brother Isaac, Daniel was an investor in the Protestant plantation of Ireland through the 1640s and 1650s. By March 1650 “in regard of the times” Daniel could “sitt downe contented with what god hath done in taking” his first wife and numerous children to a better place, but for the first time he felt impelled to pursue the debt owed him by Hummel. “I must say I have neede for the state owes me One thousand pounds upon the publique faith & whether ever I shall see a penny of it againe I knowe not”; the payment of taxation meant he could not “mayntayne my charge without borroweing, besides it is Thirteene yeares agoe next month since you went from hence as I take it & I heare yow live wel & plentiflly which I Reioyce in”. But he still signed himself “your loveing father”. Following the Restoration and the death of an impoverished and politically disgraced Isaac in the Tower of London (December 1661), Daniel appears

101 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 6 (21 February 1637/8); ‘Josias Shute’, ‘Christopher Shute’, http://www.oxforddnb.com. Like Taylor, Shute was possibly courted by Laud as a potential moderate.
102 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.55, f. 6 (21 February 1637/8).
103 TNA, PROB11/189/406; St Giles, Cripplegate, parish register, (http://www.ancestry.com).
104 TNA, SP63/294 ff. 65, 158, 162–4; SP63/285, ff. 169, 318.
105 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.79, f.1.
to have opted for a quiet life in St Mary le Bow, where he died in 1665 having outlived all but one of his children. His will made no mention either of Hummel or of the circles in which he had moved thirty years previously.  

Meanwhile, Hummel’s ties to England endured. His correspondence contains letters in Latin from Gataker (1635, 1649) and Taylor (1637, 1644), while in 1652 Henry Alting wrote to him in English. He published in 1650 and 1659 translations from English of devotional works by Sir John Hayward (?1564–1627). In the 1650s and 1660s he re-engaged with old friends from the Hartlib circle through John Durie, Theodore Haak (1605–1690) and John Pell (1611–1685). Presented by Pell with William Gouge’s A guide to go to God, he repaid the kindness by smoothing his diplomatic endeavours and by promoting Durie’s ecumenical schemes. Durie tried unsuccessfully to persuade the “churches of the cantons” to allow him to take Hummel with him on a mission to the court of Protector Oliver Cromwell, citing the precedent of the fraternal visits of Paul and Silas from Jerusalem to the churches of Asia Minor.

However, Hummel’s greatest chance to mark past friendships came after the Restoration when Edmund Ludlowe (1616/17–1692) and other fugitive regicides found Geneva too dangerous a place to hide from royal vengeance and sought sanctuary in the Bernese-ruled Pays de Vaud. It was Hummel to whom the exiles chiefly owed their permission to remain in Lausanne and then Vevey, a fact which drew their grateful letters into the 1670s. Ludlowe, who recorded that “our especiall friend” had put in a good word for them to the Bernese authorities even

106 Historical Gazetteer of London, index; TNA, PROB11/317/60.  
107 Bern, Staatsarchiv, BIII.63.50, 70, 81, 82.  
112 Bern, Staatsarchiv, BIII.63.1, 17, 20, 32, 35, 38, 39, 41, 43.
when on his death-bed, well understood the value of an English-speaking advocate. As attested by letters from ministers in Vaud to Hummel, through their religious scruples the exiles had offended their local hosts by refusing requests to stand as godparents because it seemed a mere social formality (attracting false attribution of anabaptism), and by declining on occasion to attend the celebration of communion because the criteria for participation were insufficiently rigorous. When brought to account, they assembled their arguments and then “left to Mr Hommel to mannage, as he should judge most convenient”. As Hummel “was pleased to write”, said Ludlowe, “he well understood the Customes and conscientious Reasons of the Independents in England”.

That Hummel should possess such understanding and should give sympathetic assistance to those who held such opinions is noteworthy, as indeed was his reception of Durie. Not only has the harvest of English-inspired Protestant devotion traditionally been dated to the last decade of the seventeenth century, but in the period prior to that the Protestant churches of Switzerland and of canton Bern in particular have been viewed as inward-looking, conservative, austere and moribund, concerned to exclude suspect foreign doctrines and publications. Yet Hummel survived early suspicions of his orthodoxy to rise to the highest ecclesiastical position in the most important canton, and in the peasant war of 1653 was unusually prepared to mediate in a conflict which his former compatriot in London, Sigmund von Erlach, prosecuted without compromise. In the 1660s he was prepared to engage with the increasingly heterodox Jean de Labadie, one-time minister-elect of the French church Westminster, erstwhile minister of Geneva, and friend of

114 Bern, Staatsarchiv, B III.63.34 (Abraham Mennet), 36 (Josué Chevalier).
Ludlowe. Hummel’s sojourn in England may not have altered visibly his essential adherence to the church of his youth, but it surely gave him a certain tolerance of, and open-mindedness to, others’ expressions of religious commitment. However refracted, the influence of the English puritans was surely germinating long before its full flowering.

Summary
Anglo-Swiss networks in the seventeenth century have received little attention. The autobiography of and the correspondence addressed to Johann Heinrich Hummel (1611-1674), dean of Bern, illuminate his visit to London 1634-1636 and its long-lasting consequences. They also expand knowledge of London clergy engaged in the education of foreign students, reveal the role of godly laity (Daniel and Elizabeth Penington) as hosts and as suppliers of English devotional books to a continental audience, offer insights into individual piety and comment on the sufferings of their community under Archbishop William Laud, and an early context for the development of pietism in Switzerland.
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