A Scottish Tapestry of Reform: 
John Calvin, Valérand Poullain and Some Scots

Jack C. Whytock

The Scottish Reformation can be described as an amazing genealogical tapestry of the weaving together of many continental fibers. The Calvinian fibers certainly include John Calvin, but they are inclusive of a wider continental Calvinian and Reformed family. Scotland had the position of drawing upon, being influenced by and shaping several of these Reformed fibers into her national Reformation. In this year of honouring the 500th anniversary of Calvin’s birth, I want to briefly mention John Calvin’s influence through another Reformer, Valérand Poullain.¹ By tracing that Reformer’s direct and indirect connections and possible influences upon the Scottish Reformation and Reformers, the Reformed movement is more clearly shown as “polyphonic” in its scope.²

I will begin by establishing the Poullain-Calvin connection, follow this by the Poullain-Scottish connection, then explore the parallels between Poullain and the Scottish Reformation and conclude with my assessment.

Part 1: Poullain-Calvin

I begin with a brief sketch of Poullain’s life. He was born c.1509 in Lille, France, along the border with modern Belgium, and matriculated at the ancient University of Louvain in March 1531. The location of his birth and university studies brought him into close association with the Walloons and the Flemish. He was ordained as a priest by 1540 yet by 1543 was converted to Protestantism and fled to Strasbourg, where he lived in Martin Bucer’s house. Poullain clearly identified with the Reformed side of Protestantism and wrote against the Lutheran position on Communion. The chief centres of his Protestant ministry were Strasbourg, Glastonbury-London and Frankfort, where he died in 1557.³ Poullain’s most significant textual contributions were his Liturgia Sacra (Sacred Liturgy) and Professio Fidei Catholicae (Confession of the Catholic Faith).⁴ A reviewer commenting on Poullain wrote that he was “an interesting example of the truly international character of the Reformed Church; and it is perhaps partly for that very reason

---

¹ I have adopted the spelling “Valérand Poullain” for consistency. Other forms include “Valerandus Pollanus”, “Vallerandus Poullain”, “Valerian Poullain”, “Vallerand Poullain” and “Valerani Pollani”.


³ Jasper Ridley, John Knox (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968) 306. Ridley has Poullain still alive on 15 December, 1558, but this appears to be incorrect.

that he has had a somewhat scant share of historical attention.\(^5\) I will now draw out Poullain’s connections to John Calvin.

When Calvin left his pastorate of the French refugee congregation in Strasbourg, 1541, he was succeeded by Pierre Brully, who was replaced by Valérand Poullain in 1543.\(^6\) Thus, Poullain became heir to the liturgy and church discipline that Calvin had used while in Strasbourg. (As an aside, let us remember Calvin owed a great deal to Bucer\(^7\) in Strasbourg for his ideas on liturgy and discipline. It is significant to assert this genealogical line at the outset. Calvin was the conduit of Bucer, Poullain then the conduit of Calvin or, could we say, Calvin and Bucer?) In 1550, Poullain and his congregation left Strasbourg for England due to the conditions of the 1548 Augsburg Interim.\(^8\) Poullain became the preacher and superintendent of the exiled French weavers now in Glastonbury, much like the position John à Lasco held in the Strangers’ Churches in London. Poullain’s congregation numbered over two hundred people and consisted of both Walloon and Flemish weavers.\(^9\) While in Glastonbury, Poullain set down his liturgy in Latin in 1551. This is popularly known as the Liturgia Sacra, and it owes much to Calvin’s Strasbourg liturgy.\(^10\) When Mary ascended the throne in 1553, the Glastonbury congregation, like the London Strangers’ Churches, left for the continent. They wandered through Germany by way of Emden, Wesel and Cologne and finally received refuge at Frankfort in 1554.\(^11\) Here Poullain’s Liturgia Sacra was slightly revised and republished, together with his

---


Confession. This revised edition was used by the French and English refugee congregations that had recently come to Frankfort.12

Thus, Poullain’s liturgy passed from Strasbourg to Glastonbury and then to Frankfort. At each of these places, it continued to show that it relied upon Calvin’s Strasbourg liturgy. Gordon states that the 1551 *Liturgia* is almost identical to Calvin’s 1542 “La Forme des Prieres et Chantz Ecclesiastiques”, the liturgy that Calvin used in Strasbourg. The 1554 Frankfort revised *Liturgia* contains some innovations but is still loyal to its forerunners.13 This reliance upon the work of Calvin is something to which Poullain would readily admit. Bauer, Poullain’s biographer, refers to him as “the spiritual son of Bucer and Calvin”. In a personal letter to Calvin, May 1544, Poullain wrote, “You will always find me a son: I pray you [Calvin] to be a father to me [Poullain].”14

Another evidence of his high esteem for Calvin was his request for Calvin to send pamphlets to the Netherlands on the subject of separating from “Papists”.15 By such action, Poullain was aiding in the Calvinian Reformation of the Netherlands while reflecting his own roots and affinities. Poullain possessed a detailed knowledge of Calvin’s *Institutes*. He compiled the first complete scriptural index for the aid of students, supplied the different section headings, corrected the printer’s errors and produced an early subject index. Subsequent editions of the *Institutes* contain these addenda, and we know that Poullain sent one such revision to Calvin. Bauer concluded that Calvin availed himself of this work. In Poullain’s *Professio Fidei Catholicae* for the Glastonbury and Frankfort congregations, the division of the confession into four articles reflects a reliance on the reading of the *Institutes*. Shortly after Poullain’s death (1557), Calvin included one of Poullain’s intercessory prayers in the Geneva liturgy. We also know that Poullain had a high regard for Calvin’s Commentaries and urged him to write more.16

Poullain was not subtle with Calvin concerning Calvin’s need to press on with writing biblical commentaries: “You are letting the devil divert you to other tasks when you should be

---


13 Gordon, “The Liturgia Sacra and Professio Fidei Catholicae” vii-ix, ii; Cowell, “16th Century French-speaking and English-speaking Refugee Churches” 75. [George M. Ella’s *The Troublemakers at Frankfurt: A Vindication of the English Reformation* (Durham: GO, 2003) arrived as this paper was going to press, and I have not been able to digest its contents. However, I do note here his synopsis in English of “The Frankfurt Liturgia Sacra” (1554) 227-343.]


writing commentaries.”

Following the gap of several years from the Romans commentary, 1540, commentaries did start to appear with 1 Corinthians in 1546, after which transcribing lectures allowed for “a steady flow of new commentaries.”

Poullain also urged Calvin to write against the Libertines. Both Valérand Poullain and Guillaume Farel wrote letters to Calvin to this effect, May 26, 1544, and October 2, 1544. Their solicitations appear to have worked because in 1545 Calvin’s treatise was published against the Libertines. Today, nineteen letters from Poullain to Calvin have survived. Poullain’s role was that of a stimulant to encourage Calvin to carry on the call for reform and training. Beside his exhortation to write commentaries and challenge the Libertines, Poullain also helped to see that Calvin’s polemic against the Nicodemites was read in the Netherlands and played a role in Calvin writing against the Anabaptists.

Poullain clearly held Calvin in highest regard and was greatly influenced by Calvin theologically and liturgically. Yet a tension did exist between the two men, particularly on the part of Calvin. Writing in a letter to the French exiles at Frankfort in 1555, Calvin supported Poullain and urged the church to do the same. However, Calvin did not always speak highly of Poullain. The whole incident which led to the tension between the two men concerned the “troubles of Frankfort”. Poullain pastored the French Church there, and in 1556 it became divided in part over the locational/cultural backgrounds of the people and perhaps also over Poullain’s ministerial manner. John T. McNeill describes it in no minced language: “Its injudicious minister, Valérand Poullain, was soon in trouble . . .”

Poullain had had some “run-ins” previously with Calvin, his esteemed mentor. The first seems to have been in regard to Poullain’s proposed marriage to a relative of Jacobos Falesius in 1547, about which Poullain received a letter of admonition from Calvin. The next was over the legitimacy of Poullain’s call by the people at the French refugee congregation in Frankfort.

---


19 de Greef, The Writings of John Calvin 169.


22 It appears that Calvin in the end remained silent about Poullain’s resignation as the pastor of the French congregation in Frankfort. Poullain resigned and a new pastor was appointed. Andrew Spicer summarized the remaining months of Poullain’s life in this way: “This caused a rift in the former’s [Poullain’s] friendship with Calvin which remained unresolved at the time of Poullain’s death.” Andrew Spicer, “Poullain, Valérand”, in Oxford DNB 45:48.


25 Kenneth Austin, From Judaism to Calvinism: The Life and Writings of Immanuel Tremellius (c. 1510-1580), St Andrews Studies in Reformation History (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2007) 55.
Things had become complicated when more refugees arrived. The original 1554 group were London French exiles, followed by Walloons (Flemish) from Glastonbury and French exiles from France. Since these newcomers had never voted Poullain into office, tensions were created over the legitimacy of his call. A committee was appointed to sort out this matter, of which Calvin was one member. It was decided that, as Poullain was not at fault, he should remain as pastor. The next year another dispute arose over the installation of new deacons. This resulted in Poullain’s resignation, followed shortly thereafter by his death. A new pastor was elected, François Pérussel, formerly a French exiled pastor in Canterbury. Pérussel had also experienced problems in Wesel, from where he had been expelled. This matter of tensions in the French refugee church did not end with new elections for pastoral staff. In 1559, Calvin was again writing to this church, this time over the quarreling which was going on between the two ministers, Guillaume Houbracque and François Pérussel. It thus appears questionable that the blame can completely be leveled against Poullain for the troubles in the French congregation in Frankfort.

Part 2: Poullain – Scottish Contacts

John Willock

There are three Scots who can be singled out as having connections to Poullain. The first of these, John Willock, is less conclusive by way of evidential correspondence yet still cannot be ignored because of the numerous common relationships and shared theological affinities which existed between Willock and Poullain.

John Willock, one of the compilers of The First Book of Discipline and the Scots Confession, ministered in England during Edward VI’s reign. During this time, Valérand Poullain was also ministering in England as superintendent of the French-Walloon Church at Glastonbury, 1551-1553. In 1551, Poullain published a Latin edition of his Liturgia Sacra in London and included a dedication in it to Edward VI. One can only speculate, but since Willock was often in London, he possibly could have heard of Poullain’s published liturgy or even have seen it.

Both Willock and Poullain were associated with some of the influential nobility in England between 1550 and 1553. Poullain’s Walloon congregation was settled on the Duke of Somerset’s land of the former Glastonbury Abbey. The congregation received generous privileges to worship and to order the discipline of their church as they desired. They received

---

29 Duncan Shaw, “Willock, John”, in Oxford DNB, 59:403-405. The relationship between Willock and John à Lasco has been explored often but that of Willock and Poullain very little.

---
much the same freedoms which the London Strangers’ Churches enjoyed. Thus, they had a Reformed church with elders, deacons, plain worship and a vigorous discipline.\(^{31}\)

The Strangers’ Church became a model for some of the leaders of the Reformation in England. We recall that Willock was a chaplain to the Duke of Suffolk and a preacher licensed to preach freely throughout England. It is reasonable to conclude then that such an individual would have at least heard of Poullain’s church at Glastonbury and its connection with the Duke of Somerset.\(^{32}\)

There is no conclusive evidence to show that Poullain and Willock met or corresponded during Edward VI’s reign. However, Poullain’s church was notable as exemplifying a Reformed church in England. It very much paralleled the London Strangers’ Church. As MacGregor writes, it seems reasonable to think that somehow Willock knew of this work.\(^{33}\) It is interesting to note that Poullain was the superintendent of the Glastonbury church, like à Lasco in London. Perhaps such knowledge of these two examples of the office of superintendent encouraged Willock to seek this interpolation in the Book of Discipline’s revised version.

**John Knox**

Turning to John Knox,\(^{34}\) we can find more concrete evidence of a direct relationship with Valérand Poullain. Knox’s first introduction to Poullain’s work may possibly have been during the time they were both in England, 1550-1553.

Knox, as one of Edward’s chaplains and as a preacher licensed to preach freely, was in a position to learn of the model Reformed communities of the realm. Likewise, Poullain’s unusual freedom to establish a clearly Reformed church under Somerset’s permission could not have remained unknown. This is especially true in light of the economic interest the English had in such a community as that at Glastonbury.\(^{35}\)

Poullain travelled several times to London and pleaded with the Lords of the Council concerning the perilous financial situation of his congregation.\(^{36}\) Such endeavours must surely have heightened the awareness among Protestant leaders in England of this Glastonbury congregation.

Richard Greaves, commenting on Knox’s period in England, draws attention to the fact that by 1553 Knox clearly saw the importance of discipline. Greaves points to Knox’s appearance before the Privy Council in April 1553, where he criticized the English church because its ministers did not exercise discipline. Greaves goes on to say that Knox could have


\[^{32}\text{Kirkwood Hewat, Makers of the Scottish Church at the Reformation (Edinburgh: MacNivan and Wallace, 1920) 132-133.}\]

\[^{33}\text{Janet MacGregor, The Scottish Presbyterian Polity (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1926) 34.}\]

\[^{34}\text{Jane E. A. Dawson, “Knox, John”, in Oxford DNB, 32:15-30. Dawson’s article is most helpful as an overview on Knox.}\]

\[^{35}\text{Gwynn, Huguenot Heritage 42-43. Gwynn draws our attention to the fact that the Glastonbury refugees had to teach their weaving skills to the English and overall benefit the English economy. In return the Privy Council would provide support, but it seems that this was not always forthcoming.}\]

\[^{36}\text{Cowell, “French-Walloon Church at Glastonbury, 1550-1553” 486-489; Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials II, i, 381-382.}\]
been influenced by à Lasco’s foreign church in London or Poullain’s in Glastonbury as both exercised a vigorous discipline.  

More substantial evidence of Knox’s relationship with Poullain comes from the time when the two men ministered in Frankfort. With Mary’s accession to the throne, the Glastonbury refugees left for Germany and finally settled in Frankfort in March 1554 with Poullain as their pastor. This French refugee congregation received basically the same privileges there which they had enjoyed while at Glastonbury. They were granted liberty by the town council to hold their own worship services in French according to Poullain’s liturgy. They were also allowed to exercise a zealous discipline. The same Confession of Faith used in Glastonbury was likewise used here. The council gave the French the use of the Weissfrauenkirke for their worship services.  

Shortly after this, English (and we might add Scottish) Marian exiles came to Frankfort. With Poullain’s aid, they were allowed to stay and practise their faith provided it conformed to the manner of the French Refugee Church in doctrine, liturgy and discipline. Thus, the English Refugee Church of Frankfort subscribed to Poullain’s liturgy and confession in July of 1554. Remember, much of Poullain’s work was really derived from Calvin’s Strasbourg liturgy, which in turn owed much to Bucer.  

Once this English congregation had accepted the French liturgy and confession, a pastor was summoned – John Knox, then a resident of Geneva. Knox began his work in November 1554 at Frankfort as pastor to the English refugees. Thus, he was working alongside Poullain, the pastor of the French refugees. Quickly division arose in the English congregation with two factions, one wanting the second Book of Common Prayer to be used, the other desiring a more Reformed liturgy in keeping with Geneva and other Reformed centres. Hence, the latter faction depended upon Poullain’s liturgy. Because of this division, Knox was forced to leave Frankfort.  

---

37 Greaves, *Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation* 55, 219. Knox would also have likely read Book 4 of Calvin’s *Institutes* by this time. If so, this would have provided him with a thorough grounding in the theory of Reformed discipline. À Lasco’s churches in London and Poullain’s at Glastonbury would have provided more than the theory, as the practical outworking of the theory could have been seen in these by Knox.  


39 Cowell, “Sixteenth Century French-speaking and English-speaking Refugee Churches at Frankfort” 74-75; Reid, *Trumpeter of God* 120-121. For those of the English strangers who signed it on behalf of the English church at Frankfort, see Gordon, “Liturgia Sacra and Professio Fidei Catholicae” viii-ix, 163. See also G. J. Van der Poll, *Martin Bucer’s Liturgical Ideas* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954) 34, 40, 66, 107, 109-110, 117, 124. Van der Poll concludes that Bucer’s Strasbourg liturgy was transmitted chiefly by the “many emigrant churches”; thus, “in this manner the reformed heritage of Strasbourg was scattered over an extensive area, so that when, through the Interim of 1549, Strasbourg was temporarily eliminated as a centre, other centres preserved and passed (on) this heritage, viz.: Zürich, Emden, Geneva, Frankfort, Frankenthal, Heidelberg, and Wesel”, 169. London and Glastonbury could also be included in this list.  

for Geneva in March 1555. In the ensuing months, other supporters of the Reformed order left Frankfort for Geneva.\textsuperscript{41}

Knox’s sojourn in Frankfort allowed him ample opportunity to acquaint himself with Poullain and his church order and discipline. The English church leaders would have been well acquainted with Poullain’s order, as it was the basis for the English being able to stay in Frankfort. In Knox’s \textit{Works}, we find several references to Poullain and the relationship which existed between them. Poullain’s house was the meeting place for the leaders of the English church, including Knox, to attempt to reconcile the two factions in that church. Also, in Knox’s “A Narrative of the Troubles at Frankfort”, he makes reference to the fact that he “laboured with Mr. Valeranus Polanus, a minister of the French Church”.\textsuperscript{42} These are clear indications of the relationship between the two men. The fact alone that Poullain’s liturgy and confession were published in September 1554 in Frankfort and were agreed upon by the English congregation is proof enough that Knox, when he arrived that November, would have familiarized himself with this document. The logical conclusion is that the connection between Poullain and Knox was very real and that Knox came under Poullain’s influence in regard to church order and discipline.

It is also significant that this Frankfort division is often seen as one of the critical factors in the development of a stricter Puritan approach to worship. Poullain’s sympathies were obvious, as were Knox’s – the two men were in agreement. The Frankfort division was certainly a move away from \textit{The Book of Common Prayer} to a Strasbourg, Geneva, Glastonbury or Frankfort French Reformed liturgy and ecclesiastical polity, discipline and confession of faith.

\textit{John MacBriar}

We now come to the third Scottish John connected in some way with Valérand Poullain, John MacBriar. He has remained somewhat of an unknown Scot. His name itself has in part led to confusion and false deductions.\textsuperscript{43} It has been spelled MacBriar, MackBrair, Mackbray, Makebray and Makebraie.\textsuperscript{44}

Who exactly was this John MacBriar? He was born in Galloway and studied at St. Salvator’s College, St. Andrews, in 1530. (Whether he met John Knox at St. Andrews during his student days there is uncertain.) He was ordained as a priest and is known to have once been a Cistercian monk at Glenluce (Newton Stewart area). His conversion may have been due to contact with the Lollards of Kyle (Ayrshire). Eventually MacBriar was imprisoned for “sundry

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{42} Laing, Knox’s Works, “A Narrative of the Troubles at Frankfort” 4:34, 42, 46. See also Spitz, Protestant Reformation, 206-207.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Foxe’s Martyrs in some editions incorrectly names him as John MacAlpine, the Scot who went to Copenhagen. John Foxe, Book of Martyrs. www.hrionline.ac.uk/johnfoxe/apparatus/11commentary.html (accessed September 8, 2009), I want to express my appreciation to a good friend Rev. Douglas Gebbie for allowing me to have conversations about unraveling the mysterious John MacBriar and the contents of this paper in general. Both of us hope in any revisions to the Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology, org. ed. Nigel M. de S. Cameron (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), that MacBriar will receive an entry. (Hereafter DSCHT.)
\end{itemize}
great and odious crimes, Heresies etc.”; that is, he became a Protestant. He was helped to escape the Hamilton castle jail in 1550 and fled to England.\textsuperscript{45} This was under King Edward VI’s reign, when we encounter several Scottish Protestants with the first name “John” ministering in England – John Knox, John Willock, John MacDowell, John MacAlpine, John Rough and John MacBriar.\textsuperscript{46} MacBriar was the minister of St. Leonard’s, Shoreditch (now in London).\textsuperscript{47} Thus, MacBriar was part of that significant Scottish refugee contingent of whom it was said “the [English] Protestant cause benefited substantially. . . .”\textsuperscript{48} Upon Mary’s accession to the throne following Edward’s death, many of the Scottish refugees to England joined the English Marian exiles and went to the continent. MacBriar went to Frankfort and must have arrived in the earliest contingent of refugees in 1554. This is significant, as we will see momentarily.

MacBriar either came with Valérand Poullain or within a few weeks of Poullain’s coming. Poullain arrived in Frankfort in March 1554, and quickly went about securing a church from the city magistrates (all Lutherans) for services. The White Ladies’ Church was granted to Poullain’s French congregation with its Reformed confession, discipline and liturgy. Whose name appears as the first one to subscribe to the French Reformed formulary on 19 July, 1554? – John MacBriar, as Minister of the English Exiles, minister pro tempore. Other exiles were to come; and in the coming months, the “troubles of Frankfort” would begin. These troubles were basically over the extent of the purification of worship practices.

Where did MacBriar stand in these worship wars of Frankfort? He subscribed to both William Whittingham’s invitation to the other continental English colonies to come to Frankfort, and he also signed the “call” for John Knox to come to Frankfort to become pastor of the English exiles, using Poullain’s formulary translated to English. MacBriar remained after Knox and several others left for Geneva. Why did he remain and does this mean he had “switched sides”? Christina Garrett wrote, “Mackbray would seem not to have been of Knox’s party, for he remained in Frankfort after the secession of September 1555 . . . .”\textsuperscript{49} The reality is that not all sympathizers went to Geneva either immediately or ever. Some remained in Frankfort or left for other cities of refuge, particularly in Lower Germany.\textsuperscript{50}

We next find MacBriar serving as the pastor of a congregation (presumably of exiles) in “Lower Germany”. MacBriar evidently wrote an account of this pastorate, according to David

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{45} Garrett, Marian Exiles, 223; and James Kirk, Patterns of Reform (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989) 98, 507. John Durkan writes that MacBriar took refuge amongst the Lollards of Kyle prior to going to England. See John Durkan, “Heresy in Scotland; the second phase, 1546-58”, Records of the Scottish Church History Society 24 (1992): 328. I am indebted to Dr. Ian Hazlett for drawing this article to my attention.  


\textsuperscript{47} Recall the children’s nursery rhyme, “Oranges and Lemons . . .”; “When I grow rich, say the bells of Shoreditch”.  

\textsuperscript{48} Henry Cowan, John Knox: The Hero of the Scottish Reformation (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1905) 93.  

\textsuperscript{49} Garrett, Marian Exiles 223-224.  

\textsuperscript{50} Garrett, Marian Exiles 243, on William Kethe as one such example who did not immediately proceed to Geneva. Once he did, he was there only briefly before going to Wesel, then Aarau, then Strasbourg and returning to Geneva before England.}
Buchanan, writer of the appendices in Laing’s edited edition of Knox’s Works. When Elizabeth became queen, MacBriar, like so many of the exiles, left the continent and was found to be preaching at Paul’s Cross (a cross where John Willock also preached). Then in 1568, MacBriar became a vicar of St. Nicholas in Newcastle. St. Nicholas was the church Knox preached in when he moved to Newcastle in 1551. Unlike Knox and Willock, there is no evidence that he ever returned to Scotland. MacBriar died in 1585.

To date I have not found conclusive evidence that MacBriar abandoned Poullain’s Calvinian formulary any more than did Knox or others. I find Christina Garrett’s supposition unconvincing. The reality is that after Elizabeth’s accession many Scots and English exiles managed for years to keep “under the radar” and practise a more Puritan Calvinian theological face in a period of complexity of definition and practice. For instance, John Willock was moderator of the General Assembly in Scotland yet died serving in an English parish.

Part 3: Poullain’s Work and Scottish Reform Documents: A Comparison

In exploring the possible influence of Poullain’s work upon Scottish Reformation documents, I will confine my comments initially to a comparison of Poullain’s Liturgia Sacra and the Scottish First Book of Discipline.

The Election of Ministers

MacGregor, in her monumental work on early Scottish Presbyterian polity, draws attention to the similarity between the election of ministers as stated in The First Book of Discipline and Poullain’s Liturgia Sacra. At first glance, the election of a minister would appear to be more a topic of polity. However, for the sixteenth century Reformers, the election of a minister was very much a matter of discipline. In the fourth head of The First Book of Discipline, several paragraphs are devoted to the election of a minister. Those to be elected to the ministry were to be properly examined since correct doctrine and purity of morality were the goals in the Reformed church. This examination was to be undertaken by the “Ministers and Elders of the Church”, who would examine the candidate’s doctrine and ability. In Poullain’s Liturgia Sacra, we find this same concern expressed where Poullain wrote: “Therefore on a day appointed he is examined by the Ministers and Elders of the Church, as to whether he be

51 Laing, Knox’s Works 1:530. David Buchanan’s appendix was added to Knox’s History in the London edition of 1644. Here Buchanan or Laing make reference to MacBriar’s pastorate in Lower Germany. Spottiswood states that MacBriar never returned to England. This universally appears to be an error, as he did return to England. Buchanan appears to be using John Bale, a Marian exile, as his source for MacBriar leaving Frankfort and pastoring somewhere in “Lower Germany”. John Bale, Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Brytanniae, posterior pars (Basle, 1559) 229, as footnoted in Durkan, “Heresy in Scotland”, 329.


53 MacGregor, Scottish Presbyterian Polity 38. See also Greaves, Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation 220. Greaves likewise believes the selection of ministers in the Scottish church is based upon the procedure of Poullain.

endowed with the gifts that become a Minister.”

Poullain’s comments are brief in his liturgy, unlike the Book of Discipline, which elaborates more fully on the examination questions.

Both the Liturgia Sacra and the Scot’s Book of Discipline state that the congregation had a voting right in the election of a minister. Again, the Book of Discipline goes into more detail in this area. It states that a congregation could lose this privilege if it failed to take action of some sort within forty days, at which time the superintendent and his council could present a candidate. Poullain’s Liturgia Sacra maintains this same congregational right. The reason for such an emphasis was to prevent possible abuses concerning the appointment of clergy, similar to what had occurred in the medieval church. Such a congregational right was viewed as a matter of church discipline and was the theological outworking of the priesthood of believers.

Hence, there is basic agreement between Poullain’s Liturgia Sacra and The First Book of Discipline concerning the appointment of ministers. Both documents exhibit a marked emphasis on the exercise of discipline in the election of a minister, whether it be by the examining body of ministers and elders or the vote of the congregation. However, due to the minimal discussion Poullain has given to the office of the minister in Liturgia Sacra, limitations in our comparison are inevitable. Likewise, The First Book of Discipline has been viewed as being written in general terms regarding this matter, unlike the Book of Common Order. Yet this does not detract from the basic similarities we find; rather, it makes it more convincing to think that Knox or Willock (especially Knox) may have also been influenced by Poullain as to the appointment of ministers and discipline in the establishing of a Reformed church. This does not mean that Poullain would have been the only influence in this matter. However, Poullain must be acknowledged as a possible source for Knox given the relationship which existed between these two men. Another way of seeing it is that Poullain was an additional confirming voice of the way Reformed churches were to be.

**Elders**

As we come to the election of elders, it is significant to note that the first statements made in the Scottish Book of Discipline and Poullain’s Liturgia Sacra concern the high level of Christian knowledge and lifestyle expected of men chosen for this office. The Book of Discipline reads, “Men of best knowledge in Gods word and cleanest life . . .”; and in the Liturgia Sacra we find, “The elders are the most outstanding men of the whole Church . . .”. The stress in both texts reveals a striving for holiness and purity of doctrine in the church to be undertaken in all areas by means of discipline.

The First Book of Discipline is very explicit regarding the responsibilities of elders. The elders were:

---

55 Gordon, “Liturgia Sacra and Professio Fidei Catholicae” 94.
56 First Book of Discipline 97-98, 100, 104.
57 First Book of Discipline 96.
59 Greaves, Theology and Revolution in the Scottish Reformation 76.
60 MacGregor, Scottish Presbyterian Polity 37.
61 First Book of Discipline 174; Gordon, “Liturgia Sacra and Professio Fidei Catholicae” 96.
...to assist the ministers in all publike affaires of the kirk, to wit, in determining and judging causes, in giving admonition to the licentious liver, in having respect to the manners and conversation of al men within their charge. . . .

The Seniors [elders] ought to take heed to the like manners, diligence and study of their ministers. If he be worthy of admonition, they must admonish him; of correction, they must correct him . . . .

In his *Liturgia Sacra*, Poullain only offers a brief statement as to the elders’ duties: “They are joined with the Ministers in administration, to judge all causes and rule over all matters that belong to the government of the Church.”

In his 1554 liturgy, Poullain does not specifically state that the elders are to watch over the discipline of ministers, as *The First Book of Discipline* clearly states. However, the general statement quoted above from the *Liturgia* does not rule out such a practice. This information must be placed alongside the fact that ministers and elders together examined prospective ministers on their doctrine and lifestyle. Thus, it is not hard to imagine that Poullain’s elders carried out a disciplinary function over ministers. Other common emphases between the two documents concerning the elders’ other functions are that elders were to assist the ministers in the ruling of the church and to exercise discipline.

Poullain’s *Liturgia Sacra* and *The First Book of Discipline* show similarities concerning the eldership. Knox and Willock may have been exposed to Poullain’s elders in England, and Knox most definitely was in Frankfort. Thus, Poullain must not be ignored as one of the influences in this regard. However, it is important to stress again that he was not the sole influence, as it was such a common emphasis amongst the various Reformed communities.

**Discipline Proper**

Our final area of comparison is discipline proper, or ecclesiastical discipline. Both documents lay heavy stress upon the necessity for discipline. In his *Liturgia*, Poullain compares discipline to breathing, without which death will ensue. The *Book of Discipline* compares it to the laws of the commonwealth, without which the commonwealth will not endure. Whereas the *Book of Discipline* enters into a fuller discussion concerning ecclesiastical discipline, the *Liturgia* keeps to the general procedures involved.

The *Liturgia* states first of all that discipline begins as a private act of admonition. Likewise, *The First Book of Discipline* states that “if the offence be secret or known to a few men and rather stands in suspicion then in manifest probation, the offender ought to be privately admonished . . . .” Poullain wrote that if this first private admonition was ineffectual, the
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offender was to be admonished “in the presence of the witnesses”, then before “the council of the Elders”. Poullain does not define for us who the witnesses were to be nor the exact composition of this “council of Elders”. Possibly the witnesses could have been the two elders nominated to settle disputes and minor affairs; and if these elders could not settle such, then they would have to refer the case to the “Elders”. In all likelihood, this body of “Elders” consisted of the minister and elders. Poullain went on to write that if the offender would not hear the elders, then “the Pastor discloseth the charge and the man to the Church, in order that even by this means he may be brought to a sense of shame”. If this did not work, then excommunication was inevitable.

In The First Book of Discipline, the procedure outlined following the failure of the private admonition is basically the same as that Poullain advocated in his Liturgia. The exception is that no recourse was made to witnesses before being taken to the “Ministry”. However, the key common factor to be noted between these two documents is the seriousness of discipline and the common attempt to seek repentance before discipline came to the necessity of excommunication.

Poullain does not state that excommunication would be carried out by the whole congregation. However, due to the vagueness of his Liturgia and the fact that the church had to be summoned to readmit an excommunicated person upon signs of repentance, we can assume that excommunication was a matter for the whole church. Likewise, we find this same emphasis in The First Book of Discipline, which states that the penitent excommunicant had to “appeare in presence of the whole Kirk . . . Desiring God of his mercy and grace and his Congregation, that it would please them to receive him in their society . . . ”. Both documents also state that when someone was excommunicated certain restrictions were to be placed upon that person. Poullain simply wrote that such a person was to be “ordered to withdraw from the Church. He was never excluded from public Sermons”, but he was denied the sacraments. The First Book of Discipline once again provides more details as to the nature of the excommunicant’s sentence. The Book agrees with what Poullain wrote, and it allows for the excommunicant to hear the preaching of the Word.

One matter which Poullain briefly mentions under discipline is that no one could receive the sacraments or be married in the church unless they had made public profession of faith.
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First Book of Discipline does not explicitly make such a statement, but there may be hints to this effect.77 We can conclude that there is at least basic agreement between these two documents concerning the need for ecclesiastical discipline and its practice.

Other

Before concluding this paper, mention must be made of one other documentary parallel. Poullain’s Confession of the Catholic Faith has not received adequate attention. It is not found in Cochrane’s Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century78 but is in the major collection recently published in Germany, Reformierte Bekenntnisschriften (2007),79 and in North America, Reformed Confessions of the 16th and 17th Centuries in English Translation (2008).80 A major documentary study of the Scots Confession needs to be conducted to compare it to Poullain’s Confession of the Catholic Faith. I will content myself with a momentary glance at the marks of the Church. Poullain’s Confession lists four and the Scots Confession three.81 However, math alone does not necessitate a clear matter of difference. Poullain’s marks parallel the three of the Scots, while his distinctive one (his second) is basically a formulation of what often came to be called the Puritan regulative principle. Is this all that distinctive? Not really; in placement, yes, but in statement, no. It actually enters into the very essence of the Frankfort debate on worship that followed the arrival of the new English exiles, and this principle runs throughout the Scots Confession and the Book of Common Order.82 W. I. P. Hazlett challenges the perception that the Scots Confession is almost exclusively influenced by Calvin’s Institutes.83 Poullain is another fiber to be very seriously considered.

Summary and Conclusion

This brief study, which has chiefly highlighted the influence of Poullain upon The First Book of Discipline, has served to feature two themes. First of all, we have noted the connection between Poullain, Willock and Knox. Though Poullain was one of the lesser known Reformers, we can see again the interdependence of the Reformed movement. We can begin to understand something of the complexity of this movement as we uncover the personal involvement these men had with each other. Particularly in the case of Knox, we have seen how his time spent in Frankfort would have provided a unique opportunity for him to observe Poullain’s practice in church discipline. The fact that correspondence between Willock and Poullain has not been found in no way discounts a relationship of influence from Poullain upon Willock.
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Secondly, by examining three related aspects of the *Liturgia Sacra* and *The First Book of Discipline*, we are struck not only by their basic agreement but more fundamentally by the importance discipline had for these Reformers. Such areas as the election of ministers and elders may seem somewhat removed from the topic of church discipline but not in its *classical understanding*. We have noted how both Poullain’s *Liturgia* and *The First Book of Discipline* see such matters as critically linked to discipline. Discipline for Calvinian Reformers was all encompassing and permeated every area of church life, including the election of ministers and elders, matters that in more recent generations are viewed as polity.

Thus, Poullain served as yet another model for the Scottish Reformers to draw upon. The personal connections and basic agreement in matters of discipline not only suggest Poullain’s influence but also enhance our underlying thesis that the Reformed movement was diverse, pervasive and often spread by the example of one Reformer to another. We have seen how Poullain influenced Knox and also perhaps fulfilled a confirming role for Willock.

This paper has only looked at parallels in the doctrine of ecclesiology between Poullain’s *Confession of the Catholic Faith* and the Scots *Confession*. The parallels are there, and while not exact, they are close enough to demonstrate clear harmony. What needs to be done now is a full-scale comparative study of Poullain’s *Confession of the Catholic Faith* with the Scots *Confession*. I am not aware of such a study having yet been undertaken.

Maxwell’s work *The Liturgical Portions of the Genevan Service Book* was very significant at the time and still remains invaluable. Yet the time has come for another major parallel study of Poullain’s *Liturgia Sacra* and the Scottish *Book of Common Order*. This, I believe, will continue to reveal that the Calvinian movement of the sixteenth century was truly international, containing many continental fibers.

In addition, the relationship of Poullain and MacBriar must not be ignored. The Scottish diaspora to England and the continent has often neglected Scots beyond Knox. This needs to be readdressed. It may also help us to see the definition of Puritan in the 1550s to 1560s in a fuller light. Many were Puritan but non-separatistic Puritan. “Puritan” did not necessarily mean a strict “divine right” Presbyterian polity of a latter stage. We need to be careful in using the term “Puritan” when discussing the 1550s and 1560s and not impose popular definitions back into this time-frame.

Song is something else which has often been poorly addressed. A major study of what was sung and the tunes employed, whether it be in Glastonbury, Frankfort, Geneva, or Scotland, needs to be undertaken.

Finally, there is the matter of personality. I am not convinced by the evidence to date that John T. MacNeill was fair in his treatment of Poullain. MacBriar may actually hold one key to some of this personality issue and Calvin the other key. We may need to be prepared to think more critically, even in this year of anniversaries, when there is a tendency to praise the famous and noteworthy without question. This should not keep us as historians from recognizing feet of clay. The situation in Frankfort with its Scottish, English and French exiled communities, along with its external advisors, was highly complex, and historians have yet to write it all. For those involved in contemporary church life, worship wars, personality struggles and cultural tensions, the reading of this history may bring humility and perspective.