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INTRODUCTION

This study covers ground well-travelled by accomplished, and sometimes eminent, historians. My hope is that I may have asked a new question of familiar sources. But I am conscious of how much my answer owes, not merely to recent works on some of the figures mentioned in these pages and on the various aspects of the Elizabethan Settlement, but also to the efforts of older historians for whom my admiration has steadily mounted over these past few years. Preceded by scholars of the calibre of Matiland, Neale and Pollen (to mention but a few), and the exhaustive inquiries of today's specialists, one even wonders whether worthwhile questions are left to be posed about the happenings of the first few years of Elizabeth's reign.

My query has to do with a particular mode of argument. The phrase, 'the making of the Elizabethan Settlement', is meant to be sufficiently broad to encompass the statements of those who used this argument - mainly in public debate - not merely when the terms of the 1559 religious legislation were in the process of being formulated, but also in the first years of the Settlement's implementation. The common denominator in the items considered is that, roughly speaking, they all represent initial reactions to the first parliament's enactments. There is the official justification, incorporated into the statutes themselves and other documents connected with the Settlement; the reaction of the Marian ecclesiastics to the new legislation;
the defence of it that was offered by the reform divines who supported Elizabeth; and finally, the first published assessments of the papist theologians, which only came after they had established themselves, with some kind of stability, in the Low Countries. In every case, whether it be to justify the Settlement or to condemn it, the appeal to antiquity features prominently. I have attempted to ask why; and also to see how the argument is handled, and to what effect, by the various parties.

The outcome I must leave to the reader to weigh. As to originality, I believe the study throws some light, however obliquely, on the conservatism of Elizabethans. Their concern for pedigree, precedent, and antiquity of origins, deserves more attention than it has received from scholars habituated to the notions of the inevitability and value of change. Moreover, surveying the history of the period from the point of view I have adopted, I have found myself disagreeing with some of the standard assessments of Elizabeth, the Settlement itself, and Bishop Jewel; I think I may have said something new about the Marian bishops; and certainly, I have broken a measure of fresh ground by at least beginning to discuss the theological positions of the papist exiles.¹ Most of all, I would hope to have contributed a little to the understanding of English reformation

debates, firstly by pointing to the historical factors which influenced the use of what seemed to be a purely theological argument; and secondly, by tracing the course of the English divines' appeals to the primitive church.

I know of no monograph that deals expressly with the question I have raised. The standard model for studies of this kind is still the work of the late Fr. Polman,¹ and to it (kindly made available to me by Dr. T. M. Veech, for a very extended period) I am deeply indebted. Polman's approach is synoptic, his treatment of the English controversialists is cursory and the conclusions he reaches about them leave a lot to be desired. However, I have adopted the same view-point as he, interesting myself in attempts to evaluate Elizabeth's religious legislation, not in terms of the Scriptures solely, but in terms of its conformity with the teaching and practice of Christian antiquity - the Church of the early Fathers and Doctors. Once again, I have used a wide term to identify this interest: 'appeals to antiquity'. I mean, of course, 'Christian antiquity', as exemplified principally in the writings of the Fathers. I prefer the more generic title because it also applies to claims - like those made by Elizabeth herself - that were not always overtly theological.

¹ P. Polman, L'Élément Historique dans la Controverse religieuse du XVIe Siècle (Gembloux, 1932).
Although my concern has been with appeals to the Fathers, I have not attempted to verify the patristic citations used by the various controversialists. That is, I have not asked whether the interpretation they wished to place on a particular writer's words was the correct one; or even whether the passage used was authentic. This, no doubt, is a defect in the study; but it is an unavoidable one, and I can make no apology for it. To assess the scholarship of these divines, it would be necessary - as Professor Greenslade has reminded us\(^1\) - to have in one's hands the patristic source-books that were available to them at the time. Given the dearth of information about contemporary texts, and the inaccessibility of any of them to me personally, it has seemed preferable not to enter into this question at all. A solid precedent for my apparent neglect is to be found in Fraenkel's recent work on Melanchthon's use of the patristic argument: it too sets aside questions of textual interpretation.\(^2\)

There are other, more reprehensible, lacunae in this study, some at least stemming from its very place of origin. Much of my primary source-material has been on microfilm: the Ann Arbor collection of English books printed before 1640; some made available to me, most graciously, by Fr. M. O'Connell; and the rest privately gathered, with only

---

slender funds. Some sixteenth-century works were permanently entrusted to my care by Dr. C. Tierney, the librarian of St. Patrick's College, Manly, and Professor G. Russell. To them I am most grateful. But a few serious gaps have remained, and, with one exception, these are noted in the body of the text. The exception is the Dialogi Sex of Nicholas Harpsfield, which I have not been able to acquire. Yet, if I were to find myself in the British Museum or the Vatican Library, it is the first work I would want to see, for I feel it could usefully amplify (though not, I think, alter) the argument of this study.

I have given dates according to the new style; have modernised the spelling of texts, while trying, as far as possible, to retain the punctuation of the original; and have used terms such as 'Papist', 'Gospeller', 'Roman Catholic', 'Catholic' (sometimes even 'Anglican') in ways that I hope will be both clear and inoffensive to all. With C. S. Lewis, I can only say that I have treated each 'as a mere label, intending no petitio'.

Finally, if I mention that behind this work stand the tolerant figures of Professor C. M. Williams and Professor G. H. Russell, it is to honour them, not bind them to its conclusions. I have learnt from them both far more than I have been able to say here.

Chapter One

ROYAL CONSERVATISM: ELIZABETH

'... ut et princeps sua desideria consequatur, nec tamen defectio ulla, vel schisma, in religione appareat ...'

(Thomas Cromwell)
firm in this instance. Summarily stated, it was Elizabeth's own ancestry that drew the questions of religion and succession together, coaxing (if not impelling) the new monarch in the direction of an independent religious settlement, just as Mary Tudor's lineage had turned her towards Rome.

F. W. Maitland has warned us against thinking of Elizabeth's break with the Papacy as 'an inevitable concession to an irresistible demand'. Such a caution is worth heeding. Was Elizabeth ever the mere victim of circumstances? Moreover, and this is Maitland's point, conditions in 1558 hardly favoured an immediate revival of the Royal Supremacy and a return to Edwardian Protestantism. There were weighty practical difficulties in store for the queen no matter what course of action she might choose to adopt. But at the time, the greatest danger probably lay in repealing Mary's religious legislation. Such a step could well provoke foreign interference, providing France and Spain with an excuse to intervene in English affairs and directly threaten the succession, all in the name of piety. On the other hand, perilous though it might have been for the domestic peace of the Kingdom, Elizabeth, 'jeune de face et vieille de prudence' (as Ronsard so aptly described her), may well have managed to

maintain the religious status quo had she thought it expedient to do so. However, there is no strong reason to believe that this latter was ever anything more than a theoretical possibility as far as the new monarch was concerned. And in retrospect at any rate, it is difficult not to think of the ultimate break with Rome as 'inevitable', while granting that Elizabeth need not necessarily have signalled her intentions as suddenly, or even as openly, as she did.

Whatever dangers it created, change was virtually inescapable if the queen was to insist on her own right to rule without challenge, and not have her sovereignty compromised in practice. According to church-law she was illegitimate. Had she opted to remain loyal to the Holy See, she would have been forced to sue for the Pope's approval in order to be recognised as England's lawful monarch.¹ This was compromising in itself. And it was also hazardous, given the presence of a French-sponsored contender for the throne in the person of Mary, Queen of Scots, a staunch Catholic who enjoyed the powerful backing of the Guises. To counter French opposition in Rome, Elizabeth would have been forced to rely on Spanish influence - once again, to the detriment of her own independence. Knowing full-well the truth of the analysis (made later in the reign by a French observer) that 'The first of the two great kings now reigning in France and Spain who gains England to his side will not only trim his fellow's

---

locks but shear him to the skin', Philip II immediately directed his diplomacy towards continuing the hegemony which Spain had effectively gained during the reign of Mary. His opening ploy in 1558, the offer of marriage, symbolised quite well the kind of political capitulation he was hoping to exact from Mary's successor also.

One can think of many reasons why such alternatives - the sequel to maintaining the link with Rome - might have seemed unpalatable to Elizabeth. Strong or weak, her personal religious views scarcely prompted her to play the role of dutiful suppliant before the Papacy. The Spanish alliance had become distasteful to many, if not most, of her subjects, the loss of Calais (which resulted from it) proving particularly bitter. This, and the other unpopular features of Mary's reign, made the time right for reaction. Elizabeth, seemingly, was just the person to capitalise on her predecessor's mistakes. And it has often been remarked that these latter shaped the new queen's policies, which were to be isolationist and nationalistic. But the most pertinent consideration to my mind is not that Elizabeth's tastes were Protestant, or that she knowingly yielded to a widespread desire for political and religious change. What mattered most was that

1. Francois de Noailles, 16 August 1571, cited E. H. Harbison, Rival Ambassadors at the Court of Queen Mary (Princeton, 1940), p. 57.
it looked impossible for her to retain the existing religious legislation without prejudicing — and, just as importantly, without appearing to prejudice — her own inherent right to succeed to the throne.

Henry bequeathed to Elizabeth the same superb 'instinct of regality' that was characteristic of her predecessor.¹ It was something that shaped the political fortunes of both queens. In Elizabeth's case the question-mark that some saw over her title to the crown only made her insist more regally on her right to succeed unquestioned and unaided.

'You won it, wore it, kept it, gave it me;
Then plain and right must my possession be:
Which I with more than with a common pain
'Gainst all the world will rightfully maintain.'²

The determination to be and profess herself, and have others recognise her as 'a free Princess' was dominant from the beginning.³ 'Her views of her prerogative', says Rowse, 'might be described as very much anti-Whig and high Tory': it was her personal affection 'to govern princely'.⁴ Under the circumstances this could only militate

against the survival of the link with Rome. For even to have gone through the motions of acknowledging the Papacy at the outset would have seemed to compromise Elizabeth's title to rule, and have made her succession conditional on outside factors. This, I think, did make religious change all but 'inevitable' in 1558, for a Tudor at any rate.

Certainly there was the widespread expectation of change accompanying Elizabeth's accession. Reform-sympathisers both in the capital and in exile abroad reacted immediately, taking it for granted that some alleviation of their situation must come.¹ Some, like the King of Spain, hoped diplomacy might arrest the moving currents; but Count de Feria, Philip's ambassador in London, was soon acknowledging the Queen's unfortunate addiction to 'novelties'.² Others, of course, continued to hope against hope that true piety would prevail. Yet the premonitions of the devout supporters of the Marian settlement can perhaps be gauged from the message which Cardinal Pole is said to have sent to the heir-presumptive some days before his own death which took place on the eve of her accession. Half-pleading, half-threatening, with more than a suggestion of foreboding, he was at pains to persuade her to uphold the ancient faith.³ Most recognised, even when they

did not allude to them expressly, the pressures steering the new monarch towards change. And while there were doubts on all sides as to how radical this change could be, probably only few believed that it could ultimately amount to anything less than schism from the Church of Rome.

The hopes of the new queen's counsellors in the early months are known to us from some of the memoranda that have survived. Two (authoritatively commissioned, it would seem) deal exclusively with the matter of religion; and in another, Waad, its author, ranked religious divisions and the reform of religion among the issues 'most gravely to be thought upon and speedliest amended'. Though it is likely that written advice was sought from other quarters also, these three documents that remain all raise the same question from a somewhat different view-point, giving, in miniature, a cross-section of the motives of those who would later support Elizabeth's religious settlement. Goodrich dwells on legal


(ii) "The device for alteration of religion in the first year of Queen Elizabeth", printed in Gee, op.cit., pp.195-202. Composed, in Neale's view, before 27 December - possibly even some weeks before (art.cit., p.305). Gee agrees that it was written within a few days of Christmas (op.cit., p.68).

2. A. Waad, "The distresses of the Commonwealth, with the means to remedy them", printed in Gee, op.cit., pp.206-15. Probably written at the same time as Goodrich's memorandum, and addressed to Cecil also (Neale, art.cit., p.306). Gee believes it was drawn up at the request of someone in authority (op.cit., p.23).


considerations: he enumerates English precedents for the restraint of the Pope's power by law, the better 'to stir the nobility and commons to devotion of the liberty of the realm and against the usurpation of the Pope'; and he counsels an immediate repeal of the bishops' power to institute proceedings against citizens for heresy, so that 'all quiet persons may live safely'. Waad, on the other hand, is stirred to more mercenary reflections. Touching briefly on the evils arising out of division, he mainly voices resentment at the penury of noblemen and suggests fiscal measures to remedy the situation: a fixed salary for bishops and the transfer of their remaining temporalities to indigent nobles, along with the restoring of clerical first-fruits and tithes to the Crown. Only in The Device are religious motives adduced for remedying the religious situation: true religion must be restored, and that immediately, so that God will be the more glorified and thus disposed to show mercy to the realm and its queen.

What is most significant in these submissions is not the divergent viewpoints however: it is their common assumption that there must be religious change. The central query in all of them is simply how soon it should be feasible for the Queen safely to proceed, as Waad puts it, 'to the reformation of religion' and to break with Rome. For all three take it as established that

there will be such a rift eventually; and when they raise the problem of containing Catholic opposition to the Crown it is with this contingency in mind. Interestingly, though, the memoranda advocate the greatest caution on the part of the Queen. The author of The Device - whose outlook Neale describes with some justice as 'mystical' rather than political\(^1\) is a partial exception here. Convinced that the godly solution must be put first, he opts for a final religious settlement immediately, although probably recognising that an interim solution might prove necessary.\(^2\) The worldly-wise, giving more weight to the dangers of the time and possibly expecting less of the Almighty, advise circumspection and a policy of 'gradualism'.\(^3\) Their belief is that the nation could not assimilate sweeping religious change quickly. As Waad remarks, in an oft-quoted passage:

>'Glasses with small necks if you pour into them any liquor suddenly or violently, will not be so filled, but refuse to receive that same that you would pour into them. Howbeit, if you instil water into them by a little and little they are soon replenished.'\(^4\)

>'Cautious people, waiting for a wind':\(^5\) in one respect A. G. Dickens' description of the Queen and her advisers in the opening months of the reign is entirely appropriate, as these

---

memoranda show. For the most part the men Elizabeth chose as her counsellors and administrators were no more tempted by doctrinaire solutions than she herself was. Acknowledging the need for extreme caution, they were prepared to temporize: final decisions regarding religion could well be postponed. Meanwhile, they would dissemble, and even compromise, should circumstances make this necessary. The image of a craft adrift on threatening seas, in skilled hands, yet still largely controlled by fluky breezes, is a good one - provided we grant that helmsman and crew knew perfectly well their home-port.

One may concede that Elizabeth's religious plans were both flexible and conservative in 1558. But some change was seen to be essential from the beginning; and under the circumstances this could not have meant anything less than a break with Rome. This need not necessarily have been made formal from the outset - some of the memoranda apparently hoped it would not be. Yet even to introduce, either by royal decree or parliamentary legislation, the kind of things which the submissions envisaged - the authorising of 'learned and discreet Gospellers to preach'; a 'wink at the married priests'; approval of the English Litany, together with Homilies that would treat of 'most necessary matters of our religion plainly and simply, not meddling with any matter in controversy'; Communion under both species, and suppression of the elevation of the Host, at Masses celebrated in the Chapel Royal; and perhaps too, as The Device prompted, the less frequent offering of Mass¹ - would certainly have meant a de facto separation from the Papacy. For any change of this kind would have to be construed as a 'touching'

¹. Gee, op.cit., pp. 201, 205.
of the Pope's authority.\textsuperscript{1} The situation made this inevitable. And even the cautious plans being laid before Elizabeth corroborate one's suspicions that, whatever form the final religious settlement might have taken, some change and the checking of what Goodrich called 'usurpation' by the Pope\textsuperscript{2} was unavoidable.

Chronologically this work is concerned with the initial phase of religious change in the reign of Elizabeth I: the months when some kind of 'alteration' seemed imminent to most; and the period when Englishmen of varying religious persuasions were first acclimatising themselves to the Settlement of 1559 - before Rome's excommunication of the Queen on the one hand, and the outbreak of dissensions between Anglicans and Puritans on the other, complicated the position further. Put in the widest and most ambitious terms, its theme is change as such in that it looks at the reactions of the interested parties to the aspect of 'novelty' in the Settlement.

C. S. Lewis has made the remark that 'What is new usually wins its way by disguising itself as the old'.\textsuperscript{3} No doubt there are vestiges of an innate conservatism in all of us: we normally like our present behaviour to seem consistent with our past, even when it is not. And the instinct is customarily strong in those who feel

\textsuperscript{1} Gee, op.cit., p.204.
\textsuperscript{2} Gee, op.cit., p.204.
\textsuperscript{3} C. S. Lewis, \textit{The Allegory of Love} (Oxford, 1951), p.11.
responsible for preserving the social fabric. In our own times, however, innovators do not always find it necessary to be on the defensive. Quite the contrary, for we have espoused 'progress' as an ideal. We accept the inevitability, and indeed the desirability, of change, assuming there is growth in it. This separates us rather radically from men of the sixteenth century who, in theory at least, found change of almost any kind threatening.

One could hardly accuse the Elizabethans of being any less realistic than ourselves, but the framework of their thought (and especially their social thought) was notably different. As a ready generalisation it is probably true to say, with Curtis, that they felt good order was to be preserved by seeking to abate change rather than by submitting to it.¹ They inherited, without any substantial questioning, the medieval idea of a static social system, which they affirmed in their reflexions on the 'very and true common weal' - an ideal, it has been said, that was 'conservative, and in a very real sense reactionary'.² Kings and their governments, in the context of this thinking, were believed to discharge a preservative role: their task was to administer a justice more ancient than their


own legislation, and which their laws were assumed to codify; and their aim was to ensure social tranquility.

Rather like our own conventional appeals to 'democracy', these were the stock assumptions of the Tudor age, theoretically unassailable, so it was thought, although beginning to wear thin at this stage under the pressure of actual events. Increasingly in this period of great social change, intelligent men were being forced to reckon with the fact that laws and social structures altered, hesitantly foreshadowing Gabriel Harvey's avowal that

'There is a variable course and revolution of all things. Summer getteth the upperhand of winter, and winter again of summer. Nature herself is changeable, and most of all delighted with vanity; and art, after a sort her ape, conformeth herself to the like mutability. The moon waxeth and waneth; the sea ebbeth and floweth; and as flowers so ceremonies, laws, fashions, customs, trades of living, sciences, devices, and all things else in a manner flourish their time and then fade to nothing'.

One finds Thomas Starkey, for instance, in his Dialogue between Reginald Pole and Thomas Lupset, acknowledging that civil law 'is diverse and variable': it

'taketh effect of the opinion of man; it resteth wholly in his consent and varieth according to place and time, insomuch that in diverse time and place contrary laws are both good and convenient to the politic life'.


But explicit statements of this kind remain the exception; and the tension such men as Starkey felt between the theories of a static society and inevitability of social change remained unresolved, even for them. It was still the convention in 1558 for kings to present their laws as 'ancient'; and it was anathema for them to appear to be social innovators.

This was doubly so when it came to sponsoring religious change, for here there was an added set of criteria enforcing conservatism on Christian princes and their subjects. Quite apart from the external pressures which the church-hierarchy could be expected to exert should a monarch contemplate tampering with church-doctrine or discipline, there was the restraining power of faith itself, born in submission and demanding uniformity.

Even by the sixteenth century the limits of the Church's 'immutable' doctrine and custom had not been set by theologians, as the reformation debates amply demonstrated. It was recognised, however, that there was an essential 'deposit' of truth - lodged in the Scriptures, or the Church's Tradition, or both - that must be preserved undefiled. And the very lack of precise definition as to its ingredients only made the call to adhere to the 'received' teaching all the more insistent. Again, this was a kind of conventional demand that was fast being qualified in some quarters under the pressure of the facts. Canon lawyers, for instance, were beginning to acknowledge that some laws at least could vary
according to time and place. Efforts to justify reform positions, too, had led to a sharpening of the theoretical distinction between truths essential to salvation and church-matters that were indifferent and variable. And this principle of 'adiaphorism', as it is sometimes called, had been formulated in England, as elsewhere - beginning with the Henrician apologists. In practice, however, no sixteenth-century monarch (or religious leader for that matter) wanted to appear to sponsor religious 'novelty' - the more so as religion was understood to be the very foundation of the commonwealth. Sir Nicholas Bacon, the new Chancellor, put the prevailing view bluntly in opening the first of Elizabeth's parliaments. 'Continual change and alteration', he said, is 'a thing to be eschewed in all good governances - but most of all in matters of faith and religion'.

These words neatly outline the dilemma that forms the background to this study. How did an age unsympathetic to change justify its religious 'alterations'? The question suggests another (alluded to, but hardly confronted systematically here): what effect, if any, did such justifications have on the conventional assumptions that bred them, and especially on those concerning religion? The work skirts, from a number of directions, the ideological conservatism of the early Elizabethans.

3. Strype, Annals, I, i, p.78.
It has seemed particularly appropriate to raise questions of this type in connection with the English Settlement of 1559. Elizabeth's legislation certainly did not mark the end of the English Reformation, but it did represent a momentous turning-point. And, as I have already tried to suggest, there was at the time a conscious advertence to the problems of change as such. In point of fact, the matter of 'novelty' was a dominant (if not the dominant) concern for all parties in the debates that first grew out of the Settlement. They almost beg to be considered from this point of view, although, to the best of my knowledge, this has not previously been attempted in any detail.

Of course, a great deal had already been said on the subject of religious change prior to Elizabeth's accession. As on the Continent, reformers and their opponents tussled to have their creeds characterised by the respectable title, 'ancient', almost unremittingly in England from the twenties onwards. The issue was no longer fresh in 1558. But it was still bitterly contested. And the advantage in taking up the discussions at this point is that by now the lines of approach had hardened and become relatively clear. 'Antiquity' had patently emerged as the prize to be sought after, and cases were framed accordingly.

There is a final consideration: it was the positions of the Elizabethan controversialists, and not those of their

predecessors, that most influenced subsequent debates. However unfortunate or unfair this might seem, the plodding talent of a John Jewel made a greater perceptible imprint on the methods of Anglican divines than did the scholarship of a Cranmer. On the Roman Catholic side, Thomas Harding and his colleagues (every bit as limited as Jewel) foreshadowed future developments also, as fledglings in the counter-reform methods of argument that were now beginning to crystallize. The reason for this influence lies less in the vagaries of Fortune than in the circumstances of the time: as the religious battle-lines started to take their definitive shape, leadership could, and often did, fall on strong, rather than sensitive, shoulders.

What, then, were the positions taken with regard to religious 'alterations' in the opening years of Elizabeth's reign? Not unnaturally the work begins with the Queen herself, and the attitudes revealed in the official formularies of the Settlement.

1. "All our controversors since that time have furnished themselves with arguments and authority from Jewel's writings. P. Heylyn, Ecclesia Restaurata, II (Cambridge, 1849), pp.330-1; Jewel's works provide "the first methodical statement of the position of the Church of England against the Church of Rome" and "the groundwork of all subsequent controversy", D.N.B., art."Jewel"; In the controversy with Harding "the lines which the Roman controversy was to take in the 17th century were mainly determined", O.D.C.C., art."Jewel".
Within six months of Elizabeth's accession her resolve 'to procure and to restore' the 'true advancement' of godliness in her kingdom, by establishing accord in 'such causes as at this present are moved in matters and ceremonies of Religion', had been met - legally at least.¹ The two statutes which form the basis of the Settlement — the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity — received the royal assent on 8 May 1559, the liturgical changes which the second of these imposed becoming mandatory from 24 June. The effect of these measures was of course restorative: the ecclesiastical claims which Henry VIII had forged were once more made on behalf of the crown; Henry's anti-papal legislation was revived; and equivalently, the second Prayer Book of Edward VI was reintroduced. But while the Settlement did not write anything into the statute books that had not featured there previously, it was, under the circumstances, a daring and rather self-conscious assertion that provided its own version of earlier claims.

'Non est enim red ubi dominatur voluntas et non lex': Goodrich in his memorandum had cited Bracton for the benefit of the new queen.² The words contained a pertinent piece of advice, and to all intents and purposes it was taken. Although forced to

overrule Convocation and disregard the almost-unanimous opposition of the Lords Spiritual in the Upper House, Elizabeth did submit her religious plans to the Parliament which she rapidly convened. No less than Mary her predecessor did, the new queen made a point of adhering to the legal forms that tradition sanctioned, even the reassertion of the Royal Supremacy being achieved through parliamentary statute - a portentous concession in the long term, and one that raised doubts as to the source of the monarch's supreme authority; but intended at the time, no doubt, as a gesture of kingly conservatism. If Professor Neale's persuasive reconstruction of the events before and around Easter 1559 is correct, then the step turned out to be something more than a gesture. For according to this hypothesis (accepted without demur by the most distinguished of recent Elizabethan historians), the Parliament virtually forced the Queen to revise her initial legislation, widening the liturgical provisions to mollify the reform-party.

Neale's theory corroborates the long-standing notion that the Settlement was a compromise, but refashions our conception of it.


Instead of finding in the Elizabethan enactments a *via media* between Rome and Geneva, as many once did, we are now asked to see them as an accommodation between Queen and Commons; or more specifically, between the Queen and the newly-returned Marian exiles who managed to assume effective leadership of the first parliament. In the latter case the impact of the Queen's own wishes with respect to the religious settlement is minimised, even more severely than in earlier explanations of the 1559 'compromise'.

This seems to me unfortunate in that it tempts us to disregard the affirmation that was made in the Settlement, dramatically, unexpectedly even, and at the Queen's own bidding. For, to revert to the terms of Goodrich's citation, 'lex' and 'voluntas' were no more incompatible for Elizabeth than they were for her father or her half-sister, both of whom one thinks of as autocrats. The Tudors habitually found ways of reconciling legal forms with their own wishes, exercising (in the words of J. V. Thompson) 'a dominion which was almost absolute without any of the external trappings of absolutism'.

Elizabeth in 1559, while yielding to parliamentary processes and maybe even bending to some degree before pressure from the Commons, was no exception. The concessions the Queen made, in my opinion, were minor ones, and sometimes more apparent than real. Her essential purposes were served in the Settlement; and I am inclined to agree with A. O. Meyer when he argues that 'Elizabeth appears from the beginning as

---

a strongly marked personality, clear as to her aims, though still cautious in the choice of means'. ¹

In the early months of the reign the Queen and her administrators showed few signs of the indecisiveness that one normally associates with compromise. This was so even before the signing of the treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis in March eased the foreign situation. If the government, on the face of it, had every reason for being cautious, it still did not procrastinate unduly as far as the religious question was concerned. Like her predecessor, Elizabeth convened parliament almost immediately: the writs, dated 5 December 1558, gave 23 January as the day of assembly; and by Christmas a committee had already been nominated (including, it should be noted, no clerical advisers) to draft the legislation which the government had decided to introduce. ²

While the precise intentions of the administration were not revealed in these early months, there was no reason to doubt that the Parliament would be asked to address itself to religious matters. The Queen's proclamation of 27 December suggested as much. And the terms of it - especially as glossed by Elizabeth's own behaviour at this time in the Chapel Royal - gave some notice of intent. Reading the signs, the Catholic party seems to have

---

¹ Meyer, England and the Catholic Church, p.16.
² This committee was nominated by the Council on 23 December. Neale believes its function was simply to draft legislation, not to advise about the nature of the settlement (op.cit., p.38).
divined pretty accurately what was afoot: by the end of January, Feria was writing to Philip that 'the Catholics are very fearful of the measures to be taken in this Parliament'; and the activity of Convocation was clearly an attempt to forestall the government measures. The government showed its hand without much delay in the Parliament by introducing the first Bill of Supremacy into the Commons on 9 February; and essentially, the terms of the religious settlement that Parliament finally approved were outlined in that initial draft.

The bill reasserted the Royal Supremacy and also revived the Edwardian statute (I Ed. VI. c.1) concerning Communion under both species. From one point of view - that of the reform-party - it was significantly less generous than the final legislation which

1. Feria to Philip II, 31 January 1559, Calendar of State Papers, Spanish (1558-1567) /\ = Span. Cal. / p.25.
2. D. Wilkins, Concilia Magnae Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, IV (London, 1737), pp.179-80. The resolutions of Convocation appear to have been passed on the same day the first bill of Supremacy was introduced into parliament.
3. This is anticipating a point dealt with subsequently in the chapter. It seems certain, according to Neale, that the first bill of Supremacy is substantially the same as the one finally approved, with the exception of the substitution of 'Governor' for 'Head' (art.cit., pp.308-9). Maitland, though not dealing with the matter as fully, would appear to agree (Collected Papers, III, p.198). I argue that the extension of the liturgical provisions of the first bill of Supremacy (see par. 5 of the approved statute of Supremacy), brought about by the introduction of a separate bill of Uniformity after Easter, was not a substantial compromise.
4. It is a crucial point in Neale's thesis that the first Supremacy bill contained the clause reviving this Edwardian statute. For his arguments, op.cit., pp.52f, 76. Cf. art.cit., pp.309-10.
the Parliament approved. But from the viewpoint of the Pope and the Catholic monarchs of Europe, the Bench of Bishops, and doctrinaire Papists of all ranks, the one was as provocative as the other. As far as asserting the principle of the national church went, the bill was quite as unequivocal as the ultimate settlement turned out to be.

The decision to proceed with this piece of legislation immediately points up a sense of purpose on the part of the Queen. For in acting thus she was disregarding the cautious advice given her in the various memoranda, upon which Professor Neale himself lays such stress. Given this original intention, one can scarcely term the religious policy of the government conciliatory, or imply that it fluctuated radically with the political situation abroad. Elizabeth’s manner of handling the European princes and of proceeding with this legislation may be judged cautious and discreet. But the terms of her religious stand, as they were originally expressed and then eventually sanctioned by parliament, appear to have been dictated by a native - and eminently regal - sense of fittingness rather than by expediency or, still less, the purest of Gospel precepts, for they were formulated virtually in defiance of foreign opinion and with a nice disregard for the opinions of zealots at home.

To keep the peace Elizabeth was prepared to dissemble, even to the point of appearing to yield ground. She might delay, seem to vacillate, perhaps alter her method of procedure, but she did not, in my opinion, deviate from her central purpose because of
foreign or domestic pressure in 1559. She pursued her aims consistently, if at times deviously.

The argument for a consistent policy on the part of the administration in the first months of 1559 may seem to be contradicted by Neale's reading of the happenings at Easter. Having pointed conclusively to the mood of religious radicalism in the Commons, he sees in the government's change of plan - on, or slightly before, Good Friday, 24 March\(^1\) - a significant concession to Protestant feeling in the Parliament. Neale argues that, by deciding to withhold the royal assent from the second Bill of Supremacy\(^2\) and to reconvene parliament early in April,\(^3\) Elizabeth was, in effect, abandoning her original plans for an interim religious settlement and yielding to more radical liturgical changes than she had at first contemplated. This may well have been so, and it would be very difficult indeed to contest Neale's version of the facts. But it is still possible to ask how serious a compromise this was as far as the Queen herself was concerned.

The question arises because of another concession which Elizabeth appears to have made while her religious legislation was before Parliament: the seemingly-momentous change in the terminology

1. It seems that as late as 22 March, Elizabeth intended to disband the parliament and give the royal assent to the (second) bill of Supremacy (which had its final reading on 22 March) on 24 March (Feria to Philip II, 24 March, Span.Cal., p.44). The queen's proclamation about Communion under two species, dated 22 March, bears this out (Steele, op.cit., p.53). However, she changed her mind - according to Neale, either on the night of 23 March or the following morning (op.cit.,p.69).

2. For the progress of the bill of Supremacy up to this time, see Maitland, art.cit., pp.196-7; Neale, passim.

3. The date for reassembly was 3 April.
of the Royal Supremacy, from 'Supreme Head' to 'Supreme Governor'.

This is a pertinent sample of the way the Queen could seem to give
ground - in this case, to both Catholic and exile parties at once -
without really departing from her own initial position at all.

'She was an economical woman', says Maitland, 'and thought one stone
enough for two birds'. At the same time that Feria was congratulating
himself for the revision and appealing to it as proof of the
Queen's moderation, the exiles were attributing the change to a
godly scruple which one of their number had 'wisely' put in
Elizabeth's head. Yet it is very doubtful indeed whether the new
term represented an essential concession on the Queen's part; at
best it was probably only a clarification, with Elizabeth's purposes
being as fully served by the one term as the other. As John


2. Feria to Philip II, 11 April, Span.Cal., p.52 (cf. his earlier
despatches, Span.Cal., pp.37, 43); Philip II to Feria, 24 April,
Span.Cal., p.60.

3. Sandys to Parker, 30 April, Parker Correspondence, ed. J. Bruce
and T. T. Perrowne (Cambridge, 1853), p.66.

4. This matter has been much discussed, and can be pursued at
several levels: the constitutional, historical etc. Some believe
that the constitutional implications of the change were real
(cf. Cross, op.cit., p.23). However, there seems to have been
no historical difference of any substance between Henry's
'Supreme Head' and Elizabeth's 'Supreme Governor', although the
latter helped clarify ambiguities (notably regarding the
potestas ordinis) in the former (cf. Scarisbrick, op.cit.,
pp.385, 414f). According to Hicks, Henry himself used the term
'Head' and 'Governor' indiscriminately on some occasions, "The
Ecclesiastical Supremacy of Queen Elizabeth", The Month, CLXXXIII
(1947), p.171. Meyer and others disagree (op.cit., pp.22-5;
Dickens, op.cit., pp.412-3).
Parkhurst put it, writing to Bullinger some time later, it 'amounts to the same thing'.

One could say almost as much of the liturgical changes which, Neale claims, were forced on the Queen. From the beginning, it seems, the government had committed itself to the re-introduction of the Edwardian practice of administering Communion under both kinds. Granted that the approval of a revised form of the 1552 Prayer Book amounted to an extension of the government's programme, was this a significant concession or a token one? I have already argued that, in the context of the foreign situation, the final settlement was not notably less cautious than the one originally proposed. Nor was it notably more threatening as far as devout Catholics at home were concerned: they would have been as reluctant to receive Communion under both kinds as they were to assist at the Prayer Book service, since the same principle was at stake in both modifications of the universal Catholic practice. The strongest reason for seeing the introduction of a separate Bill of Uniformity as a serious compromise on the government's part is that the move led it to forsake the constitutional methods of procedure which it had originally decided to follow.

According to Professor Neale, Elizabeth's government was bent on adopting the tactics successfully used in the reign of Edward VI. Its intention was to frame an interim policy, use

the Oath of Supremacy to remove Papists from office and, having thus moulded Convocation to its purpose, move then to have a suitable prayer book approved. It may be doubted, however, whether the Queen and her advisers were irrevocably intent on preserving the constitutional forms, in the way Neale suggests. To be sure, Elizabeth would have preferred to act through Convocation. But had she given the royal assent to the second Bill of Supremacy before Easter, as she intended, she would still have been committing herself to legislation which the Lords Spiritual would certainly have rejected unanimously, and which the Convocation had already condemned in advance. By allowing the Parliament - not a Convocation more delicately attuned to her own wishes - to determine what liturgical arrangements were to be adopted, the Queen was conceding something, but not, I think, a great deal. After all, the stamp of the Supreme Governor was quite adequately impressed on the Prayer Book eventually approved.¹

In spite of token deviations, Elizabeth consistently followed her own star in the early months of the reign, her intention being to establish her sovereignty as securely in religious matters as in any other sphere of government. If Mary Tudor's parentage serves as a suitable paradigm for the religious settlement she championed, so too does Elizabeth's. What she stood for was that independence from Rome which her own birth symbolised - not, it should be noted, the independence of any and every Christian from the dictates of a usurping Pontiff

¹. For the Queen's revisions of the 1552 Prayer Book, see Gee, op.cit., pp.258ff.
but, far more specifically, the independence of Princes called to assume an Imperial Crown. Dr. Scarisbrick has recently reminded us how thoroughly Henry had refurbished the English concept of kingship by his assertion of the Royal Supremacy.\(^1\) It was this quasi-faith in the rights of the Crown Imperial which Elizabeth (perhaps more instinctively than consciously) set about reaffirming from the beginning of her reign - if one takes her much-interpreted comment to Feria as a firm declaration of intention.\(^2\)

Certainly, this was what the Queen was affirming by her own actions weeks before the Parliament met when 'in advance of the law /she/ beckoned the nation forward'.\(^3\) Maitland has spoken of scenes at court, played by a young actress and staged with admirable art. There was a series of them, most centering on the

\(^1\) Scarisbrick, op.cit., p.389.

\(^2\) Feria to Philip II, 19 March 1559, which refers to Elizabeth being 'resolved to restore religion as her father left it' (Span.Cal., p.37). Neale considers this 'a comment of considerable significance', believing that here Elizabeth was speaking sincerely and quite literally ('The Accession of Queen Elizabeth I', Essays in Elizabethan History (London, 1958), p.47). Dickens does not quite agree: 'she must have been impressing him /Feria/ with her conservatism rather than announcing a serious intention' (English Reformation, p.404). An even more significant remark, in my opinion, is recorded in the despatch of 24 March (Span.Cal., p.43). See also the communication to Philip II, of 25 November 1558, cited H. N. Birt, The Elizabethan Religious Settlement (London, 1907), p.4.

Chapel Royal; and though they were calculated to confuse, and did confuse, Catholic and Protestant devots alike, there was also a consistent message in these incidents: that the queen expected her will to prevail in religious matters. The fullness of their meaning is captured in the Act of Supremacy, which should be judged the nerve-point of the Settlement as far as Elizabeth and her lay advisers were concerned.

Talk of the Settlement as a compromise can distract us from the affirmation that is made in this statute and that echoes unmistakably through other official documents issued in the first year of the reign. The terms of Elizabeth's stand were not utterly dictated by expediency: an idea of kingship was at work in them, colouring the whole and giving a coherence to the religious arrangements decided upon. Historians have sometimes presented the Royal Supremacy as a predominantly negative thing. But Henry had managed to forge an assertion in the fire of his conflicts with Rome, using it both to justify his break with the Papacy and to establish his rights over the national church. It was a persuasive assertion for many - 'a revelation and a liberation', as Scarisbrick says - and the fact that it was a convenient assertion also (both for the king who preached it and others who accepted it) does not mean it was not seriously held. One may speculate about the degree to which those who supported Elizabeth in her re-affirmation of Henry's principle in 1559

acquiesced in its positive claims. At least some of the Queen's allies were uneasy about the Supremacy doctrine and possibly persuaded themselves that the main aim of Elizabeth's statute was to confound Papistry. But whatever qualifications the more extreme Protestants may have placed on this act, it was far more than a rejection of Roman jurisdiction, and more than a merely legal revival of certain Henrician statutes. It stated a doctrine about the rights of kings to which Elizabeth subscribed, and to which she expected her subjects to subscribe, if not in theory, then most certainly in fact.

Although somewhat speculative, this conclusion as to the nature of the Settlement is of some consequence when it comes to weighing the official appeals to antiquity made on behalf of it, in the statutes themselves and other documents. Such appeals, I would want to argue, largely grow out of the Settlement's central assertion regarding kingship and are continuous with it. If, as has rightly been said, the Morning Star of the 1559 legislation was not so much John Wyclif as Henry II, then it is also true that the statutes' claims to be restoring an 'ancient jurisdiction' to the crown (or even to be restoring the liturgical forms of the primitive church) owe far more to royal precedents than to the arguments of the sixteenth-century reformers. One

1. For instance, Thomas Sampson to Peter Martyr, 17 December 1558, Zurich Letters, I, p.1. See also Cross, op.cit., pp.19, 47ff.
2. Thompson, op.cit., p.3.
can imagine them being formulated, and almost in the way that they were, even if the Reformation had not taken place. For it was of the essence of the kind of claims made in the Settlement that they would be characterised as 'ancient'.

In this context it is useful to recall the remark made earlier in this chapter: that English monarchs of the sixteenth century still adhered to the medieval ideology regarding kingship. At coronation they pledged themselves (in the way their medieval predecessors had done) 'to hold and keep the laws and rightful customs' of the realm. Significantly perhaps, Henry VIII had planned at one time to alter the rite, but did not do so. 1 The old conventions still applied, at least at the level of principle. Kings when legislating must always seem to work within established precedents. More than this, they were understood to be the exponents of an ancient and venerable law which they formulated but did not create. Good pedigree ought to be as much a feature of their enactments as it was of their own persons. One finds the true analogy for Elizabeth's references to ancient rights, and her claims to be restoring ancient practices, in the efforts of medieval kings to surround themselves with the aura of antiquity.

But of course, Elizabeth's immediate predecessors on the throne, her father particularly, had powerfully reinforced

---

1. Henry drafted the additional words, 'not prejudicial to his crown or Imperial jurisdiction', but they were never used. Baumer, op.cit., p.167, n.138.
this medieval convention by their official attempts to justify their own innovations. Parvenus to the monarchy, the Tudors were always notably sensitive to charges of novelty; and in an increasingly literate age, they frequently resorted to propaganda - which took the form of 'a kind of historical casuistry'¹ - to allay doubts as to the antiquity of their lineage and enactments.

One could perhaps apply to Henry VIII words said of Martin Luther: 'a medieval figure ushering in the modern age'.² As Scarisbrick gently insists, he was 'the last of the troubadours', not the archetype of the Renaissance Prince. His propaganda efforts tend to bear this out: they show him to have been passionately concerned about appearing to conform to the prevailing conventions about kingship. To bolster his own dynastic pedigree, he is said to have sponsored Hall's chronicle, described as one of the most ambitious propaganda works of the first part of the sixteenth century.⁴ And to support his case in the divorce and the assertion of the Royal Supremacy, his pamphleteers

1. Ferguson, The Articulate Citizen, p.221.
systematically plundered historical works in search of respectable precedents.¹ For 'underlying all these transactions was the contention that by these Acts of Henry VIII establishing, or better, declaring the supremacy, Henry was not demanding new and additional powers, such as hitherto had not pertained to English sovereigns, but was simply taking up again what had always belonged by inherent right to the crown of England'.²

The charge that Henry's statutes sometimes 'manufacture(d) history on an unprecedented scale' may well be true.³ Yet it is doubtful whether his propaganda efforts were ever entirely cynical in spite of Janelle's conclusions about 'manipulation', and 'the total immorality of the Henrician propaganda'.⁴ It is far more

¹ For the efforts of Fox, Gardiner and Sampson on behalf of the Royal Supremacy, see esp. P. Janelle, L'Angleterre catholique à la veille du schisme (Paris, 1935), pp.232-319. This remark of Ferguson is pertinent: 'In their handling of the basic problem of church and state, the Henrician publicists generally showed little originality. They drew mainly on the stock of ideas common to late medieval Christendom and spent most of their ingenuity in a desperate and pragmatic search for the most impressive precedents and most useful authorities'. (op.cit., p.221).
² Hicks, art.cit., p.173.
⁴ Janelle, op.cit., pp.250, 325. Janelle comes out strongly against Henry's 'impudent hypocrisy' (p.201), although professing some admiration for the king's 'formidable propaganda machine' (p.207) and his 'press offensive(s)' (p.140), controlled from the top (p.278), which marked him out as an innovator (p.203) and one who had assimilated the lessons of Machiavelli (p.246). Other estimates of Henrician propaganda in Hughes, op.cit., I, pp.247f, 254, 269 etc; Baumer, op.cit., pp.211-24.
tempting to believe that Henry was convinced his claims must be 'ancient' because he had first persuaded himself they were proper to a king. In other words, his adherence to the ideological convention linking the 'ancient' with the 'just' was probably genuine, however maladroit and devious his efforts to establish the antiquity of his enactments may have been. Paradoxically, as the medieval thought-patterns began foundering on the facts, attempts to assert their buoyancy became all the more insistent. One sees this in Elizabeth also, whose legislation (and methods of justifying it) obviously owed much to Henry.

Her Act of Supremacy at once re-affirms the abolition of all foreign jurisdiction in England and claims to restore its ancient prerogatives to the Crown. When the statute speaks of 'usurped ... power' it is not condemning Rome's pretensions in the name of scriptural principles; that is to say, it is not a charge of impiety that is being made. Nor is it thinking principally of injustices to the queen's subjects, though the preamble does refer to these. The chief ground of complaint is that 'the Rights, Jurisdiction and Pre-eminences appertaining to the Imperial Crown' of the realm have been undermined by the late queen's repeal of the Henrician legislation.

It was this very charge, of injustice to the Crown, that Henry VIII had levelled against the Papacy in a number of his statutes, beginning with the Act concerning Appeals in 1533. Its basis was a newly-hewn conception of England as an empire, with its king 'furnished by the goodness and sufferance of Almighty God with plenary whole and entire power' (imperium merum) over all causes concerning his subjects—a right, according to this same statute, acknowledged throughout Christendom before the days when popes presumed to 'annoy' princes. Serving their own ambition, enslaved by worldly affections, the popes had robbed Christian kings of their God-given birth-right: they had excluded 'Christ out of his Kingdom ... and all other temporal Kings and Princes out of their Dominions', wanting to 'obscure and delete ... power given by God to the Princes of the Earth'. In England, specifically, they had 'by sufferance and abusions in times passed ... usurped and vindicated a feigned and unlawful power and jurisdiction'.

1. 24 Henry VIII c. 12 (S.R., III, pp.427-9). Note, however, that the Supplication of 1532 had already spoken of England as 'an imperial realm'.
4. 28 H VIII c. 10 (S.R., III, p.663).
5. Ibid.
7. 35 H VIII c. 1, par. 7 (the oath). (S.R., III, p.957).
After its own fashion, Elizabeth's legislation restates Henry's principles. The claims are more economically put. The stance is far less polemical and condemnatory. Indeed, it might be claimed that the 1559 legislation is less ideological: the Henrician statutes revived by Elizabeth in the Act of Supremacy relate to the more pragmatic aspects of Royal Supremacy, whereas some of Henry's rather doctrinaire enactments are passed over. Elizabeth is less jealous of the royal style than her father also and, generally speaking, more discreet. But for all that, her assertion of the royal prerogatives is as uncompromising as his. Indeed, to judge from the statutes, one would say it is even more assured and imperious. With Elizabeth, Henry's theories of empire (pared down somewhat and ever so slightly re-oriented) are accepted as dogma, seemingly without question.

Parliamentary statutes in themselves do not provide conclusive evidence about the temper of a monarch's reign. Yet, in the case of the Tudors at least, they are a pretty accurate index. It is revealing, for instance, to compare the statutes of Elizabeth's first parliament with the legislation enacted during the reign of Edward VI. The former refer constantly to 'the Imperial Crown' and its rights, whereas the Edwardian acts

1. I Eliz. c. 1, pars. 2-3 (S.R., IV, i, p.351).
2. V.g. 26 Henry VIII, c.1 (S.R., III, p.492); 28 Henry VIII, c.10 (S.R., III, pp.663-6).
3. V.g. I Eliz. c.3 (S.R., IV, i, p.358); I Eliz. c.4 (S.R., IV, i, pp.359, 361); I Eliz. c.5, par.4 (S.R., IV, i, ii, p.366); I Eliz. c.24 (S.R., IV, i, pp.397-8).
scarcely ever use the phrase. What they commonly insist on are the canons of godliness rather than the ancient prerogatives of kings. The stated reasons for Edward's liturgical legislation, to take one example, contrast strikingly with those given in the preamble to Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity. Public order and a fear of the 'plagues' that 'contempt or irreverence' may bring down upon the realm are the factors that weigh heaviest with Elizabeth. Edward's statutes, on the other hand, anxiously insist that they have an eye to 'the most sincere and pure Christian Religion' taught by Scripture and illustrated by the practice of the primitive church; if the king's preoccupation is the unity and concord of his subjects, it is because he wishes 'especially' agreement 'in the true faith and Religion of God', for his aim is that Englishmen should 'do their duties first to Almighty God and then to his Highness and the Commonwealth'. Elizabeth's priorities were not stated in quite this fashion. Like Henry, she rather insisted on the godliness inherent in obedience to the Crown. While Edward's legislation might fairly be described as Gospel-oriented, hers followed Henry's in being quite patently Crown-oriented.

1. The only reference I have noted is I Ed. VI. c.11, par.2. (S.R., IV, i, p.17).

2. I Eliz. c.2, pars. 4, 13 (S.R., IV, i, pp.357-58). The statute does mention that Mary's repeal of the Prayer Book had been 'to the great decay of the due Honour of God and discomfort to the Professors of the Truth of Christ's Religion' (par.1, S.R., IV, i, p.355).

3. 2 & 3 Ed. VI, c.1 (S.R., IV, i, p.37). Cf. I Ed. VI. c.1 (S.R., IV, i, p.3); 3 & 4 Ed. VI, c.10 (S.R., IV, i, p.110); 5 & 6 Ed. VI c.1 (S.R.,IV, i, p.130).

In reviving the quasi-faith in the rights of the monarchy which her father had first proclaimed, Elizabeth inherited its fundamental ambiguities and changed it only slightly. Perhaps it could be said that she capitalised on its strengths and papered-over the weaknesses. She did nothing to clarify the question which Henry's assertion of the Royal Supremacy raised; whether the monarch's power to govern the church came to him directly from God and resided in him absolutely or was rather vested in the king-in-parliament. If anything, Elizabeth's initial religious legislation compounded the underlying problem here. With a discretion that was probably partly native to her and partly forced on her by circumstances, the Queen did clarify somewhat the limits of her competence as Supreme Governor of the church, thus removing some of the possible ambiguities in Henry's position. But perhaps the most obvious change she worked was to


2. The anomaly was continued in that it was Parliament which reasserted the Royal Supremacy and enacted the liturgical legislation. It was also compounded, I think, by some provisions in Elizabeth's legislation, notably that concerning heresy, in the Act of Supremacy (par.20). Perhaps the result of compromise, as Maitland once suggested (Collected Papers, III, pp.191-2, 198), this attributed a certain competence to Parliament - along with Convocation - in the determination of heresy: 'or such as hereafter shall be ordered judged or determined to be Heresy by the High Court of Parliament of this Realm with the assent of the Clergy in their Convocation ....' But decisions in the matter of church-ornaments were reserved, by the Act of Uniformity, to the Queen, advised by the commissioners (par.13).

give the supremacy doctrine a more explicitly nationalist ring, by abandoning Henry's overt references to Rome and speaking simply of 'foreign' usurpations.¹ In this way, the Queen's willingness to equivocate helped seal in the nationalistic flavour of the Royal Supremacy.

When it came to asserting the antiquity of the royal prerogatives, Elizabeth was no less emphatic than her father had been. It was intrinsic to Henry's assertion of the supremacy that he claimed to be 'restoring' an ancient jurisdiction to the crown. His postulate that England was an empire was corroborated, so the Act concerning Appeals claimed, by 'divers sundry old authentic histories and chronicles'.² Indeed, what Henry's conception of kingship (after 1533 at least) implied was a whole new national epic, as Scarisbrick points out.³ By portraying it as a recapturing of ancient rights, the King invested his move against the Church with the aura of a holy quest. Somewhat like the Humanists and Reformers, he pointed to a period of decadence when ancient principles had been disregarded; and he looked beyond it to an authentic past, which he declared it his mission to revive. In this way, Henry not merely justified his actions by the appeal to precedent, but he successfully idealised them as well. On to

¹. I Eliz. c.1, par.1 (S.R., IV, i, p.350). Note, too, the changes made in the Injunctions to the clergy: contrast the first injunction with the corresponding one of Edward VI; and notice the change made in the petition of the Litany (Gee, op.cit., p.47).


³. Scarisbrick, op.cit., p.386.
the assertion of power a theory had been grafted. Although, generally speaking, Elizabeth was less doctrinaire than her father and occasionally emasculated, or disregarded, his speculations, in this instance she subscribed to the substance of Henry's theory.

Elizabeth perhaps simplified the claim, yet the appeal to the past was just as crucial to her as it was to her predecessor. The Act of Supremacy of course emphasises that it is 'restoring... the ancient jurisdiction', and this remained the essence of the queen's claim. This statute makes no great point of the abuses that prevailed before Henry re-asserted the Crown's rights, and does not refer explicitly to the Papacy. It merely adverts to the 'great and intolerable charges and exactions ... unlawfully taken' before the Royal Supremacy was revived. But it is Elizabeth's Injunctions (1559) which best reveal her government's concern to have the stamp of antiquity clearly embossed upon the Settlement.

These Injunctions are a revised form of the articles issued by Edward VI in 1547. And the revisions are significant, especially in the case of the Royal Supremacy. Edward's clauses

1. I Eliz. c.1, par.1 (S.R., IV, i, p.350).

2. Printed in Gee, op.cit., pp.46-65, where they are collated with those of Edward VI. These 1559 Injunctions were later supplemented by the Interpretations and further Considerations (1560), but they constituted the basic standard of ecclesiastical discipline for a long time to come, and were, as Gee points out, 'a very important document' in the Elizabethan Settlement (op.cit., pp.43-4).
are altered, seemingly with the utmost care,¹ to give greater emphasis to the idea of restoration;² and in addition, an
Admonition is appended to the Injunctions insisting that the supremacy doctrine is no novelty.

There is indicated here an added reason for Elizabeth's conservatism - one that made it even more guarded than Henry's. The progress of the Reformation in England had naturally heightened the 'new'-'old' dilemma, and the Injunctions reflect this changed state of affairs. The Admonition is meant as an apology for the Oath of Supremacy, made necessary, so it claims, by the 'perverse construction(s)' being placed on the oath by certain clerics.³ It is a clear rejoinder to papist charges of innovation and purports to clarify the Queen's intentions. Her plea is that she imposed nothing which had not been enacted by previous kings and that she was simply restoring its ancient prerogatives to the Crown:

---

1. Gee refers to a draft of the section on the Supremacy in Cecil's hand, which shows, he claims, the special care taken with it (op.cit., p.43). Parker, some years later, referred to Cecil as the chief author of the document (11 April, 1575, Strype, Annals, I, i, p.236).

2. Edward's injunction read: 'laws and statutes made as well for the abolishing and extirpation of the Bishop of Rome, his pretensed and usurped power and jurisdiction, as for the establishment and confirmation of the king's authority, jurisdiction, and supremacy of the Church of England and Ireland'. It was altered to read: 'laws and statutes made for the restoring to the crown, the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical, and abolishing of all foreign power repugnant to the same'. Gee, op.cit., p.47.

'For certainly her majesty neither does nor ever will challenge any other authority than that was challenged and lately used by the said noble kings of famous memory, King Henry VIII and King Edward VI, which is and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is, under God to the sovereignty and rule over all manner persons born within these her realms, dominions, and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them'. 1

Not surprisingly, this same claim is made explicit in the simplified oath which the government drew up for the clergy in 1559, as a test of their loyalty to the Settlement. It began:

'... /we7 do humbly confess and acknowledge the restoring again of the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical and spiritual to the crown of the realm, and the abolishing of all foreign power repugnant to the same ...' 2

The result was that Elizabeth's administration, stung by charges of novelty at a time when it was anxious to demonstrate its conservatism, even outstripped Henry in its practical insistence


2. According to Gee, it was decided not to administer the Supremacy Oath to the clergy in the form outlined in the statute. Instead, 'a summary form of subscription to the settlement of religion as set out in the Supremacy Act, the Uniformity Act, and the Injunctions' was prepared by the government, with Parker's help. Gee, op.cit., p.45. These words are from the oath administered to the clergy of the Northern Province, Gee, op.cit., p.77.
on the Royal Supremacy as a restoration of long-standing rights.¹

In its central proposition, therefore, the 1559 Settlement was pedigree-conscious. Though its over-all tone was assertive rather than polemical — and it was not the ambition of those who framed it to be more contentious than necessary in matters of religion - it patently argued an historical case because of what it affirmed about the monarchy. Its contention was that the Royal Supremacy restored an ancient, and religiously correct, order of things. And along with this of course, an even wider contention was advanced, on behalf of the Settlement as a whole. While frankly breaking with the immediate past, it too was declared a restoration of an authentic order of things: it was a setting forth of 'God's true religion';² and it took as its criterion 'the usage of the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ'.³ The official documents of 1559 are not as thorough-

¹ The first oath which Henry imposed in support of the Supremacy simply affirmed the fact that the king was Supreme Head, and abjured the Bishop of Rome's authority. 28 H. VIII, c.10, par.6 (S.R., III, p.665). Cf. the earlier ones, 26 H. VIII c.2 (S.R., III, pp.492-3); and 28 H. VIII, c.7, par.15 (S.R., III, pp.661-2), which bore principally on the succession. However, the single oath which eventually replaced these 35 H. VIII, c.1, par.7 (S.R., III, pp.956-7), while laying most stress on the fact of the supremacy, did advert to it as a restoration: 'by sufferance and abusions in times passed, they aforesaid have usurped and vindicated a feigned and unlawful power and jurisdiction within this Realm which hath been supported till few years past ...' (S.R., III, p.957). Here the claim is framed negatively. Elizabeth's simplified oath is more assertive.

² Injunctions, no. xli (Gee, op.cit., p.59).

³ I Eliz. c 24 (S.R., IV, i, p.398). The Injunctions also, in an appendix ("The form of bidding the prayers to be used generally in this uniform sort"), recommended prayer 'for Christ's Holy Catholic Church, that is for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Church of England and Ireland'. (Gee, op.cit. p.64). Henry, of course, had also claimed not to have separated England from the Catholic Church. Cf. Scarisbrick, op.cit., 200.
going as, say, Edward VI's in appealing to Scripture and the practice of the primitive church as the norms for the Crown's enactments. But they do occasionally refer to them. And the clergy were required to swear that the liturgical innovations imposed by the Act of Uniformity, the Prayer Book and the Injunctions were 'according to the true word of God, and agreeable to the doctrine of the primitive Church'.

Because it was necessary for Elizabeth not simply to make religious changes but to have them recognised as just changes sanctioned by precedent, the Settlement did advance, however hesitantly, its own version of the past. Essentially this had to do with the rights of the imperial crown. Intrinsic to it was an affirmation of papal usurpation, discreet though the statutes were about naming the Papacy expressly. And it championed the possibility of breaking with the established ways of Christian behaviour in order to revert, in the name of Christian principles, to an ancient, and better, order of things. In so

1. Injunctions, no. xxix. Elizabeth introduced a new injunction concerning the marriage of the clergy, which declared that 'there be no prohibition by the word of God, nor any example of the primitive Church, but that the priests and ministers of the Church may lawfully ... have an honest and sober wife ...

2. From the oath administered to the clergy of the Northern Province, Gee, op.cit., p.78.
doing the Settlement made qualified allies of those who, in varying degrees, stood for a return to primitive Christian practice and railed against Rome's abuses; and it created almost insuperable difficulties for Papists. By claiming the past for the Crown, it inevitably re-opened debates about the past between Reformer and Papist.

But the roots of the conservatism that officially characterised the Settlement were royal and (broadly speaking) cultural, not religious. Elizabeth's appeals to antiquity - continuous with the affirmation of kingship which the Settlement enshrined - owed more to the conventions of the age than to the theories of reform divines. They were patterned on techniques of self-justification that her Tudor predecessors, and pre-eminently her father, had both favoured and perfected; although the maturing hostility to innovation on the part of conservative churchmen (including some who had earlier supported Henry) did leave its mark on the Queen's stand. It is to these latter, the Marian bishops, that we now turn.
Chapter Two

PASTORAL CONSERVATISM: THE MARIAN BISHOPS

'... those that be too swift, (and) those that be too slow ...

(Sir Nicholas Bacon)

'It was merry in England afore the new learning came up; yea, I would all things were as hath been in times past'.

(Duke of Norfolk)
For the contemporary historian, John Foxe, and doubtless many others at the time, Elizabeth's accession and the making and enforcement of the new religious settlement proved surprisingly, almost miraculously, trouble-free: 'so calm, so joyful, and so peaceable, without any shedding of blood'.¹ In most respects the Queen's advisers turned out to be mistaken in their premonitions regarding the Papists: no external threats from the Catholic powers eventuated; there was no rebellion, no 'murder of Christian men, or treason'; and even overt acts of non-compliance with the Settlement were fewer than anticipated.²

The facts concerning the domestic opposition in 1558-9 have been well sifted, and yet balanced views of the situation are rare. Traditionally Roman Catholic scholars have acted as if they found the facts threatening, attempting to put as good a face as possible on the lack of resolute opposition among the lower clergy and laity particularly. On the other hand, admirers of the Settlement, if not exaggerating the extent of the papist rout in 1559, have frequently underestimated the achievements of the Marian restoration in the consciences of some Englishmen at least. Or so it seems to me.

One can grant the political ineffectualness of the Papists, from the bishops down, in the opening months of the reign. The action taken by the ecclesiastical leaders, in the Parliament and outside it, did little to halt the progress of the reforming legislation; and if it modified it, it was only indirectly, and in a way the churchmen themselves would not have wished. The lack of resistance on the part of the laity, both in the Commons and the House of Lords, is all too clear, contrasting markedly with the driving and effective activism of the reform-party. Whatever the final count might have been, the clerics who refused the Oath of Supremacy were certainly in the minority. There was no sustained or widespread opposition to the alterations from the populace. Not only were the Papists outmanoeuvred by the Queen and their religious opponents on the significant occasions, but there was something indecisive and overly-detached about them in the public arena. One thinks of them as torn between conflicting emotions: loyalty to the Crown, a deep-seated aversion to social disruption, their own fears, bewilderment before the ways of Providence, along with the need to remain true to personal ideals. From these issued a widely-observable fatalism that said (in the words of Archbishop Heath): 'There is nothing to be done, but everything to be endured, whatsoever God may will'.

And yet such a sentiment surely reflects strength, not weakness - the more remarkable in that it is now to be found in an Henrician churchman like Heath, a one-time supporter of the Royal Supremacy, who might well have confessed with William Paulet that he had cultivated the art of surviving Tudor sovereigns by modelling himself on the birch rather than the oak. While it would be a mistake to regard the emergence of this type of conviction as the result of the Marian restoration solely, it had developed, in some clerics at any rate, in the years between Henry's death and Elizabeth's accession, finding expression in, and doubtless being consolidated by, the return to the Roman allegiance under Mary.

One should perhaps say of the Marian revival that it had not managed to become a popular missionary movement: the people at large and the lower clergy may not have been notably affected by it, as the events of 1559 appear to suggest. But in certain eletist circles - in the universities, and among the higher ecclesiastics - it had had its successes, nourishing a conviction that Elizabeth herself almost certainly underestimated in hoping to win the support of some of the bishops for her moderate reassertion of the Supremacy. In the leaders of the clergy there had emerged a \textit{practical} conservatism, which caused them to oppose the return to a mitigated Protestantism quietly, soberly, and with the utmost courage. Its roots were of course multiple, and not all expressly religious. Before examining the expressions of that conservatism, in the deeds and statements of the episcopacy in 1558-9, it is worth looking a little more closely at the conditions that generated it.
On Elizabeth's accession the Bench of Bishops was sadly, even scandalously, depleted. No fewer than five sees (Salisbury, Hereford, Gloucester, Bangor and Oxford) were vacant. With the death of Cardinal Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of Norwich, Rochester, Bristol, and Chichester in the closing months of 1558, only sixteen sees were filled when the Parliament assembled. Of the surviving bishops, five were Henricians, and these of course included the senior members of the English episcopate: Bonner of London, Heath of York and Tunstal of Durham, all of whom had been deposed from office during the reign of Edward VI and reinstated by Mary. Thirlby of Ely and Kitchin of Llandaff were the other Henricians, and they had ruled under all three of Elizabeth's predecessors without interruption. The rest - if one includes Pate of Worcester, who had been named bishop by Paul III in 1541, without Henry's approval, remaining an exile in Rome until Mary's accession - were all consecrated during Mary's reign.

With this nice blending of Henricians and Marians, zealots, men who had suffered for their convictions under Edward and those who had managed to remain in office, aged prelates like Tunstal ('on the very verge of the grave', as he himself put it), 1 tired, moderate by nature and made tolerant by the years and, at the other extreme, Watson, the junior bishop, spirited and inquisitorial, the unanimity of the episcopate before the Settlement is all the more remarkable, especially as Pole's death had left them without their natural leader. What prompted their resistance?

1. Sanders to Moroni, op. cit., p. 36.
Self-interest immediately comes to mind as one possible explanation. The **Device** had anticipated ecclesiastical resistance to the alterations it was proposing, on the grounds that the 'bishops and all the clergy will see their own ruin' in them and conspire unscrupulously to preserve their status.¹ Their livings were one of the obvious stakes in the bishops' tussle with the Queen. The reigns of both Edward and Mary had brought a spate of deprivations; and with Elizabeth's accession the position of men like Bonner, who had replaced ecclesiastics deprived for Protestantism, was once again in jeopardy. But presumably the other bishops as well recognised that their continuance in office depended on the Queen's favour, and that their very title to their sees must be prejudiced if the realm formally broke with Rome. No doubt this knowledge gave an edge to the struggle. In itself, however, it does not account for the episcopal opposition to the Royal Supremacy. If a narrow self-concern were all that motivated the bishops, some of them at least could have been expected to press for a compromise, especially as the Queen herself was anxious for their support. A more attractive hypothesis would be that they were concerned for the clerical state as a whole, whose fortunes, as Goodrich correctly observed, had grown 'more tickle'² since Henry first asserted the royal rights over it, and which now, once more, were threatened.

---

2. Gee, op.cit., p.204.
That this was one of the cardinal issues in Catholic opposition to Elizabeth is suggested by the fact that it was almost exclusively the ecclesiastics who spoke out against her legislation. It is also shown by the last of the five articles drafted by Lower Convocation 'for the disburdening of their conscience and declaration of their faith' (and, be it noted, at the earnest instigation of their superiors also) in January-February 1559 while the first parliament was sitting. An unashamed declaration of clericalism, it stated that the authority to handle and define things belonging to faith, the sacraments, and discipline ecclesiastical had hitherto always belonged and should belong only to the pastors of the Church whom the Holy Spirit has set in the Church for this purpose, and that this authority does not belong to laymen.\(^1\) Strype has termed the first three of the Convocation articles - which relate to the Eucharist, and are simply a re-statement of the points set down for debate in the Oxford disputation of 1554 - 'the great criterion of Popery';\(^2\) but it is just as obvious that this assertion of clerical rights, along with the related assertion of Papal Supremacy (the fourth of the articles), was seen by the bishops as equally fundamental to their position in 1559.

---

   It is of interest that this was the only one of the five articles not approved by the two universities, Strype, Annals, I, i, p.81.

2. Strype, Annals, I, i, p.81.
Probably the full realisation of the impact of the Royal Supremacy on the clerical office had come only after Henry VIII's death. Playing shrewdly on lay resentment against the clergy, the King had at first used the national church as a pawn in his contest with the Papacy. Later he came to view it as a prize, and it was in the realm of finance that the English ecclesiastics first experienced the sting of the royal pretensions to headship over the Church. Only gradually, it seems, did they come to realise that their swiftly-felt loss of fiscal independence was but a token of a more far-reaching subjection to the Crown—the lesson not being driven home to them fully until after 1547 when the logic of the dead king's actions began to be ruthlessly applied in the reign of Edward VI. At this point it became apparent how successfully Henry had created something new while appearing to stay within the bounds of the old: the concept of 'a national church' had now patently been infused with a new meaning, with independence from Rome and from the ordinances, past and present, of the Church Universal leading to a drastically-heightened dependence of the clergy on King and Parliament at home. The latter, almost certainly, was the real rub, and a reason for the disenchantment of some who had previously supported the Royal Supremacy. For in effect the King's claim to jurisdiction over the Church was seen now to mean a ceding of the most sacred clerical rights to the King-in-Parliament, bringing the threat of lay dominance over all kinds of religious matters.
Symbolically enough, the petition of the bishops and clergy of the province of Canterbury to Cardinal Pole on the occasion of the formal reconciliation of the realm with the Holy See had been for the return of 'our jurisdiction and ecclesiastical liberty'. In that same year, remarks to the effect that the priests were coming back to take their revenge were "every-day commonplaces". This was largely true: Mary's reign witnessed the triumph of clerical reaction - the lost ground was temporarily recaptured, and the old claims to independence triumphantly reasserted.

There were difficulties in accomplishing this of course: the irony of the situation was that, in law, only the Queen-in-Parliament could return to the clergy the rights they believed were inherently theirs. At first Mary was hamstrung and embarrassed by her inherited title of 'Supreme Head'; she appears to have recognised it as an anomaly, and to have been open to a return of their jurisdiction to the clergy, from the beginning. Her first parliament did not remove that anomaly; although, in repealing the major religious enactments of Edward VI's reign and restoring the religious situation to what it had been at that King's accession, it did begin to re-assert


the independence of bishops in that they were no longer to be appointed by letters-patent.\footnote{I Mary, c.2 (S.R., IV, i, p.202).} After the considerable distraction of the Wyatt Rebellion, however, the Queen, overcoming her scruples, acted in her capacity as Supreme Head of the Church (ironically) to abdicate more of the Crown's rights over the clergy - in practice, if not statutorily.

Early in March 1554 Mary issued to the bishops a series of articles which translated the negative achievements of the Parliament into a pastoral programme of sorts, its chief purpose apparently being to safeguard the bishops' freedom of action in their dioceses.\footnote{Articles and accompanying letter in W. H. Frere and W. M. Kennedy, Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation, vol. 2 (London, 1910), pp. 322-9, see esp. p.234. Hughes comments: 'These royal Injunctions of 1554 are, in fact, no more than a warranty from the Crown that the bishop will not suffer any legal consequences for what he does to re-Catholicise his diocese ...' (op.cit., p.73).} The oath touching (as the Queen put it) 'the primacy, or succession' was no longer to be administered to clerics; and the episcopal style was no longer to include the clause 'Regia auctoritate fulcitus' with its implication that the bishops' jurisdiction derived from the Crown. Moreover, the Queen did something towards encouraging a renewed respect for the Canon Law in England. The first of her articles decreed that all bishops 'shall with all speed and diligence, and all manner of ways to them possible put in execution all such canons and ecclesiastical laws, heretofore in the time of King Henry the Eighth used within this realm of England, and the dominions of
the same, not being direct and expressly contrary to the laws and statutes of this realm'. In spirit at least, these enactments concede the principle of the clergy's independence from the Crown as this was understood prior to the schism.¹

The full legal restoration of clerical rights was achieved a few months later when the Parliament, 'for a declaration of (its) repentance' after the reconciliation with Rome in November 1554, passed the second statute of repeal.² To signal the nation's return 'home again into the right way' this act revoked the religious measures enforced by Henry after 1529, including the act for the submission of the clergy, which had made it impossible for Convocation to 'enact, promulge or execute any new canons' without the Royal Assent and had generally undermined the independent status of Church Law.³ With this measure the English Church technically regained its '... jurisdiction and ... liberty'. The right to legislate in ecclesiastical matters independently of statute law was exercised (if not exactly in a collegiate fashion, at least by the Papal Legate, Pole, and the bishops) first in the National Synod which began in November 1555, and subsequently in Provincial ones; and as well as this, the ecclesiastical courts once more began to function as they had previously done.

¹. Arts. 1, 2, 3 (Frere and Kennedy, op.cit., pp.324-5, cf. p.68).
². 1 & 2 Philip and Mary, c.8 (S.R., IV, i, p.246).
All of this represented a victory for the clerical party in Mary's cumbersome and sharply-divided Council - a party led by Gardiner in an unremitting personal feud with Paget, 'a shrewd and supple *homme nouveau*' (as Harbison calls him) who commanded considerable lay support, especially with the nobles and civil servants among the Queen's councillors. It was a challenge, not simply to Protestant feeling, but to the sentiments of prominent Catholic laymen also, particularly those who, like Paget and Petre, had amassed fortunes as a result of the dissolution of the monasteries. What the legal freeing of the clergy really symbolised was a blatant resurgence of clericalism in England, with the ancient clerical prerogatives being jealously and uncompromisingly reaffirmed by the bishops often in the face of Catholic resentment.

Beneath the almost aggressive appeals to the medieval canons (so much in evidence in the episcopal injunctions issued in Mary's reign) and the command of the Legatine Synod that the clergy expound the Canon Law to the laity, one sees the attempts to buttress clerical authority. In a famous sermon delivered in 1557 - described by Hughes as 'the nearest thing we possess to a public review of the quality of the Marian restoration ... made

3. Note, for instance, how Bonner's Articles frequently return to the medieval precedents (arts. 34, 44, Frere and Kennedy, *op.cit.*, pp. 338, 340).
by a contemporary who is an Englishman - Cardinal Pole saw the whole condition of the realm in terms of 'the going down of the authority of the church' under Henry and Edward and its restoration under Mary. A central point in the sermon is the need for obedience to the clergy: '...above all, obey their word speaking in God's name, whatsoever their lives be...'. And the legate roundly condemns the nation's past disrespect: '...you, above all other nations that I know, dishonoured the ministers of the church and priesthood itself ... you have gone further than any schismatical nation hath done, that ever I read of ...'.

The fruits of England's repentance for heresy and schism should be shown, according to Pole, 'by honouring again the law of the church, the order and authority of priesthood ...'. Reverence for the bearers of ecclesiastical authority is something that Pole's fellow-bishops found it necessary to insist on also.

And meanwhile, along with the panoply of ceremonial that spoke so eloquently of clerical privilege, there went the re-establishment of episcopal control over many areas of the Englishman's life - from the uncovering of heresy and the approval of writings on religious subjects down to the licensing of midwives and the supervision of schoolmasters. The extent to which this return

2. J. Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials relating chiefly to Religion and the Reformation of it ... under King Henry VIII King Edward VI and Queen Mary II (= Memorials, III, ii (Oxford, 1822), pp. 484-5, 488, 494.
3. See, for instance, Bonner's Injunctions, no. 27, cf. no. 30 (Frere and Kennedy, op. cit., pp. 368, 370).
to power was resented by the laity can perhaps be gauged by the opposition in the House of Lords to the reintroduction of the heresy laws late in 1554 (after the reconciliation), where, significantly, they were resisted on the grounds that they sought to establish clerical jurisdiction over the layman. 1

But it is in the attitude taken towards the church-lands confiscated by Henry VIII that the clericalism of the leading Marian churchmen, and the main reason for lay hostility, most clearly appear. Pole's intransigence in this matter was one of the factors that delayed his arrival in England and the reconciliation of the realm with Rome. Forced ultimately to accept the impossibility of a wholesale return of these lands to the Church, he proved to be a graceless loser, continuing to press home his attacks against those in possession of them, thereby creating a great deal of ill-will. '(Pole's) Christmas present to the nobility of England' in 1554 2 was to sign, on Christmas Eve, a document conceding that the possessors of the lands 'may without scruple of conscience enjoy them, without impeachment or trouble by pretence of any General Council, canons, or ecclesiastical laws, and clear from the dangers of the censures of the church'. 3 But there were barbs in this concession:

3. I & 2 Philip and Mary, c.8, patt.9 (S.R., IV, i, p.246). Landholders in both Houses had wanted the Papal dispensation included in the statute itself, see Harbison, op.cit., p.216.
the main one being that the matter of title to the lands was left vague here, their owners being made to feel that if they did enjoy them it was by the continuing grace of the Apostolic See and that, in strict equity, the onus was on them to return the lands freely or at least share the fruits of them with the Church. Pole kept the wound open.

As late as 1557 the Cardinal was still threatening the punishments of God on those who retained church-lands. This denunciation, from a sermon delivered on the anniversary of the reconciliation in that year, deserves to be cited in full because of the animus it reveals on the part of the ecclesiastic, allowing us also to guess the kind of sentiments it must have aroused in the owners of such lands, and doubtless in other laymen also.

'... this I say to you now, that by licence and dispensation do enjoy, keep, and possess such goods and lands of the church, as were found in your hands, that this was done of the church your mother's tenderness unto you, considering your imbecility and weakness, after so sore a sickness that you had in a schism, at the which time your appetite served you to no meat but to that fruit that came from the land of the church, and by that you lived. Which she was content you should keep still, and made promise it should not be taken from you, and so it was left in your hand, as it were an apple in a child's hand, given by the mother, which she perceiving him to feed too much of, and knowing it should do him hurt, if he himself should eat the whole, would have him give her a little piece thereof; which the boy refusing, and where as he would cry out if she would take it from him, letting

him alone therewith: but the father her husband coming in, if he should see how the boy will not let go one morsel to the mother, that hath given him the whole, she asking it with so f'air means, he may, peradventure, take the apple out of the boy's hand, and if he cry, beat him also, and cast the apple out of the window. This may Christ the husband do, if you show such unkindness to your mother, which is his spouse.

She asketh that she knoweth should hurt the child, and do her great good, because she is indeed in a manner famished, and what unkindness to give her nothing?

Can her spouse be content with such ungratefulness? - especially knowing, that though you deny it her, yet she of herself will never constrain you further. But this I trust you will do, when you by his grace waxing a little stronger, your appetite shall be returned to its natural course'.

Pole himself was, of course, notably doctrinaire as far as church-rights were concerned. Not all the hierarchy would have supported him totally in his stand over the lands. Yet one can accept the proposition that there was substantial unanimity among them regarding the recapturing of the clergy's prerogatives, which went forward steadily between 1553 and 1558, with the Queen's backing and the support of the clerical party in the Council. A key ingredient in their outlook, one suspects, was the higher ecclesiastics' resentment and uneasiness at the way laymen had come to arbitrate in religious matters, particularly in the reign of Edward VI. The same distrust was there in 1558-9 when the bishops were confronted with a likely return to what they regarded as unwarranted interference in the clergy's business.

One thinks of the fifth of the articles framed by Convocation; and of the remark which Tunstal is reputed to have made before Elizabeth's Council:

'Do you think that for me, who as a priest and a bishop have taught the faith for more than forty years, it would be right, after such practice and experience, on the very verge of the grave, to accept a rule of faith from laymen my juniors?'

No doubt there were other factors influencing the bishops' stand. One might hazard the suggestion, for example, that constancy was virtually forced on them by the Marian persecutions. For whoever is to be held finally responsible for making the first move in what Elton calls that 'distressing game of chess', the clerical leaders were widely blamed for the repression. After the very first of the religious executions (that of Rogers), Renard, the Imperial Ambassador, reported:

'Some of the onlookers wept, others prayed God to give him strength ... not to recant ... others threatening the bishops.... The haste with which the bishops have proceeded in this matter may well cause a revolt.'

Not all (and possibly very few) of the bishops had much taste for persecuting, yet they sanctioned the executions and, if

---

1. Sanders to Moroni, op.cit., p. 36.
only indirectly, their attitudes fostered them. Though even Foxe could grant of Pole that 'he was none of the bloody and cruel sort of Papists', the legate was absolutely uncompromising in his view of heretics:

'there cannot be a greater work of cruelty against the commonwealth, than to nourish or favour any such heretics. For be you assured, there is no kind of man so pernicious to the commonwealth as they be; there are no thieves, no murderers, no adulterers, no, no kind of treason to be compared to theirs; who, as it were undermining the chief foundation of all commonwealth, which is religion, maketh an entry to all kinds of vices in the most heinous manner ...'.

It was the teaching of Pole's Legatine Synod that it was the bishop's task to deter, if need be, in order to preserve the faith. And Pole himself subscribed to the type of estimate that appears to have produced the executions in the first place:

England was not a nation overrun with heretics, but rather 'a nation uninfected, where some few teachers came to spread errors' - the implication being that to do away with these latter would be to remedy the situation.

3. '... docendo, monendo, hortando, ac si opus fuerit, deterrendo...', Reformatio Angliae, fol.14v.
4. Burnet cites this statement as Pole's without reference (G. Burnet, History of the Reformation of the Church of England, ed. N. Pocock, II (Oxford, 1865), pp.479-80). Schenk also accepts its authenticity (op.cit., p.157, n.30). Pole had expressed the view that it was the leaders of heretical movements who should be dealt with, first of all at the second session of the Council of Trent on 7 January 1546; and later in his introductory speech at the National Synod (Schenk, op.cit., p.143. Cf. Burnet - Pocock, op.cit., II, p.480).
Gardiner was of the same mind. The success achieved by the recantation of Northumberland at his execution early in the reign had probably convinced him that, if an example could be made of a few prominent heretics, the mass of those merely disaffected would soon submit. The reintroduction of the heresy laws became one of the prime aims of Gardiner's clerical party and, whatever the Chancellor's attitudes may have been when the executions began to multiply, that group must bear a good deal of the responsibility for the tragic happenings in the last three years of Mary's reign. Their policy of political conciliation and religious severity proved a disaster to the Catholic cause, the fruits of it being reaped when Elizabeth (who benefited from their political indulgence) ascended the throne, and the bishops — now thoroughly compromised by the ferocity of the persecution — stood helpless before her.

How the persecution affected the situation of the bishops in 1559 can possibly be estimated by considering the case of one of them, Thirlby of Ely, a Henrician bishop (the first, and only, bishop of the see of Westminster, erected as a result of the dissolution of the monasteries) and an adroit compromiser who even managed to survive Edward's reign without losing the see of Norwich. Thirlby's great patron and friend had been Cramer, but in 1556 he took part in the ritual of the archbishop's degradation. 'He was observed to weep much all the while; he protested to Cranmer that it was the most sorrowful action of his

1. Loades, art.cit., p.58.
3. On the policy of the clerical party, see Harbison, op.cit., p.223.
whole life, and acknowledged the great love and friendship that had been between them; and that no earthly consideration but the Queen's command could have induced him to come and do what they were then about. Thirlby could be considered representative of those bishops who had no stomach for burnings, but without necessarily taking anything more than a formal part in the persecutions, he was stained by them and, one would suspect, changed by them. It is difficult to see how men associated (even if only by reason of their office, and against their own feelings) with so severe and public an enforcement of a code could ever again publicly abjure that code. Certainly Thirlby did not do so in 1559. Though once again faced with a queen's command, on this occasion he resisted it.

Perhaps circumstances like the persecutions contributed to the bishops' obstinacy in 1558-9, but my main contention is that it was a practical conservatism which really prompted their opposition to the Settlement. By this I mean that their own experiences, far more than their theological reflexions, had taught these churchmen to distrust the Royal Supremacy doctrine, and indeed, any religious innovations, but especially those authorised by the Queen-in-Parliament. This conclusion is borne out, I think, even when one examines the theoretical assertions of the Papacy's rights over the national church which these clerics had sponsored in the previous reign.

1. D.N.B., s.v. "Thirlby".
There is no reason to question the sincerity of such utterances. The return to the obedience of the Apostolic See in Mary's reign, and the acceptance of the doctrine of Papal Supremacy as the Council of Florence had formulated it, were not simply perfunctory acknowledgments, at least as far as the leading ecclesiastics were concerned. Admittedly, to those mainly responsible for the reconciliation with Rome - the Queen herself, Gardiner and Pole - the project had in it something of the vendetta as well as of the crusade. But though their motives for asserting it may have been mixed, their fealty to Rome was sincere; and one can assume the same of their chosen collaborators, the bishops.

Sick and alone, hectored by Cromwell (telling her she was the 'most obstinate and obdurate woman, all things considered, that ever was') and even advised by Chapuys to do so, Mary Tudor had submitted to Henry's commissioners at Hunsdon in 1536, accepting the King's Supremacy and abjuring the Pope's, as well as acquiescing to the invalidity of her dead mother's marriage. But Mary remained as convinced of the Pope's authority as she was of her own legitimacy, the two causes being subtly intertwined (naturally enough) in her case. In the letter which Pole wrote to Julius III immediately on hearing of Mary's accession to the throne, he admitted that she, along with the rest of the nation, had consented to the schism, but he was sure she would now recant.


And even before the formal reconciliation of the country with Rome in November 1554, in the period when she was persuaded by Charles V of the need to compromise and delay the full implementation of the religious settlement she desired, the Queen, by her actions, had formally acknowledged the Papal Supremacy. She showed herself to be genuinely scrupulous about the use of the title 'Supreme Head', consulting the legate about the matter within a few weeks of her arrival in the capital; and she was equally troubled over the canonical difficulties of appointing new bishops, writing first to Pole on the subject in February 1554 and finally sending a letter in her own hand to Julius III, in April of that year, begging him to give his confirmation to the consecrations which Gardiner had performed some days earlier. According to Pastor, this was the Queen's first solemn acknowledgment of the Papal Supremacy, and Julius read the royal letter, with many tears, five times to the assembled Cardinals.

As legate, Pole was of course unremittingly zealous in promoting the cause of Papal Supremacy, being in some respects even more anxious than Julius himself to have the Henrician statutes repealed quickly. He once wrote that the reunion of England with Rome 'is and has been these many years my greatest desire, as it is my daily prayer'.

dedication was more the result of his opposition to the Royal Supremacy than of a genuine and positive penetration into the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy - but there can be little doubt that his acceptance of the latter was completely sincere.

Pole certainly had his personal reasons for wanting to see Henry's religious legislation reversed: as he admitted in a letter to Edward VI: 'Henry ploughed me up with the heavy ploughshare of his persecution' and 'deprived me of all that was dear to me'; and one sees in what his contemporary, Starkey, termed the 'frantic judgment' of Pole's Defence of the Unity of the Church how deeply his own feelings were bound up with his effort 'to render Peter's bark safe against any piratical attack' in 1536. On the other hand, Pole had never been enamoured of Rome and as one of the select committee which had produced that extraordinary document, Consilium de Emendanda Ecclesia, at the Pope's request in 1537, he presumably subscribed to the outspoken criticisms of the Papacy which it contained. Even so, Pole had become a convinced Papist: like Thomas More, whom he so deeply admired, he changed his view of the papal authority in the thirties, finally holding it to be of divine origin - doubtless as a result of having to reconsider the matter, given the situation in England; and possibly also because (as his biographer suggests) he

1. Schenk, op.cit., p.86.
2. Cf. Schenk, op.cit., pp.67, 72, and esp. 87, n.22.
was then finding new hope in the apparent rejuvenation of the Papacy. As a Cardinal, he loyally served a succession of Popes and in 1549 came within one vote of being elected to the Papacy himself. By this time he was thoroughly committed to the view that, in God's design for the Church, it was the Papacy 'that holdeth up all'.

Estimates of Gardiner's part in the reconciliation with Rome vary. Burnet once maintained that it was he who persuaded the Emperor to try to moderate the Queen's religious heat, yet he was anxious to have the reconciliation proceed, and have Pole promptly received into the country as papal legate. Politically, the clerical party were looking to Rome rather than to Brussels; and in spite of the fact that Gardiner had been Henry's chief apologist for the Royal Supremacy, his conversion to the Pope's cause by 1554 seems genuine. Pole accepted it as such, in a letter of March 1554; and the Louvainists (no doubt relying on the evidence of Thomas Harding, Gardiner's chaplain) later accepted it also - it is Stapleton who recounts his dying words: 'Negavi cum Petro, exivi cum Petro, sed nondum flevi cum Petro'. Two days

after the reconciliation, in the presence of Philip and Pole, Gardiner preached at Paul's Cross, taking as his text 'Now is the time to arouse from sleep' and denouncing the schism. Along with those of other Henricians, his views would appear to have changed.

Quite apart from the sincerity of those who sponsored it, however, what needs to be estimated is the quality of the English reassertion of the Papal Supremacy in Mary's reign. To judge from what is probably the principal, and most authoritative, clerical utterance on the subject - the decree of the National Synod - one could only say it was a mechanical, and somewhat lifeless, assertion; devoid of any notable theological insight, being predominantly legal in tone; and that it was curiously over-generous. The Synod's central teaching with regard to the Papacy is no more than a literal reiteration of the teaching of the Council of Florence. Conveniently noting that it is chiefly on the matters of the Sacraments and the Papacy that Englishmen have erred during the schism, it simply goes on to reproduce the Decree for the Armenians. In spite of the stormy debates of the previous decades, no doctrinal elaboration is attempted and there are no polemical


2. Reformatio Angliae,fols. 6r-10r. The Decree for the Armenians was the Bull, 'Exultate Deo', issued by the Council of Florence on 22 November 1439. Text in Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decretal, ed. J. Alberigo etc. (Freiburg, 1967), pp.510-535.
justifications of the Romanist position. Admittedly, doctrine is not normally the main preoccupation of synods; the emphasis, traditionally, is on church-discipline, and in 1555 there was a pressing need for the English Church to concern itself with this. But convened (as it put it) to 're-form' a deformed Church after years of schism, the National Synod can justly be accused of adopting a casual, almost lazy, attitude towards the doctrine of the Papacy. Its authoritarian and reactionary stance suggests theological aridity.

What is emphasised most by the Synod is that the English Church stands with Rome; and the expressions of this determination strike one as being unusually servile. If the nation must know 'which doctrine to follow, and which to flee', then, say the bishops,

'we reverently accept and embrace all of that faith which the Holy Roman and Apostolic Church holds and teaches'.

'With pious affection we accept ... all of those books or traditions relating to faith and ecclesiastica discipline which the Holy Roman Church has approved to this day, and now receives, or which it shall subsequently approve and receive ...'.

The tone is that of a protestation: the nation's faith has been called into question; and so, rather too amply, it asserts its dedication to the Church Universal, past, present, and future, in order to put its loyalty beyond doubt. The sincerity is unmistakable; and yet the terms of the declaration seem mechanical, as if the need to specify and delineate - or even to justify in rational or theological terms - is not recognised.

1. *Reformatio Angliae*, fols. 5V - 6R.
But in one respect the views of English churchmen on the Papacy had deepened appreciably. The twenty years between Henry's break with Rome and the reconciliation had given some of them at least (including the most prominent) time to estimate—as it were, pragmatically— the advantages of belonging to the Church Universal and the dangers of attempting to steer an independent course in religious matters. If not on highly theological grounds, then at least on practical ones, they had become convinced of the importance of reuniting the English Church with Rome and of retaining the ancient ecclesiastical discipline. And they would have genuinely believed this to be in the nation's interest.

The very fears of the Marian Bishops— which show up all too clearly in the efforts at repression, or in the pessimistic estimates of the nation's youth made by Marian preachers and others— are one slight indication of this. The churchmen were preoccupied with dangers, and therefore prone to put their trust in authoritarianism in an effort to stamp out what Bonner termed 'the maintenance of carnal liberty'.

Yet another symptom of the outlook I refer to is the zeal with which the ecclesiastics insisted on the 'return to (the) ancient religion' or 'the old laudable custom of the Church'.

1. For instance, Reformatio Angliae, f.15; Bonner's Injunctions, no.21, cf. Bonner's Articles, art.112 (Frere and Kennedy, op.cit., pp.356, 366-7); Pole, in Strype, Memorials, III,ii, pp.497ff.

One needs to dwell a little on the detail to realise just how total was the restoration they envisaged and worked to implement. It was not simply a return to the ancient orthodoxy that was contemplated. Even more rigorous, if anything, was the insistence on the ancient ceremonial and discipline - or, to use their hallowed word, 'custom'. Some months in advance of the first Statute of Repeal, the Latin service was restored, at least in London. With the repeal of the Edwardian statutes, clerical celibacy was once again mandatory, Mary's articles referring to it as 'the laudable custom of the Church'. Receding Edward's Injunctions, frequent processions were re-introduced, 'after the old order of the Church in the Latin tongue' - Pole taking care to add, for the benefit of the students of Cambridge, the rubric: 'reverenter orando et cantando et non confabulando'. Preachers must return to the time-hallowed subjects: '...the Articles of the Catholic faith; the Ten Commandments expressed in the old law, the two commandments of the Gospel ... the Seven works of Mercy; the Seven deadly Sins ... the Seven principal Virtues; and the Seven Sacraments of the Church'. The Sacrament must be reserved in the ancient manner.

2. Art.7 (Frere and Kennedy, op.cit., p.327).
3. Art.18 (Frere and Kennedy, op.cit., p.419). Re processions, see Mary's Articles, art.11; Brooks' Articles, art.25 (Frere and Kennedy, op.cit., pp.327, 406).
5. Bonner's Articles, art.47 (Frere and Kennedy, op.cit., p.341).
The old religious practices were once again insisted on; holy water, holy bread, palms and ashes reappeared; and in general parishioners were exhorted to reassume their pre-Reformation obligations. The intransigence of these prescriptions is remarkable in the light of the nation's recent past, and sometimes they reveal an equally surprising insularity, 'In no way touched', as Hughes remarks, 'by the new habits which, for a generation now, had been fostered in Spain and in Italy', the episcopal injunctions of Mary's reign simply seek to lead the nation back to an ancient order of things - perhaps to put beyond all question the nation's orthodoxy; but also, I think, because English churchmen had convinced themselves there were enormous dangers in even the slightest deviation from the traditional.

Pole was one who weighed the past in terms of profit and loss to the nation and claimed to find the balance tipped in favour of 'the ancient doctrine'. Working always from the assumption that religion is 'the foundation of the commonwealth',

4. Hughes, Rome and the Counter-Reformation, pp.74-5, where he contrasts Bonner's Injunctions and the decrees of Trent on the practice of frequent Communion.
he could argue that it 'should have been to the utter undoing of
the realm, if our return to our ancient religion had been deferred
any longer'. Painstakingly he traced (in his sermon of 1557) the
steps in the nation's ruin, seeing in the declaration of the Royal
Supremacy the opening of the door to disaster - the disaster of
spiritual decay. With the break from Rome, he said, 'the
foundation /i.e. of the commonwealth/ began to move'; this /unity/
alone broken, the gate was set open to Satan to break all the rest,
and bring in to the church here, what pernicious opinions he list;
as the succession showed he did'. The fruit of disobedience had
at first seemed sweet, but time has proved differently, 'giving
you space in the mean season to prove and taste the bitterness of
the fruit received by the swerving from the unity of the church'.

Thomas More, according to Pole, had, with 'an instinct
that the fear of God put in his mind', forseen the ultimate
outcome of a denial of Papal Supremacy. To Anthony Bonwise he
had revealed his premonitions, even before the schism began.
He foresaw that, in spite of the King's defence of the sacrament,
faith in the Eucharist would decay in the realm if unity were
broken. This, to the Marian churchmen, was one of the proofs
of decay (perhaps the final one), that the Blessed Sacrament should
be reviled by the people and belief in the Real Presence and the
sacrificial character of the Mass mocked. There is no mistaking
the sincerity of Tunstal, for instance, when, in his Injunctions

for the Durham Chapter, he cites the declining faith in the Eucharist as proof that faith in Christ has slipped in England and an evil tempest has descended on the land. John Jewel accurately gauged the situation when he wrote of the Papists to Peter Martyr, early in 1559: 'Vident erepto illo palladio the Mass omnia ventura in periculum'.

The conservatism of the bishops owed much to their own fears - not for their personal safety or position, but of the practical consequences of the Royal Supremacy. In 1559 they believed they understood clearly what those consequences were: the undermining of clerical rights first of all; but also the erosion (as they saw it) of the most sacred and fundamental tenets of Christianity - and with this, the subversion of the social order. Even to take one step in the direction of liturgical innovation independently of Rome was to court disaster. The recent past, in their estimation, proved it. As pastors and men of affairs - not as divines - they had been drawn to recognise in the Papacy a foundation-stone 'that holdeth up all'. Perhaps this made them more intransigent Papists than theoreticians might have been.

1. Tunstal's Injunctions, no. 4 (Frere and Kennedy, op. cit., p414).
2. Jewel to Peter Martyr, no date (some time after April 1559), Zurich Letters I, appendix, p.14.
3. Cf. Sanders' account of the words Heath is reputed to have addressed to the Queen: '... great mischief accrues to the State from frequent changes, even in the laws relating to the administration of justice. How much less then ought alterations to be attempted in religion, where evidence of antiquity was accounted so great a commendation?... To call in question such sacraments, after such a length of time, and to do this in a kingdom in which, by a manifest marvel of God's providence, the late schism was but just removed, how could this fail to be injurious to the queen herself, grievous to the citizens and perilous to the whole kingdom?', Sanders to Moroni, op. cit., p.26.
The bishops' opposition to religious change was made manifest in a series of well-known incidents early in 1559. At first, with only the likelihood of a new ecclesiastical settlement before them, the churchmen resorted to warnings, perhaps hoping to check the tide. Very soon, however, a more drastic stand was called for as Elizabeth, in advance of the law, demanded modifications in the liturgy, at services in the Chapel Royal and also on more public occasions. With this, the episcopal resistance showed signs of becoming concerted, revealing itself also as totally uncompromising on matters of principle, although remaining discreet and respectful of the law. As hopes died there was room only for gestures; and the bishops made their point manfully and with dignity. Later of course, they had some opportunity to dispute the terms of the Settlement openly, voicing the reasons for their opposition to it both at the Westminster Disputation and in the Parliament. And when the Oath of Supremacy came to be administered to them, all, with the exception of Bishop Kitchin, refused it and were deprived of office.

The story is a familiar one and hardly needs to be reconstructed here, except for those details which draw attention to the bishops' conservatism. For the concern of this study is not purely with the leading churchmen's opposition to the Settlement, but with their rejection of it as an innovation.
This repudiation of religious novelty came through at each phase of their clash with the government and its supporters—characteristically, in deeds as much as in theological argument.

In the very first weeks of the reign the episcopal attacks on 'innovations' commenced. Tuning her pulpits from the outset, the Queen had appointed her chaplain, William Bill, to preach at Paul's Cross on 20 November.₁ Bill was a known sympathiser with the reform doctrines; he had been deprived of his office as master of Trinity, Cambridge, in 1553. In fact, it was his successor in that office, Christopherson, now bishop of Chichester, who replied to Bill's sermon on the following Sunday. No doubt there was personal animus in the exchange, but Christopherson voiced the papist opposition to 'novelty'. 'Believe not this new doctrine', he urged. 'It is not the gospel, but a new invention of new men and heretics'.²

₁ Sandys to Bullinger, 20 December 1558, Zurich Letters, I, p.4; Machyn, Diary, p.178; Strype, Annals, I, i, p.50. Cf. also Cecil's memorandum, drawn up on the day of Mary's death, recommending this, Strype, Annals, I, i, pp.6-7.

Pollen, however, disagrees, claiming the sermon must have been on 27 November (and Christopherson's a week later) as Elizabeth was still at Hatfield on 20 November, English Catholics, p.19, n.3.

² Sandys to Bullinger, loc.cit. Sanders in his report to Cardinal Moroni does not mention Christopherson's sermon, but does refer to sermons by Scott of Chester and Bayne of Lichfield and Coventry, on 'the unity of the Church, ... the blessed Eucharist and the pope's supremacy, op.cit., p.25, esp. n.1.
The truculent but able bishop of Winchester, John White, returned to the theme a fortnight or so later when preaching the oration at Queen Mary's funeral. White has been described, with some justice, as 'more of a theologian than a courtier'; and though he did not question Elizabeth's title to the crown or speak disparagingly of her (as has sometimes been claimed), his words on this occasion were scarcely calculated to win him the royal favour. He warned his distinguished audience of the dangers of abandoning their 'first profession as members of Christ's catholic church', and gave notice of ecclesiastical resistance to 'the wolves .. coming out of Geneva, and other places of Germany'. Moreover, he lauded Mary for having purged the realm of heresy, and for having refused to describe herself as 'head' of Christ's church - 'Which title', he said, 'never no prince, a thousand and five hundred years after Christ, usurped'.

Correct or not, White's forthright interpretation of the past was the prelude to a royal embargo on all preaching. He himself was temporarily imprisoned (as Christopherson had been), and later arraigned before the Council; and before the end of December the Queen had issued a proclamation commanding her subjects to 'forbear to preach or teach, or to give audience to any manner of doctrine and preaching'. This was partly

1. D.N.B., s.v. 'White'.
2. Strype, Memorials, III, ii, pp.539, 542, 546. The sermon was delivered on 13 December, text in Strype, op.cit., pp.536-550; see also Jewel's (second-hand) summary of it, Jewel to Martyr, 26 January 1559, Zurich Letters, I, p.7.
3. Queen's proclamation concerning preaching, 27 December 1558, Steele, op.cit., I, p.52.
aimed at preventing unauthorised Protestant ministers from resuming their duties and causing unrest. But, of course, it silenced Catholic voices also: even in their own dioceses, the bishops were now unable to preach, unless they happened to be authorised by the Queen to do so - which was highly unlikely. It was Bill, not a bishop, who preached at the delayed obsequies for Charles V on Christmas Eve; Cox preached at the opening of Parliament; and other Marian exiles - described by Il Schifanoya with such high disdain - gave the Lenten sermons at Court during February and March.

Accordingly, in the months between Christmas and Easter the bishops were forced to resort to gestures in order to signify their resistance to religious change. And they did so quite effectively, emulating (although scarcely matching) the histrionics of their Queen. There was one minor ritualized clash between Elizabeth and episcopal conservatism in the Chapel Royal on Christmas Day. 'The bishop of Carlisle', according to one contemporary report,

'sang high mass, and her Majesty sent to tell him that he was not to elevate the Host; to which the good Bishop replied that thus had he learnt the mass, and that she must pardon him, as he could not do otherwise; so the Gospel being ended, her Majesty rose and departed, and on other days it has been so done by her chaplains'.


The Queen's independence of 'the old form' of the liturgy and
the ecclesiastics' determination to adhere to 'the custom of the
Catholic Church' were nicely symbolized by the incident,\(^1\) which
was followed by a far more serious act of resistance when the
bishops refused to cooperate in the Queen's coronation in January.

Although all the facts concerning the bishops' participation in the coronation are not entirely clear, it is certain that they declined (virtually as a body) to take part in the rite of anointing the new monarch. With the see of Canterbury vacant, the privilege of performing the consecration would normally have been Archbishop Heath's. However, he and the other senior prelates withheld their cooperation; and it was only at the last minute that one of Heath's suffragans, Bishop Oglethorpe, a very junior member of the hierarchy, agreed to do the anointing. In addition, it appears that all the bishops - Oglethorpe included - refused to celebrate the Coronation Mass.\(^2\)

They of course attended the service of anointing (which was the

---

1. The terms are from contemporary accounts of the incident, see C.G. Bayne, "The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth", *English Historical Review*, XXII (1907), p.662, n.47, sections i, iv.

2. II Schifanoya to the Castellan of Mantua, 23 January 1559, *Ven.Cal.*, VII, p.17. For a detailed discussion of all the evidence, see Bayne, art.cit., passim. Bayne was originally of the view that Oglethorpe celebrated the Mass - that is, he followed the account of the so-called 'English report' of the coronation in preference to II Schifanoya's. Later he reversed this opinion, "The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth", *English Historical Review*, XXIV (1909), pp.322-3. Cf. H.A. Wilson, "The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth", *English Historical Review*, XXIII (1908), pp. 87-91.
opening part of the coronation); and did homage to the Queen in
the traditional manner after its completion. But according to
at least one report of the ceremony - that of the Romanist
historian, Nicholas Sanders - at a later stage of the proceedings,
when the Eucharist proper began, the bishops actually withdrew
after they saw 'the queen had introduced a novelty' by changing
'part of the ancient rite in the celebration of the Mass'.

For her part, the Queen used the ceremony to signal
her intentions also: as well as having the elevation of the Host
omitted at the eucharistic service, she apparently disregarded
the traditional protocol by making the bishops do homage, with
their mitres off, after the lords temporal. Behind the
elaborate ritual the clash of wills went on, anticipating the
later struggles in the Parliament. Yet it seems fair to
interpret the action of the hierarchy as a conscientious stand,
rather than as an overt political gesture. According to
William Allen (writing in 1584), the churchmen refused to anoint
Elizabeth because they feared 'she meant either not to take the
oath, or not to keep the same, which all Christian kings (and

episcopi tamdiu affuerunt donec aliquid de ritu antquo
Sacrificii Missae immutatum videbant. Introduxerat quippe
regina novum genus Missae, ut hostia consecrata populo
adorando non proponeretur'. Likewise Feria, the Spanish
Ambassador, is said to have refused to attend the coronation
because 'alguna alteracion' was to be made that shocked him.
Instead, as a sign of deference, he merely accompanied the
Queen to the door of the Abbey. See Bayne, English
Historical Review, XXIV (1909), p.322.

2. Cf. Bayne, English Historical Review, XXII (1907), p.670,
n.89.
specially ours in England) do make in the Coronation, for
maintenance of Holy Church's laws ...'; and there was some
doubt in their minds as to whether she would even agree to be
anointed with the sacred chrism. Moreover, they were
obviously determined to resist royal-inspired innovations
in the liturgy at all costs, though they must have realised
that their cause would suffer because of their intransigence
on this solemn, and politically-important, occasion.

Changes like those demanded by Elizabeth at this
stage - notably the omission of the elevation - hardly amounted
to what Sanders called them: 'novum genus (Missae)'. Yet one
can understand the bishops' opposition to them, not for what
they were in themselves, but for what they symbolised: a
departure from universal church-law, on merely local authority,
and lay authority at that. The manner of their introduction
was the crucial point for the Papists; and in this context any
change to the liturgy would have seemed equally bad. An

1. From True, Sincere, Modest Defence of English Catholics,
cited Birt, op.cit., p.36, n.1.
2. Birt, loc.cit.
3. The Calendar account reads: 'the bishops not having chosen
to say Mass without elevating the consecrated Host, as that
worthy individual did /Dr. Carew, the Queen's chaplain/,
Il Schifanoya to the Castellan of Mantua, 23 January 1559,
Ven.Cal., VII, p.17. See however, G. Lockhart Ross, "Il
Schifanoya's Account of the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth",
English Historical Review, XXIII (1908), p.533. The real
words of the despatch read: "non havendo voluti gli vescovi
celebrare senza levare il corpo di Christo, ne consecrare
l'hostia con le parole Englesi ...", which of course suggests
that the use of the vernacular at the consecration may also
have been an issue.
additional factor, however, was the implication that elevating and worshipping the Sacrament was sacrilegious: this presented a challenge both to the traditional faith in the Real Presence and to the time-hallowed practices of Christians. Those who wished the elevation abolished were passing an adverse judgment on the Church's past, threatening defined faith, and wanting to take the Church's law into their own hands as well.

Their practical gestures of non-compliance with the Queen's personal wishes regarding the liturgy already convey the essence of the bishops' stand on the matter of change. Obviously the churchmen were unequivocally opposed to all alterations, however slight they might be. Even minor tamperings with established ritual in the relative privacy of Elizabeth's chapel were unacceptable. This suggests that they were chiefly concerned with the issue of legal competence: whose right was it to institute religious changes? The nature of the changes envisaged was of less significance to the bishops, it would seem, than this question. Both their gestures and Elizabeth's - vesting trifles of protocol and of liturgical propriety with such a high seriousness - show the issue of authority to have been central to the differences over religious alterations, whether these involved breaking with Rome formally or merely omitting certain rubrics from the ritual of the Mass.

Perhaps other factors impinged on the bishops' stand also: they seem to have become especially sensitive to the
dangers of any innovations in the Eucharist. In the light of the contemporary debates regarding the Real Presence and the Mass, even the smallest change in ritual was likely to be interpreted as having doctrinal significance. No doubt their intransigence reflects this, and also a social conservatism, in that the churchmen were sensitive to the disruptions which religious uncertainties had already caused in the commonwealth. For reasons proper to them as pastors, therefore, they were doubly inclined to make 'novelty' anathema. To label the doctrines of their opponents 'new' (as we have seen Bishop Christopherson doing) was to pass a final condemnation on them.

The bishops' practical attitudes found a measure of theological expression in 1559 - first of all in the articles of the Convocation, which have already been referred to as something the prelates persuaded the lower clergy to endorse. The five propositions are of course no more than a summary statement of the conservative clerical position. They merely say that what the body of the clergy accepts is the 'old' Mass and the old order of things, where Pope rules supreme and authority in religious matters belongs where it 'has always belonged' - with the pastors, not the laity. There are no explanations or defence. Indeed, the tone admits of no dispute. However,

1. Strype, Annals, I, i, p.81. Sanders says of the bishops in the Parliament: 'When any controversial questions arose in Parliament, the Archbishop of York ever protested that it ought not to be debated there, but in Convocation, by the bishops and not by the laity', Sanders to Moroni, op.cit., p.32.
magisterial assertion was quickly turned into argument with the
government's decision to sponsor a conference that would
(supposedly) thrash out the propriety of the projected religious
legislation.

We cannot know precisely where the idea for it
originated, but, according to the semi-official record
(published soon after it occurred), the Westminster Disputation
was devised by Elizabeth and her Council;¹ and certainly it was
staged - or perhaps, more accurately, stage-managed - under the
closest government supervision. No doubt the Queen's motives
for sponsoring this conference were mixed, and were predominantly
tactical - in spite of The declaration's pious reading of the
monarch's 'godly and most Christian purpose'.² Positively, it
was probably meant to serve as propaganda for the Settlement,
and further delude the Queen's potential enemies into believing
that she was still wavering and anxious to conciliate the
opposing religious parties.³ Negatively, and even more

1. The declaracyon of the procedynge of a conference, begon
   at Westminster the laste of March, 1559 (London, 1559),
   printed also in Cardwell, History of Conferences, pp.25-9.
   The reference here is Cardwell, op.cit., p.25.
3. Cf. II Schifanoya to the Castellan of Mantua, 11 April
   1559: 'The poor Catholics believed that the affair was
   to proceed loyally, without the deceit and fraud which
   were finally discovered'. (Ven.Cal., VII, p.64).
Several recent historians have described the Disputation
as a propaganda display: Neale, Elizabeth I and her
Parliaments, I, p.71; J. E. Booty, John Jewel as
obviously, it was designed to counter the bishops who were proving (as Jewel put it, on 20 March) 'a great hindrance' in the Parliament.¹

The circumstances of the Disputation point pretty clearly to this latter intent. The decision to hold it was taken around the middle of March, when the bishops' unequivocal opposition to the government's religious programme had been made plain and it was obvious that Parliament would have to pass its legislation without the assent of any of the lords spiritual. The three propositions set down for debate artfully put the bishops on the defensive: the first claimed it was against the word of God, and the custom of the ancient church, to use a tongue unknown to the people in common prayer and the administration of the sacraments; the second that every church has authority to appoint, take away, and change ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites, so the same be done to edification; while the last asserted it cannot be proved by the word of God that there is in the Mass offered up a sacrifice propitiatory for the quick and the dead.²

---

¹ Jewel to Peter Martyr, 20 March 1559: 'The bishops are a great hindrance to us; for being, as you know, among the nobility and leading men in the upper house, and having none there on our side to expose their artifices and confute their falsehoods, they reign as sole monarchs in the midst of ignorant and weak men, and easily overreach our little party, either by their numbers, or their reputation for learning ... In the mean time, that our bishops may have no ground of complaint that they are put down only by power and authority of law, a disputation is determined upon ...' (Zurich Letters, I, p.10, cf. p.27.)

² Cardwell, op.cit., pp.24-5.
the prelates, and also diverted them from appealing to the authority of the Church Universal by setting up Scripture and testimony of the ancient church as the true criteria of theological propriety. As well as this, the rules of procedure for the debate put the churchmen at a further disadvantage.¹

It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the Disputation was engineered to undermine the bishops' claim that the traditional Catholic practices were 'in possession'. There was a trap in the government's invitation: had the prelates refused to debate, then, of course, this would have been used against them; whereas simply by agreeing to argue with the reform divines, in the presence of the nobility and the members of the Parliament (who naturally were made to appear the arbiters of the whole debate), the bishops lost valuable ground. Almost inevitably the occasion would have symbolized the churchmen's abdication as sole judges of religious policy.

It was only after the conference began that the bishops seem to have realised what an impossible position they were in. Some of their complaints (made on the second day)

¹. For instance, it was resolved that the bishops should speak first, 'because', as The declaration says, 'they were in authority of degree superiors' (Cardwell, op.cit., p.26). Sanders also complains that it was decided that 'Lutherans should take the judges' seats' (Sanders to Moroni, op.cit., p.26). Sir Nicholas Bacon, the Lord Keeper, was moderator.
about the arrangements for the discussions appear to have been fully justified. But even these worked strongly in Elizabeth's favour: their refusal to continue was used to discredit the prelates; the bishops of Winchester and Lincoln (the ablest of the eight Catholic participants) were committed to the Tower, and the rest held in recognisance; while the swiftly-produced report of the Disputation laboured the 'default and contempt' of the bishops. Jewel commented on the outcome, which was a tribute to the government's astute planning. 'It is altogether incredible', he said, 'how much this conduct has lessened the opinion that the people entertained of the bishops'.

1. According to the transcript of the proceedings of the second day which Foxe provides, the bishops complained (a) that they had been given only two days warning of the Disputation; and (b) that there had been unnecessary confusion about the procedure to be followed in the debate (Acts and Monuments, VIII, pp. 688-9). I am not inclined to attribute much weight to the first of these complaints: even Sanders agrees that the bishops were given six days to prepare for the debate (Sanders to Moroni, op.cit., p. 26); and Jewel's letter to Peter Martyr, written 20 March, suggests that they knew about the debate even earlier (Zurich Letters, I, p. 11, cf. p. 14). However, it does seem likely that the bishops were (perhaps deliberately) confused about the proceedings, and especially in the matter of tendering written submissions (Sanders to Moroni, op.cit., pp. 27, 29).

2. Jewel to Peter Martyr, 6 April 1559 (Zurich Letters, I, p. 16). It was once said, by Strype and others, that Bishops White and Watson, the unruly disputants at Westminster, had openly threatened to excommunicate Elizabeth either on the occasion of the Disputation or soon afterwards. Roman Catholic historians have tended to dispute this, Dodd-Tierney arguing, for instance, that had there been any threat, Foxe would certainly have mentioned it (op.cit., 2, p. 135, n. 2). A.F. Pollard seems to dismiss the idea of a threat as a misunderstanding, due probably to Camden (D.N.B., s.v. "Thomas Watson"). C. G. Bayne, however, believes such a threat was envisaged by the two bishops, but that they were dissuaded from making it by Heath (Anglo-Roman Relations, 1558-1565 Oxford, 1913, p. 53, n. 41).
Both parties in the Westminster Disputation later spoke of it as an abortive debate: for the Protestant participants it was 'an useless conference', 'the disputation that should have been';\textsuperscript{1} while it was the plea of their opponents that they had gone to Westminster to debate and had been prevented.\textsuperscript{2} The only real victor was the Queen; not only did the conference help to rout the clerical party for her, but it showed she could count on the support of the newly-returned exile divines, many of whom were personally dissatisfied with the religious settlement which Elizabeth was currently proposing to implement.

As the 'troubles' abroad during Mary's reign had shown, exile had nurtured a radicalism in some of these divines that made even the terms of the final Edwardian settlement unacceptable.\textsuperscript{3} Like Thomas Sampson, presumably, they stood for 'an entire reformation in all ecclesiastical functions', with the Queen conceding to a new clergy 'the right of ordering all things according to the word of God, both as regards doctrine and discipline, and the property of the church'; and were not prepared to accept ecclesiastical office until that

---


3. There is ample evidence of this in the disputes over the liturgy which arose among the exiles abroad during Mary's reign, see A brieff discours off the troubles begonne at Franckford (1575), the most accessible edition being that of E. Arber (London, 1908).
happy state of affairs had first been achieved. Even the more moderate, who did not reject Elizabeth's settlement on principle, accepted it only as an interim measure, groaning meanwhile at the Queen's dalliance with true piety. In March 1559 there was considerable reason to doubt whether Elizabeth could press such zealots into the service of the settlement, turning them into spokesmen who could hide their own dissatisfactions and uncertainties and speak with a common voice.

Yet the Disputation showed the Queen had won the exiles - or enough of them to begin to implement her policies. Almost all the Protestant disputants at the conference were Marian exiles. Wooed by the hopes for a better future which Elizabeth was always so successful in keeping alive in her subjects, and helped by carefully-framed propositions which made it possible for them to forget their differences as they set about confounding Papistry, they effectively volunteered their services as apologists for a settlement which they did not thoroughly admire.


2. V.g. Jewel to Peter Martyr, 16 November 1559 (Zurich Letters, I, p.55).

3. Neale cites the clerk's record of the meeting: 'Mr. Horne, Mr. Cox, and other Englishmen that came from Geneva ...' (Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, I, p.72). The Protestant disputants were: Cox, Scory, Whitehead, Jewel, Grindal, Horne, Aylmer and Guest - with Sandys included also by Foxe (op.cit., p.679, n.1). Of these only Guest had not been an exile.
The alliance led to a muzzling of theology, as the propositions set down for debate at Westminster suggest. To win the united support of the exiles no less than to confound the Marian churchmen, they were all framed polemically and given an anti-Rome bias. They also took up points of ecclesiastical discipline rather than doctrine and were sharply focussed on the liturgy. In short, the questions proposed for Westminster neatly skirted the issues likely to divide the reform-minded and brought to the fore some of their less disruptive points of agreement.¹ For their part, the exile-divines were at pains to speak with a united voice there - no doubt in the hope of winning the Queen's patronage.² It might certainly be argued that in resolutely cutting their coat according to Elizabeth's cloth, they fashioned for themselves a strait-jacket.

Protestant submissions on two of the three propositions survive: the first, signed by all eight of the disputants, was read by Horne on the first day of the conference; the other, on the second proposition, was not read, as the Disputation had broken down over procedural issues before it could be considered.³

¹ See Maitland's comments on the three propositions set down for debate. He notes, for instance, that the third point exposed the Papists to 'the united force of Lutherans and Helvetians', for the Real Presence was not explicitly referred to in it, and questions as to the mode of presence could be avoided, Cambridge Modern History, II, p.568.

² The submission which Horne read was signed by the eight Protestant disputants (Cardwell, op.cit., p.62). The bishops, on the other hand, did not give the same impression of unanimity, as the events of the second day showed. They were more careful in the Parliament, cf. Sanders to Moroni, op.cit., p.32.

Both show the exiles sanctioning the terms of the Settlement on theological grounds, and discreetly identifying their own position with that of the proposed legislation. The propositions were so framed, of course, that the gospellers were required to attack rather than defend. Horne's lucid and restrained contribution, for instance, keeps to the point of showing that the use of an unknown tongue in the liturgy is contrary to Scripture and ancient custom. But, inevitably, an assertion intrudes into his remarks: a return to the vernacular is implicitly declared to be a 'return to the first original of St. Paul's doctrine, and the practice of the primitive catholic church of Christ'. The matter is mandatory in fact, for he does not believe that the choice of language in the liturgy can be judged an indifferent thing - a revealing comment on the adiaphorism of these particular divines.

The second paper is even more direct in its defence of the principles on which the Settlement was based. It asserts the right of the 'particular church' to institute or change ceremonies, artfully equivocating about such contentious matters as who has the authority to rule the particular church, and the

2. Cardwell, op.cit., p.58.
3. The submission speaks of unprofitable rites being 'abrogated and removed by the authority of a particular church'; but goes no further than to imply that the authority 'to dispose things to edification' belongs to the bishops (Cardwell, op.cit., pp. 79, 89).
binding force of the decisions of general councils. In addition, it dwells on the advantages of ecclesiastical diversity - 'that the liberty of the church may remain'; strongly presses the case against the 'unprofitable and superstitious rites' of Papists. But above all, it contributes a rationale of religious change to bolster Elizabeth's claim to be restoring an ancient and authentic order of things to the English church.

This submission points not merely to the fact of change in the Church, but to its inevitability. And though there is some ambiguity about the precise limits it sets, it certainly understands the scope for change to be large. As it says: 'anything, that cannot necessarily be gathered out of the word of God, may be changed'. The chief area of concern here is, of course, the Church's liturgy. The submission appears to say that some things in the Church's liturgy are correctly held to be immutable - but only those which 'have their original from God', meaning those that are expressly or

1. The submission says that it acknowledges (with St. Augustine) General Councils as 'right wholesome in the church' (Cardwell, op.cit., p.92). However, it is often possible for particular churches to see things that are hidden from General Councils (p.78); and such assemblies are held only infrequently (p.75) - in fact, there were none in the first 300 years of the Church's history (p.91). During that time 'every province ruled' their own churches according to the scriptures, only with the help of provincial councils (ibid.). The submission promises that the matter of General Councils will be dealt with later (p.92).


3. Cardwell, op.cit., p.89.

(to use its careful phrase) 'by necessary deduction or consequence' commanded in the Scripture. The rest - rather misleadingly referred to under the generic title of 'rites and ceremonies' - are simply human institutions, and as such are fated to become corrupted with the passing of time.

The exiles' view of the Church's past is apparently dictated by a view of man, in which mutability is made synonymous with decay. Because man's nature is 'mutable and corrupt', then

'...all ordinances devised by men are subject to mutability, and ready to receive corruption. And therefore albeit they /the ceremonies of the church/ were well, and upon some godly zeal received at the beginning, yet afterwards, by little and little, they fall to abuse'.

There are no rites so holy that they cannot be corrupted; and the submission traces the ways in which this process of liturgical decay has occurred in the Church. Indeed, the paper makes it plain that the whole state of the Church has become corrupt - the reason being that when the Popes aspired to 'the unjust primacy', the criteria of Christian behaviour were distorted, and men clung to a soulless ritual 'rather for a public recognition of their subjection to the monarchy of the see of Rome than for any edification'.

2. Cardwell, op.cit., p.77.
Such arguments parallel, and amplify in a more explicitly theological context, the view of the past taken in the parliamentary statutes and Elizabeth's Injunctions. The question of the Royal Supremacy was never directly referred to at the Westminster Disputation - in fact one gets the impression it was studiously avoided, both by those who framed the propositions for debate and by all the participants, Gospellers and Papists alike. Yet the exiles' version of the Church's corruption, while not substantiating the royal claims, at least provided a kind of contextual verification of them; and of course, it stamped the exiles as the Queen's allies in any anti-papal campaign she might see fit to launch, and in the task of justifying, theologically, the liturgical aspects of the Settlement.

The alliance between the more moderate of the exiles and the Crown (which is equivalently signalled in the Westminster Disputation) had important consequences for the Settlement. They were to become its theological defenders; and in a very real sense, the theological complexion of the Settlement was determined by what they could say on its behalf, and by what they could not say. If, for instance, the strong assertion of Royal Supremacy in the Parliament's statutes is not reflected in the theological debates which followed the Settlement, this is partly due to the awkward situation the moderate exiles were in - that is to say, their own hesitations are mirrored in the debates. So, too, are their certainties. The defence of the Settlement became something the original statutes were not explicitly, even
violently, anti-Papist. Similarly, the reformers' convictions about the church's past were to amplify the view taken in the official formulae already referred to, with the Settlement being polemically justified as 'catholic' and as a legitimate return to ancient usages.

In the Disputation, the Gospellers angered the bishops by unequivocally claiming to be the sons of 'the true and catholic church of Christ'. Horne's words were principally an assertion of the reformers' own orthodoxy, but, by implication, they already asserted as much on behalf of the proposed legislation. One may speculate about what Elizabeth's statutes formally conveyed by claiming that the Settlement was a setting-forth of God's true religion. It might be argued that they meant only that the enactments were legitimate - sanctioned by Scripture and ancient usage - without necessarily condemning other styles of religious behaviour. Statutes were normally discreet about making condemnations: for instance, even the Edwardian act that introduced Communion under both kinds - doctrinaire though it was about declaring this practice to be 'more agreeable both to the first institution of the said Sacrament ... and also more conformable to the common use and practice both of the Apostles and of the primitive Church ...' - was at pains to point out that it was 'not condemning hereby the usage of any Church out of the King's Majestys Dominions'.

2. I Ed. VI c.1 (S.R., IV, i, p.3). See also 2 & 3 Ed. VI c.21, regarding the marriage of priests (S.R., IV, i, p.67).
Men like Horne, however, were less qualified. For the exiles at Westminster, the claim to catholicity was exclusivist, even though their views about the particular church, and the advantages of ecclesiastical diversity, might, logically, have seemed to demand a greater tolerance of them. If they were the sons of the true and catholic church, then the Papists were not. 'By the catholic church', said Horne, 'we understand not the romish church ...'.

This intransigence was, of course, fully shared by the Papists; and it steered the debates about the Settlement along a definite line. Seeing their positions (even with regard to the minutiae of the liturgy) as antithetical, both sides would be at pains to show that they, and only they, represented authentic Christianity. It was already clear at the Westminster Disputation that the liturgical practices of each party were going to be scrutinised relentlessly, with antiquity being acknowledged by both as a prime criterion of authenticity. Though Scripture remained their chief norm, the exiles were ready to contest the past with the Papists also: they declared they stood for the ancient faith contained in the three creed; and they were prepared to justify their positions

1. Cardwell, op.cito, p.56.
2. See, for instance, the first of the propositions, which encouraged this type of scrutiny.
by appealing to the customs of 'the church when it was most pure'. The appeal to the past was intrinsic to the Gospellers' claim to be 'catholic'; but they saw it, above all, as a polemical necessity, virtually forced on them by the attitudes of their opponents. The second submission concedes as much:

'many men nowadays stay themselves chiefly upon the decrees of old councils, and the writings and judgments of the doctors and fathers ... forasmuch as our adversaries will stand most upon those grounds, we have thought it good to match them with their own weapons, and in that field wherein they think themselves best appointed /viz. the authority of the doctors, and the examples and practice of ancient churches/'.

Only one submission on the propositions was made by the Marian ecclesiastics; and it was delivered, not by a bishop, but by Dr. Henry Cole, a former Protestant sympathiser who had recanted in 1553 to fill various important offices in the Marian church, ultimately becoming Dean of St. Paul's and Vicar-General to Cardinal Pole. Cole was, in fact, the first to speak at the Westminster Disputation, but did so without a written text. It was only some days later that this was produced, at the insistence of the authorities. Cole's words were directed, of course, to the first of the three propositions, his central contention being that the use of Latin in the liturgy is 'convenient, and (as the state of the cause standeth at this present) necessary'.

1. Cardwell, op. cit., p.87.
2. Cardwell, op. cit., p.76.
Tilting at the way the proposition was framed, Cole insists that the issue is not to be judged from the words of the Scriptures alone, but from the practice of the Church. As it happens, says Cole, 'there is no Scripture manifest against this our assertion and usage of the church'. But even if there were, yet 'it is not to be condemned that the church hath received'. In several instances, the Church, 'moved by the Holy Ghost', has even seen fit to abrogate practices positively and expressly enjoined by Christ and the Apostles.

'By all which examples, and many other, it is manifest, that though there were any such scripture which they pretend, as there is not, yet the church, wherein the Holy Ghost is alway resident, may order the same, and may therein say as truly, "Visum est Spiritui Sancto, et nobis", as did the apostles; for Christ promised unto the church, that the Holy Ghost should teach them all truth, and that he himself would be with the same church unto the world's end'.

As Augustine said, the Church, in this phase of the economy of salvation, is forced to tolerate much that is evil; but it never approves that which is contrary to faith or the good life.¹

To move away from the use of 'the learned tongue' in the liturgy is, thus, to pass an adverse judgment on the Church: the Church as it was, and the Church that is present. It means breaking unity, and falling into 'a fearful and dangerous schism' - something that every Christian man is bound, under pain of damnation, to avoid. And, as Cole sees it, such an enterprise

¹ Cardwell, op.cit., pp. 64-6.
means setting a private judgment above the wisdom of one's forefathers in the faith. In a passage that brings us to the crux of his objections against the projected changes, he laments 'the intolerable boldness of such as will enterprise without any teacher (yea, contemning all doctors) to unclasp the book, and thereby, instead of eternal food, drink up present poison'.

Christian living demands docility of us. Fidelity consists in standing fast to the traditions of the ages; and Cole claims great antiquity for the use of Latin in church services: it 'being universally observed through the whole church from the beginning'. According to Cole's reading of the 'ancient historiographer(s)', none of the founders of the churches in the West ever conducted services or administered the sacraments 'in their own vulgar tongue'. The only exceptions he recognises are preaching, and the administration of matrimony.

One sees here the type of assertions against which the reformers were reacting. In essence, the Papists were insisting that the inviolability of the Church - present and past - be recognised, even at the expense of the clear words of Scripture, if necessary. Acknowledging virtue only in conformity with the teachings of the ancients, they of course

2. Cardwell, op.cit., p. 68.
claimed droit de cité for their practices on the grounds of 'long continuance of time', and laboured the dangers of substituting a private judgment and breaking with the nation's, and Christendom's, past.

Texts of several speeches given by the bishops in the Parliament survive, and they are probably authentic. Strype has printed four of them, two on the Supremacy statute which he attributes to Archbishop Heath and Bishop Scott of Chester, the others, on the bill of Uniformity, being identified as the contributions of Scott once again, and John Feckenham, Abbot of St. Peter's, Westminster. These strike one immediately as the reflexions of men of affairs. They are not untheological; and certainly, they are not devoid of religious conviction. Conscience speaks unmistakably in all of these interventions. One looks in vain for traces of political scheming, or even cynicism and disillusionment. But the words of the bishops are blunt rather than scholarly. For the most part social consequences of the proposed legislation engage their attention more than theological niceties - a reflection of the circumstances in which the speeches were delivered, obviously; yet also, I think, a genuine indication of their sentiments as pastors.

In speaking to the Royal Supremacy, for instance, Heath shows himself to be both hard-headed and loyal. He speaks feelingly of his obligations to the Crown (as does Scott in his speech on the same bill); and he has no illusions about the personal qualities of the current Pontiff, who, he says, 'hath declared himself to be a very austere stern father unto us, ever since his first entrance into Peter's chair'. But he proceeds to elaborate on what England must lose - the words 'forsake and flee' recur in connection with each of the four points he makes - by breaking with the See of Rome. It will mean rejecting all the General Councils of the past, including the four most ancient (Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon), which are 'approved of all men, doubted or denied of no man'; repudiating all canonical and ecclesiastical law; spurning the judgment of all Christian princes; and destroying unity, which is always dangerous. 'By our leaping out of Peter's ship', says Heath, 'we must needs be overwhelmed with the waters of schism, sects and divisions'. Indeed, such a step is self-destructive: it means forsaking the nation's heritage, for

'... we have received no other gospel, no other doctrine, no other faith, no other sacraments, than were sent us from the church of Rome ...'.

2. Strype, op.cit., p.400.
The other speeches are full of similar warnings. Changing the liturgical services, according to Bishop Scott, and thus shattering the unity of Christ's church, can only lead to social disruption. It is charity that joins citizens together in one, 'which bond being loosed, we must needs fall one from another, in divers parties and sects, as we see we do at this present'. The old religion, says Feckenham, 'doth breed more obedient, humble and better subjects: first and chiefly unto our Saviour and Redeemer; secondly, unto our sovereign lady the queen's highness, and to all other superiors'.

In Mary's reign men lived 'in an order':

'The subjects of this realm, and especially the nobility, and such as were of the honourable council, did in queen Mary's days know the way unto churches and chapels, there to begin their day's work, with calling for help and grace, by humble prayers, and serving of God'.

Now however, fealty is threatened:

'... children are degenerate from their natural fathers, the servants contemptors of their masters' commandments, the subjects disobedient unto God and all superior powers'.

One might say the dominant concern here is for security: the security of society, its institutions and traditional virtues; and of course the security of the nation's faith particularly, which alone safeguards the salvation of the individual. Notions of this kind even intrude into the bishops'

discussion of the competence of Parliament to sanction religious change. The dangers are what Scott alludes to, for instance, when raising this issue: if faith is made to 'hang upon an act of parliament', then, says the bishop, 'we have but a weak staff to lean unto', for statutes change, and often quickly. Moreover, the matters to be decided are too weighty for the Parliament: one fears its conclusions can only be ill-advised.

'Now, my lords, consider, I beseech you, the matters here in variance; whether your lordships be able to discuss them according to learning, so as the truth may appear, or no: that is, whether the body of Christ be by this new book consecrated, offered, adored, and truly communicated, or no; and whether these things be required necessarily by the institution of our Saviour Christ, or no; and whether book goeth nearer the truth. These matters, my lords, be (as I have said) weighty and dark, and not easy to be discussed; and likewise your lordships may think of the rest of the sacraments, which be either clearly taken away, or else mangled, after the same sort by this new book'.

Remarks such as these provide us with the proper context in which to situate the bishops' appeals to antiquity in their speeches in the House. Feckenham, Scott, and Heath all make these appeals - the first two particularly. The Abbot of Westminster, in commenting on the proposed liturgical legislation, accepts the idea that 'two sundry kinds of religion' confront the nation. The dilemma is to decide which is true and which counterfeit; and to resolve the issue Feckenham proposes antiquity as a sure

The true religion is that possessed of the greater antiquity; the one that is observed in the Church by all men, at all times and seasons and places — a 'stayed religion', steadfast and consistent with itself.¹

Referring to the same bill, Scott opposes the innovations on the now-familiar grounds that change would mean 'unadvisedly condemn(ing) our forefathers and their doings'. And he continues:

'This we know, that this doctrine and form of religion, which this bill propoundeth to be abolished and taken away, is that which our forefathers were born, brought up, and lived in, and have professed here in this realm, without any alteration or change, by the space of 900 years and more; and hath also been professed and practised in the universal church of Christ since the apostles' time. And that which we go about to establish and place for it, is lately brought in, allowed nowhere, nor put in practice, but in this realm only; and that but a small time, and against the minds of all catholic men. Now if we do consider but the antiquity of the one, and the newness of the other, we have just occasion to have the one in estimation for the long continuance thereof, unto such time as we see evident cause why we should revoke it; and to suspect the other as never heard of here before, unto such time as we see just cause why we should receive it, seeing that our fathers never heard tell of it'.²

The safer thing is to stand by what is established, for there assurance in numbers and long continuance of time: there can be no cause to doubt 'matters determined and practised in the holy catholic church of Christ by three hundred thousand bishops,

and how many more we cannot tell.\(^1\) Our 'schoolmasters', says Scott, are 'our forefathers in the catholic church': there are fifteen centuries behind us, while our opponents' teachers are no more than fifty years old.\(^2\)

Again, the emphasis is on security; and antiquity (say the bishops) provides it. Doctrinal considerations certainly lay behind this appeal to the past: consistency was all-important to these churchmen because innovation meant passing judgment on the Church of the past, with the implication that the Universal Church could err or promote what was unchristian - a proposition which they considered their faith in a divinely-supported Church contradicted.\(^3\) Moreover, disrespect for one's forefathers in the faith meant the introduction of that 'intolerable boldness' - or private judgment - which was the very antithesis of belief. In the estimation of the churchmen, reverence, not questioning, was the proper accompaniment to faith; and this doctrinal (or perhaps better, moralistic) notion also fed into their appeals to antiquity.\(^4\) But the strongest overt ingredient in such appeals, on the lips of the Marian prelates, was of a cautionary, rather

\(^1\) Strype, op.cit., p.439.
\(^2\) Strype, op.cit., p.422.
\(^3\) V.g. Cardwell, op.cit., p.72.
\(^4\) Strype, op.cit., p.439.
than of a theological, nature. The ancient ways were safe; the new unproven and suspect. Being practical men, alive to dangers, their tendency was to equiparate the true with the secure. In this way, their own brand of conservatism coloured the bishops' often-heroic refusals to countenance 'any new doctrine' in the realm.  

Rationalized and made formal, the bishops' conservatism expressed itself in theological formulae which had been commonly used in English debates for some decades prior to 1559. Attempts to justify the traditional positions on the grounds of their antiquity had become a standard ploy for papist divines - both the easy recourse of the prelates to this type of argument in the Parliament, and the remarks of their opponents at the Westminster Disputation, suggesting as much. But this polemical technique was one that had developed out of the reformation debates, both in England and abroad. In fact, its emergence signifies a kind of turning-point in the progress of the reformation movement - a fact I would like to illustrate sketchily (referring only to the English scene) in order to situate the Marian ecclesiastics and their theological claims.

Looking at the appeals to Christian antiquity made by those who opposed the reformers - that is, their arguments from the Church Fathers, the ecclesiastical writers of (roughly) the first seven centuries, and also from the teaching and practice of the Church of that period - one might say they fall

2. The patristic age is commonly regarded as ending with John Damascene, who died in 749.
into two categories. What differentiates them chiefly is the purpose they are intended to serve. The testimony of antiquity is sometimes used to refute and sometimes to justify - a pedestrian distinction perhaps, but an important one, for, broadly speaking, the two activities coincide with the phases of the Catholic response to the reformers. Naturally, the two phases are continuous: the second has its roots in the first and emerges from it - so the chronological limits of each are difficult to set precisely. Yet there is a noticeable difference between the arguments of the first English opponents of the reformers and those of their colleagues in, say, the reigns of Edward and Mary; and the papist appeals to antiquity can be seen to assume a rather different function in each case.

Theological refutation was clearly the overriding aim of divines like Bishop John Fisher, Sir Thomas More, and Henry VIII himself, in the polemical works they composed during the twenties and early thirties. These were, of course, the first English interventions in the reformation debates and were predominantly anti-Lutheran. As early as 1521 the King and the bishop of Rochester saw fit to oppose Luther; and when the latter replied, More was drawn into the discussion, although


Fisher remained the principal English spokesman for orthodoxy, contributing a number of treatises that establish beyond all doubt his stature as a theologian. The bishop continued his attack on the continental reformers with a work against John Oecolampadius in 1527, while More, from 1529 onwards, wrote tracts in the vernacular against the English dissidents, Tyndale, Fish, Barnes and Frith.

All of these works were concerned with the repudiation of heresy. Secure in their own position (or so it seemed), but alive to the dangers in the situation and (above all, perhaps) stirred by a deep-seated horror of heterodoxy, the public figures who wrote them must have thought of themselves as cauterizing the body of Christendom — one recalls Thomas More’s oft-quoted remark about treading heretics down like ants.

1. J. Fisher, Assertionis regiae defensio (1523); Assertionis lutheranae confutatio (1523); Sacri sacerdotii defensio contra Lutherum (1525); in Opera, reprint of 1597 edition (Farnborough, 1967).


3. T. More, Dialogue concernynge heresyes (1529); The supplicacion of soules (1529); The Confutacyon of Tyndales answere (1532); A letter ... impugnye the erronyouse wrtyngye of John Fryth (1532); The answere to the fyrst parte of the poysened booke, whych a namelesse heretyke hath named the souper of the Lorde (1533), in Workes (London, 1557).

Their struggle was against doctrinal error within the Christian ranks; and remaining focussed on the question of truth or falsehood, they used - with varying degrees of expertise, of course - the traditional methods of theological demonstration to make their case. That is to say, they appealed to the 'authorities' recognised by the scholastics, treating them in much the same way as the scholastics had done.

There was one significant difference, however, and it stemmed from Luther's efforts to restate the accepted criteria of theological validity. Though it was heavy with implications in many spheres - including those of hermeneutics and exegesis - Luther's principle of *Scriptura sola* was interpreted by his opponents chiefly as an attack on the authority of the Church, past and present: and it led writers like Fisher and More to expatiate on the need to refer to the views of the Fathers and the testimony of antiquity in order to establish the true sense of Holy Writ.

Both of these divines reject the view that the Scripture needs no authoritative interpreter. Along with other opponents of the reformers, they find the written Word of God to be 'dark and obscure to senses unexercised' - 'a sweet

---

pure flower, whereof spiders gather poison and bees honey'.  

More refers to the difficulties in interpreting the Scriptures.  

And as a preamble to one of his major works against Luther, Fisher expounds 'the ten truths' which he considers ought to govern all theological discussion. They amount to this: only heretics appeal to the naked text of the Scriptures; in all controverted matters it is necessary to go to the Church, for the Spirit has been sent to Christ's Church to make us certain of the truth when errors arise; and

that Holy Spirit has hitherto used, and always will use, the orthodox Fathers to extirpate heresy, and instruct the Church fully on issues that are doubtful'.

As he says in another place, 'what is the doctrine of the church but the doctrine of the fathers'.

It will be seen that Fisher's principles are as much concerned with the Church of his day as they are with the Church of the first centuries. 'Fathers', in this context, would seem to be a synonym for 'the pastors, or prophets, of all ages'.

1. S. Gardiner, A declaration of such true articles as George Joye hath gone about to confute as false (London, 1546), fols. lxxxii r, lxxxiv r.
4. J. Fisher, A sermon had at Paulis (London, 1525), Sig. F i V.
These are the men the Spirit used to lead the Church and instruct it in the meaning of God's Word; and their voice is heard pre-eminently in the decisions of General Councils.¹ The implication of the bishop's argument is, of course, that the decisions of the present-day hierarchy must be heeded. But while he may not be attributing any unique authority to the statements of the early 'orthodox Fathers', Fisher does, in practice, set exceptional store on their opinion when it comes to resolving disputed interpretations of the Scriptures. That is to say, their judgments are no less authoritative than those of the present-day Church; they are protected from error by the Spirit.² And for the purposes of theological verification, they have a special importance: contrary to what Luther suggests, their version of the Scriptures must be considered binding.

The testimony of Christian antiquity has an added significance for Fisher and More, in that they both accept the notion that some things have been said, done and taught by God which are not contained in writing.³ Firstly, says Fisher,

¹ Fisher, Assertionis lutheranae confutatio, Opera, cols. 290f.
there are 'apostolic traditions', not alluded to in Scripture, which must be observed by all Christians; and secondly, there are 'customs' received by the Universal Church which have to be similarly revered.¹ For evidence of these one needs to consult the practice and statements of the primitive Church. That the believer should refer to 'the consistent judgment of the holy fathers and the faith of the whole Catholic Church rather than his own opinion' is, according to Thomas More, a postulate 'no less evident to the Christian than the geometrical postulates of Euclid are to the philosopher'.²

This theoretical insistence on the value of the patristic witness provided the basis for all subsequent appeals to antiquity on the part of the Romanist divines. But for the first English opponents of Lutheranism, this was the statement of a principle rather than the formulation of a programme. To refute Luther they argued the importance of the Fathers. The consent of the approved interpreters of Scripture, and the public custom of the Church, were declared to be suitable criteria for resolving theological questions.³ Yet when it came to actual debate, their techniques for handling the Fathers

1. Fisher, Assertionis lutheranae confutatio, Opera, cols. 293-5.
remained the conventional ones. That is, these early polemicists made no special attempts to establish historically the agreement of the Fathers on particular questions. Texts of 'authorities' were still examined in isolation (and given the kind of symbolic importance which medieval theologians had attributed to them), the emphasis, as I have said, being on theological refutation rather than on historical justification.

One finds Fisher, for instance, correcting Luther's interpretation of patristic texts he had happened to cite;¹ and this is his customary concern. Even in Book Four of his work on the Eucharist against Oecolampadius, where his aims seem, at first sight, to be more ambitious, he does not really advance beyond this. Fisher speaks of establishing 'from the common consent of the Fathers' the fact of the Real Presence, and provides, by way of introduction, a brief but promising survey of the history of Christian thinking on the subject.² In actual practice however, the work is directed to the theme that Oecolampadius has wretchedly abused and mutilated the orthodox Fathers, the chapter-headings accurately indicating the narrow

1. V.g. Fisher, Assertionis lutheranae confutatio, Opera, cols. 989-997.

scope of Fisher's patristic enquiries.¹

Thomas More is even less concerned than Fisher about accumulating a weight of patristic evidence to support his contentions.² Probably he was less well-equipped to do so: the suggestion has recently been made that he used manuals like the Glossa ordinaria as a kind of index to the Fathers, to help him in his polemical works.³ His practice, too, is to contest the interpretations of his opponents, and rely on the odd telling citation to provide positive evidence for his views—a technique dear to his King also, in the Assertio septem sacramentorum.⁴ Only rarely does one find in these early works

¹ Fisher, De veritate corporis et sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia ... adversus Johannem Oecolampadium, Opera, col.989. Some of the chapter-headings read: 'In Ambrosii citatone, falsarius ostenditur Oecolampadius' (c.1); 'Citat etiam Origenis allegorias, quae nihil ei conferre valent' (c.2); 'In Cyrpiani citatone falsarium deprehendes, ubi multa notab is lector, pro parte nostra' (c.12); 'Tantum symbola quaedam esse, mysteria ista contendit, ex Chrysostomo, quem corruptissime citat' (c.27) etc., cols. 1000-1124.

² Cf. R. Pineas, Thomas More and Tudor Polemics (Bloomington, 1968), p.99. In this book, and earlier articles, Pineas has touched on themes which are central to this thesis. However, I have not found his work to be very helpful to me, probably because Pineas' approach is literary and the theological aspects of early Tudor polemics are not dealt with thoroughly.

³ Marius, art.cit., p.385.

anything approaching a detailed survey of the testimony of antiquity: Henry provides one doubtful sample when he attacks, with great gusto, Luther's assertion that Transubstantiation is a novelty; and Fisher's discussion of St. Peter's presence in Rome is another. In the main, historical verification is avoided.

This was not always the case, however, with the divines of a later age. As time passed and the rift widened, the terms of the problem confronting the defenders of the traditional faith gradually changed. It became increasingly unrealistic to think of the reform movement as an internal church-squabble. By mid-century a number of systems of churchmanship had emerged, each with its own confessional formulae, and - just as importantly, in the context - its own set of cherished practices, to impose on its adherents. All of course claimed to represent true Christianity. The full recognition of definitive schism may have been slow coming: it was only towards the end of the sixteenth century that people saw the situation as one where you had a number of 'churches' competing for the title of 'true church'. However, the fact of division was impossible to overlook: men spoke of a multiplicity of 'religions' if not 'churches'. With this, a positive justification of one's chosen form of religious

allegiance was increasingly called for, even on the part of those who justly (if sometimes haughtily) insisted that theirs was the time-hallowed faith. It grew more and more futile to rest on one's laurels and cry 'heresy'.

Moreover, the traditional forms of theological verification were fast losing their usefulness - at least in debate between the various factions. Whereas previously theological discussion went on within the framework of an acceptance of church-authority, now that protective structure was undermined, and there was no security as to criteria. As Philip Hughes once put it, when commenting on the revolutionary implications of the Henrician legislation in England: churchmen

'abandoned the principle that the authority of the teaching Church is the first source of a Christian's knowledge of religion divinely revealed; and something like Pierre d'Ailly's theory ... emerged in its place, that the way to the truth about revealed doctrine is through a congress of Christian learning'. 1

Needless to say, Catholic divines in no way abandoned church-authority as the final criterion of theological truth. But in their polemical writings there was more emphasis on scholarly demonstration; and to put it bluntly, the appeal to authority was camouflaged, reappearing as an appeal to the Fathers of antiquity. This was hardly a conscious deception.

It was partly the result of the earlier assertions that the Fathers were privileged interpreters of the Scriptures, and that the practice of the ancient Church was (in some respect, at any rate) normative. Philip Melanchthon particularly had sought to capitalize on such claims, arguing that the doctrines and practices of the reformers were sanctioned by antiquity. His intentions were partly — perhaps largely — eirenical: it seemed for a time that both sides might have found common ground in the testimony of the first centuries. The hopes were illusory, but the polemical efforts of both Catholics and reformers were affected by them. To oversimplify the situation a little, the question, 'which faith is the more ancient?', became more important to the controversialists than the question, 'which faith is true?'.

Writing in the sixties, the reformer, Martin Chemnitz, who was extremely well-acquainted with the Catholic theology of the time, remarked on this change. He said that whereas the first Catholic apologists had appealed to the authority of the Church to refute their opponents, their

1. For the development of the argument from antiquity in the writings of Melanchthon, see esp. P. Fraenkel, Testimonia Patrum. The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon (Geneva, 1961); also A. Sperl, Melanchthon zwischen Humanismus and Reformation (Munich, 1959). On the impact of Melanchthon's approach on subsequent controversy, the best survey is still that of P. Polman, L'Elément Historique dans la Controverse religieuse du XVIe Siècle (Gembloux, 1932).
successors invoked apostolic traditions as a means of defence. Chemnitz saw this as a retreat: unable to find support for their practices in the Scriptures, the Papists looked to unwritten traditions to support them, claiming a kind of superior knowledge for the Church, which the Bible could not be used to test. There is a measure of truth in Chemnitz's analysis, along with some wishful-thinking and the obvious touch of polemics. The controversialists did change their approach. Out of the insistence that orthodox Christianity needed to be corroborated by the testimonies of the Fathers, there grew the historical claim of a de facto correspondence between the Church's present practice and that of the primitive Church. As a result, the patristic testimony was handled differently - or rather, an additional use was found for it. To justify the claim of antiquity, it was treated as so much historical evidence.

1. Chemnitz made these comments in his work Examen concilii tridentini (1565), and I owe the reference to Polman (op. cit., pp.236ff), who cites the relevant passages (esp. p.237, n.1). Unfortunately, Chemnitz's treatise has not been available to me. Polman agrees that a change took place, although he contends it was not a very radical one: the concern of the later writers was 'historical', whereas the mentality of their predecessors was 'ecclesiastical', or 'papal' (op.cit., p.311). Whereas Chemnitz contended the new orientation was due largely to the influence of Albert Pighius, Polman believes it owed more to Trent (op.cit., p.312) and the need to counter Protestant arguments from history: 'C'est donc bien à cause du recours des protestants à l'histoire que les catholiques se croient fondés à recourir de plus en plus à la même source' (op.cit., p.313).
As Chemnitz himself acknowledged, the change in what he called 'the state of disputation' was a gradual one. Indeed, the recourse to history in polemics was only starting to manifest itself fully at the time he was writing, with the appearance of works like the Magdeburg Centuries under the inspiration of Flacius Illyricus.¹ Prior to this, attempts to demonstrate the consent of antiquity on particular issues were normally tentative and incomplete, although certainly more ambitious than anything undertaken by the controversialists of the twenties. In England one finds samples of the new approach in Catholic tracts appearing after 1547.

Antecedents for the kind of efforts I have in mind may be looked for earlier, of course - notably in the treatises which Fox, Gardiner and Sampson produced at the King's bidding, to buttress the Royal Supremacy, in which, as Janelle remarks, the beginnings of a patristic erudition characteristic of subsequent debates can be detected.² In these the argument from the past emerges as something of a cross between scholastic

¹. Original title, Ecclesiastica historia, integram ecclesiae Christi ideam ... secundum singulas centurias...complectens ... (Basle, 1559-74). Later editions appeared as Centuriae Magdeburgenses.

². On these works, see Janelle, l'Angleterre catholique, pp. 271ff. However, Gardiner's De vera obedientia oratio (London, 1535) is not notable for its patristic erudition, in my opinion.
and legal modes of demonstration. Fox's work, for instance, is little more than a catena of texts against the Papacy culled from a variety of sources. This style of textual compilation had scholastic antecedents, but what dominates is a legal-minded concern for laying out respectable precedents. Tunstal followed much the same path in a famous sermon before the King in 1539, bringing forward a series of historical examples to show how popes were submissive to emperors in the early Church.¹

It was during Edward's reign and later, however, that the Catholic divines began to recognise the need to justify the Papist tenets historically. Whereas in his earlier works (against Frith and others), Gardiner adhered to the pattern set by Fisher, accusing his opponents of "defaming" the Fathers, and bringing forward isolated citations to show 'the godly tradition of the truth ... plainly and truly received, taught and continued in the church, since the beginning',² his later surveys were

1. C. Tunstal, A sermon of Cuthbert Bysshop of Duresme upon Palme Sondaye before the Maiestie of our souerayne lorde Kyng Henry VIII (London, 1539), Sigs. C ii r f. Cf. D v ff. Tunstal also attempted to show that the Pope's claims were against 'all the ancient best learned, and most holy interpreters' of Scripture, Sigs. D ii r, D iv r.

2. S. Gardiner, A detection of the deuils sophistrie, wherwith he robbeth the unlearned people, of the true byleef, in the Sacrament of the aulter (London, 1546), fols. lxxxii r, xcix r.
somewhat more thorough. To combat Bucer and his Edwardian colleagues, he took pains to demonstrate the antiquity of the Papist beliefs in the Eucharist, and also of matters of church-discipline like the practice of clerical celibacy, the use of holy water, and the veneration of images.\footnote{Especially the works against Peter Martyr, \textit{Confutatio Cavillationum} (1552), and Bucer, \textit{Exetasis testimoniorum} (written earlier, but published 1554). Cf. Polman, op. cit., pp.443f; Muller, \textit{Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction}, pp. 311, 314.} Tunstal attempted the same in a work that has been described as one of the best polemical tracts of the sixteenth century.\footnote{C. Tunstal, \textit{De veritate corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi in Eucharistia} (Paris, 1554). I have been unable to consult this work. Cf. Polman, op. cit., pp.445-6.}

It must be emphasised that these attempts, and those of the Marian divines, to demonstrate antiquity were exceedingly modest and imperfect. All that should be said, perhaps, is that the Catholic polemicists were now sensitive to the need to assert the antiquity of their position, the marshalling of evidence remaining, in practically all cases, an unfulfilled ambition. They doubtless felt it was something that could be done, for they were confident the past was on their side. But possibly it was too much for them to undertake, as their scholarship was limited; and moreover, the spirit of the Marian reaction would seem to have worked against detailed refutations of their opponents' theories.
If one reads Thomas Watson's work on the Sacraments — one of the notable theological productions of Mary's reign, published at the wish of Convocation as a counter to the Homilies of 1547 — one sees how assertion was replacing argument. Surprisingly, this lucid and rather beautiful book stands above controversy: the reformers are scarcely alluded to. The impression given is of timeless truths, firmly 'in possession'. If the tract reflects the ecclesiastical mood of the time, as I feel sure it does, then one can readily account for the emphases of the more overtly polemical treatises.  

Watson himself provides evidence of these in a work published in 1554. He argues the need to complement Scripture with the testimony of the Church: the 'true sense' is only known by the tradition and consent of the catholic church; the one without the other provides no direction for Christians, but is but a seduction for simple men. "The consent of the church", he says, "is always a sure staff". One can discover this consent in several ways: in the pacific adherence to a doctrine over a long period; in the determinations of General Councils, and the condemnation of heretics; and also from the writings of the holy Fathers and pastors.  

1. T. Watson, Holsome and catholyke doctryne concerninge the seuen sacramentes (London, 1558). A similar approach in J. Feckenham, Two Homilies upon the first, second, and third articles of the Crede... (London, 1555).  

2. T. Watson, Twoo notable sermons made ... before the Quenes highness concernynge the reall presence of Christes body and bloude in the blessed Sacrament (London, 1554), Sigs. B vii r - viii r; L vi v - M vii v.
Watson refers to the heightened interest of theologians in the views of the Fathers: in no age have they been 'so curiously sought, so diligently found(?), and so substantially weighed as in this our time'. But he makes it plain that it is a consent, and not the mind of one man, however virtuous or learned, that must be sought for. Yet, though he seeks to establish that consent in relation to the Eucharist, Watson's demonstrations are scarcely more than token ones. The consent tends to be stated rather than proven:

'But it was never so taken of any good ancient author which all with one consent do expound this text of St. John, of the giving of his flesh ...'.

James Brooks, another Marian bishop, throws further light on the form the argument from antiquity was taking at this time. More specifically, some of his remarks in a sermon of 1553 give us an added insight into the bases on which that argument was constructed. 'Antiquity' is a sure indication of Christian authenticity for Brooks. In an important passage he describes 'antiquity' as one of the 'notes', or distinguishing marks, 'whereby as well the catholic church, as the catholic verity is discerned, and known'. That is, the criterion of antiquity enables us to discern both the true Church, and the

1. Watson, op.cit., Sigs. H i^v - ii^r. The text reads: 'foundent'.
2. Watson, op.cit., Sig. B viii^r.
3. Watson, cop.cit., Sig. C viii^v. No texts are brought forward to substantiate the claim.
true teachings, of Christ. 1

The reasons for this assertion lay in Brooks' notion of the Church. It is the guardian of a tradition. Not only does the Church expound the true sense of Scripture, but it imparts inherited verities to us. For this reason,

'In such things wherein the Scripture doth determine no certainty, the custom of the godly people, and the decree of the elders are to be kept for a law'.

Behind this thinking the principle of unbroken succession is working - what Brooks terms St. Irenaeus' 'engine and weapon'. In the true Church godly truths are 'by tradition given from the elders to their successors'. This is why one's forefathers in the faith must be heeded, and why established church-custom must be retained. And since unbroken succession is an essential characteristic of the Church that guards unwritten truths, 'antiquity' must be one of its distinguishing marks.

Because of convictions such as this the assertion of antiquity was maintained by the Marian divines. But, as I have said, assertion rather outpaced demonstration. Probably the fullest exposition of the evidence on any issue is to be found in the curious work of Bishop John White, the Diacosiomartyrion, where the testimony of 200 writers (not all of them Fathers of

1. J. Brooks, A sermon very notable, fruictefull and godlie made at Paules crosse (London, 1553) » Sig. C iii r.
2. Brooks, op.cit., Sigs. A vii r - B i r; B vii r; B viii r; C ii r.
the ancient Church) is presented in Latin verse - an engaging, but hardly telling, contribution to the debate with Peter Martyr on the Eucharist.¹

Even so, works of this kind make it possible for us to situate the theological claims of the bishops in 1559. Their statements were not ample or overly doctrinaire - indeed, I have argued that their stand was dictated mainly by practical concerns. Yet their protests were, of course, couched in theological form and reflect an approach which had matured in the ranks of Catholic polemicists, its keynote being the assertion of antiquity on behalf of the papist practices, with an openness to the need for historical justification. Christian antiquity, so the claim went, was on their side. This - for reasons of their own - the reform divines were anxious to contest.

¹ J. White, Diacosiomartyrion id est ducentorum virorum testimonium de veritate corporis et sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia ... adversus Petrum Martyrem (London, 1553). Apparently the book had been sent to Louvain for publication c.1550, but it did not appear until the beginning of Mary's reign and was then printed in London.
Chapter Three

POPULAR CONSERVATISM: JEWEL'S CHALLENGE

'... large offers in open places ...'

(An Apology of Private Mass)

'Reflecting ... on the manner how very many (I wish I might not say most) controversies are managed; that is, by debating much about diverse conclusions, but very little about the first principle in controversy, I cannot wonder if disputes come slowly to an end when few of them were ever rightly begun ...'.

(John Sergeant)
In March 1559 Catharine Bertie, the Dowager Duchess of Suffolk and a Marian exile, complained to her friend, William Cecil, about the administration's delay in proceeding with church-reform. 'There is no fear of innovation', she wrote, 'by restoring old good and repealing new evil'. In broadest outline, this was to be the case of those concerned with justifying the religious legislation of the first parliament, and its liturgical provisions particularly. The revised eucharistic service was - as those who fathered it in Edward's reign also claimed - a return to 'the first original' and a godly retreat from the 'new evil' of papist abuses.

Although it was so vigorously expounded and contested in the first decades of Elizabeth's reign (and indeed, for generations afterwards), this line of argument was already a well-tried one by 1559, as the earlier chapters of this study suggest. All of the issues (but especially those arising out of liturgical change) had been actively canvassed by this time in the European debates between Papists and Gospellers, and in England from the accession of Edward VI onwards. Furthermore, it had been the stock contention of reform apologists for some decades that antiquity favoured their cause. The first defenders

of the Settlement returned to the positions of the Edwardian reformers: they concentrated on the same pragmatic issues; and their emphases were much the same - except that, from the very beginning of the reign, greater weight, if anything, was put on the argument from antiquity.

On the lips of, say, Erasmus or the first wave of reformers, the call to reshape an ailing church according to the primitive model had been an exciting one. Some vestige of that excitement remains in the works of Edwardian divines - especially, perhaps, in those of preachers like Latimer - but even then, what was originally a heady programme of reform, with seemingly limitless possibilities, had been transformed by the pressure of political necessities into something far less stirring.

Without necessarily abandoning their hopes for wider change, Cranmer and his fellows were forced to shoulder the responsibilities of the second generation of reformers. Their chief theological task was to defend, as authentically christian, those religious alterations which the policy-makers had judged feasible - and of course, defend them chiefly against papist attacks. By mid-century there were scarcely any divines (either in England or abroad) who were appealing to Christian antiquity to nourish a vision of what might be. The only obvious heirs to Erasmus were eirenists like George Cassander, who at this time were still appealing, fruitlessly,
to the dissidents to try to reach agreement on the basis of the practice of the first five or six centuries. These were very much in the minority. Most had become accustomed to brandishing Christian antiquity as a polemical weapon, using it as a criterion by which to vindicate, or condemn, the religious practices connected with a particular status quo.

Around 1550 the limits of the qualitative (as opposed to the quantitative) expansion of the reformation movement throughout Europe had pretty well been determined. The drive to grow, territorially and numerically, was unabated, especially among Calvinists; but the imaginative energies had been pretty-well quenched. Original hopes for wide-reaching reform had become crystallised into a relatively static set of disciplinary changes; and advocacy of these (even more than of reform doctrines) became the badge of the Gospeller, just as unequivocal opposition to them was the distinguishing mark of the Papist. At this time, as a recent historian has said, 'The rival churches had chosen their battle-grounds';¹ and the matters most violently contested were the pragmatic ones: the celebration of private masses, administration of communion under one species, the reservation of the sacrament, invocation of saints and prayers for the dead, clerical celibacy and the like.

Significantly, it was on such issues as these that the Colloquy of Ratisbon had foundered in 1541, even though the two parties—Contarini and the Roman theologians on the one hand, and Melanchthon and Bucer on the other—had reached a surprising measure of agreement on doctrinal points, including justification. In one sense, the possibility of some kind of conciliation on the practical aspects of reform remained, even as late as the early sixties. Around mid-century there were some, like Cassander, who still hoped for agreement on liturgical change; and Giovanni de'Medici, the future Pope Pius IV, had declared he was not irrevocably opposed to communion under two kinds and the relaxation of clerical celibacy. In fact, at the final session of the Council of Trent, in his pontificate, the envoys of both the Emperor and the King of France were still pressing for 'the securing of the cup to the laity' and other disciplinary changes favoured by the reformers, on the grounds that such revisions would restore to the Roman Church whole provinces that had departed from it.¹

Yet, virtually if not formally, the doors to compromise were slammed shut by the time Trent first convened in 1545. Trent did not simply create intransigence in the Roman

camp. It also mirrored it. And what it chiefly reflected at the beginning was the intransigence of those whose minds, terrified by the prospect of rebellion, had firmed on the principle of papal authority (or, if not this, at least on the need to re-assert ecclesiastical authority). For fear of the consequences, the conservative churchmen were already reluctant to make any practical concessions to the reform movement, even in those areas where the theologians and jurists acknowledged the Roman Church was theoretically free to alter its legislation. The doctrinal inflexibility built up as the Council went on, and each decree that it issued from 1545 onwards made compromise increasingly impossible. While the final decision on communion under two kinds, for instance, was not taken until 1562, it had long since become obvious - and certainly from 1551, when Trent promulgated its doctrinal decree on the Eucharist - what Rome's verdict would be.

In England, from the time of Edward VI's accession in 1547, debates between Papists and Gospellers had mostly centered on the pragmatic issues. The Edwardian legislation thrust these questions into prominence of course, and notably the liturgical ones. As a result of I Ed. VI c.1, an interim order of communion was established to supplement the existing Latin missal whereby the priest was commanded to communicate with the
laity at Mass and administer the sacrament under both species. Further changes in the eucharistic service, including the use of the vernacular, were introduced with the approval of the first Book of Common Prayer in 1549 (2 & 3 Ed. VI c.1). And more drastic revisions followed three years later when this book, 'explained and made fully perfect', was superseded by a second (5 & 6 Ed. VI c.1) - the 1552 Prayer Book which Elizabeth was to reintroduce. The trend of such reforms was to challenge seriously, if not entirely abrogate, many established practices. Prayers for the dead were abandoned along with other formulae from the Canon of the Mass; the practice of venerating the sacrament was discouraged in a number of ways; vestments, and other features of the ritual, were simplified; and, in general, the Eucharist was treated as a commemorative rite, not a sacrifice. Meanwhile, other disciplinary changes had been sanctioned by the Parliament: priests were permitted to marry (2 & 3 Ed. VI c.21. Cf. 5 & 6 Ed. VI c.12); and images had been 'put away' (3 & 4 Ed. VI c.10).

Although matters of this sort are rightly termed 'pragmatic' or 'disciplinary', they were by no means distinct

---

1. These practices contravened the Act of the Six Articles of 1539 (31 H. VIII c.14), which was formally repealed in December 1547 (1 Ed. VI c.12). As early as July 1547, some liturgical changes had been sanctioned by the Royal Injunctions. These included: the recitation of the Epistle and Gospel at High Mass in English; the abolition of processions before High Mass; the removal of images and the use of only two lights on the altar.
from the doctrinal questions that separated Papists and Reformers. To say that in Edward's reign the emphasis was on the practical rather than on the theoretical aspects of reform, is certainly not to imply that the reform views with regard to justification, or the Eucharist, or good works and other such topics were not sincerely held by the prominent Edwardian divines. Nor does it mean that they somehow dissociated those views from the concrete changes they were advocating. In the case of the divines at least, and no doubt a number of the politicians also, the contrary was true. The changes were taken as a symbol of a broad adherence to reform teaching and (even more emphatically, perhaps) of the repudiation of papist superstition. Some of the changes patently impinged on doctrine, others less so. Most, from a strict scriptural view-point, would have to be judged indifferent matters in themselves - that is, they are not practices that are imposed on Christians by the express words of Scripture, or imposed as a necessary deduction from the words of Scripture. But, in the context of the time, none were neutral matters - not, at any rate, for the 'party-men' on both sides. Only the eirenically-minded or the religiously indifferent could have regarded them as such in the England of 1550.

1. One might usefully recall here the distinction made by the Puritans, Sampson and Humphrey, in 1564, when replying to Archbishop Parker's questions about the surplice. Asked whether they regarded the use of the surplus as an 'indifferent' matter, they answered that it was indifferent 'in substance', but not 'by circumstances'. Cf. V.J.K. Brook, A Life of Archbishop Parker (Oxford, 1962), pp.160-1.
It is true, however, that the Edwardians and their opponents were more concerned with contesting the symbols than with exploring doctrinal positions. Apart from the first Book of Homilies (1547), the one authoritative doctrinal statement of the reign was the 42 Articles, which appeared only a short time before Edward's death (1553). The Articles are forthright enough in enunciating Protestant teaching. They take up the standard position with regard to Scripture as norm of faith (a. 5), justification (a. 11) and good works (aa. 12,13). And, negatively, they declare that the Church of Rome has erred, even in matters of faith (a. 20. Cf. aa. 21, 22), specifying, as examples of this, its teaching on purgatory (a. 23), the efficacy of the sacraments (a. 26), transubstantiation (a. 29) and the sacrifice of the Mass (a. 30). But the Articles are notable for their lack of inventiveness. They are more original in their rejection of certain Anabaptist tenets than they are in dealing with the theoretical issues which were then of vital importance to Protestants in their confrontation with Rome. Here the Articles are guardedly assertive, claiming no more than all but the most extreme Protestants were likely to agree on, and mostly reiterating the terms of the 1530 Augsburg Confession. 1

1. For the origins of the 42 Articles, see C. Hardwick, A History of the Articles of Religion (London, 1881), pp. 97ff.
The moralistic tone of the 42 Articles\(^1\) and their concern to provide a functional rationale for those disciplinary changes which were the main part of the Edwardian reformation\(^2\) are a clear pointer to the character of the debates between Gospellers and Papists at this time.

A number of factors help to explain why the Edwardian reformers had concentrated on the practical issues. It was probably inevitable that a state-controlled reformation, as this was, should highlight the concrete rather than the theoretical. But timing and the temper of the nation were contributing factors also. Without at all impugning the native inspiration of the steps taken in England, it can be said that they reflected the changing fortunes of the reformation movement abroad - the hardening of attitudes and the burgeoning of polemics in the face of a more concerted opposition, and also the doctrinal dissensions in the reformation parties themselves. We know that it was one of Archbishop Cranmer's great ambitions to weld the Protestant

1. Note how the articles repudiate papist teaching regarding transubstantiation, the sacrificial character of the Mass and the *ex opere operato* efficacy of the sacraments as 'superstitious' (aa. 26, 29) or 'pernicious' (a. 30).

2. See, for instance, a. 25 (the vernacular), a. 29 (eucharistic processions and the veneration of the sacrament), a. 31 (clerical celibacy), a. 23 (images and relics); and the general point made in a. 33 concerning the variety of traditions and ceremonies.
dissidents on both sides of the Channel into a unity. This preoccupation, fed by an English talent for compromise and a wariness of the doctrinaire, left its mark on the ecclesiastical events of Edward's reign. Wherever possible, the points of difference among Protestants were muted. The practical abuses of Rome were loudly denounced; and mitigated reform - meaning the abolition of uncontroverted superstition - was made the clarion-call of the approved English Gospeller. Perhaps typically, Edwardian polemics had taken continental debates as their starting-point, but had narrowed the scope of those discussions by an even greater insistence on the pragmatic.

Catholic responses had of course contributed to the character of Edwardian debates also. The papist controversialists were not numerous: Gardiner, one-time apologist for the Royal Supremacy, was the chief of them; most of the others had been staunch Henrician churchmen; and their contributions, especially in the early years, could normally be described as politic. Generally speaking, they were less reluctant than their opponents to avoid the weightier doctrinal matters. Yet the best of them were lawyers by training rather than theologians; and most of all, perhaps, they were statesmen. This made it natural for them to contest the disciplinary changes principally - and especially those which contradicted Henry VIII's Six Articles of 1539: the abolition of private Masses and communion in one kind, practices that denied the
truth of transubstantiation, and the relaxation of clerical celibacy. They found an opening for the defence of the traditional practices in the claim of the Edwardian legislation that the changes were 'more conformable to the common use and practice both of the Apostles and of the primitive Church by the space of Five hundred years and more after Christ's ascension'. In contesting the pedigree of the Prayer Books' enactments, they set firm precedents for the opening theological debates in Elizabeth's reign.

It was to be expected that discussion of the 1559 Settlement would largely reduplicate the Edwardian debates. In the first place, the Settlement (especially as seen by the theologians) raised the same basic issues. For a variety of reasons, the attention of the reform divines - and, somewhat less markedly, of the Papists also - was focussed on the Act of Uniformity rather than on the implications of royal supremacy in 1559. Defending the Settlement was, at first, chiefly taken to mean defending the terms of the 1552 Book of Common Prayer which that act revived. Some factors made the situation in Elizabeth's time slightly different from that of Edward's. Minor modifications of a conservative kind had been made to the Prayer Book - some by the statute itself; and more, presumably

1. This claim is made on behalf of communion under two kinds in I Ed. VI c.1 (S.R., IV, i, p.3)
on the Queen's authority, in the book as printed. Moreover, in practice, the Queen's attitudes further mitigated certain aspects of the reformed discipline: she was to be less tolerant of clerical marriage than her brother; was tantalisingly equivocal in regard to images and some other features of ritual; and she probably did not favour gestures that implied disbelief in the Real Presence. But the central provisions of the 1552 legislation remained unaltered, notably those affecting the eucharistic service. Very likely the Queen's conservatism made the Gospellers all the more anxious to present this as a Protestant settlement. So the Edwardian polemic on behalf of such things as the use of the vernacular and the administration of communion under two kinds was quickly revived, along with the Prayer Book.

This was all the more inevitable given the background of the early Elizabethan polemicists. To fill the major ecclesiastical posts already vacant at her accession and those emptied by the refusal of all but one of the Marian bishops to take the Oath of Supremacy in 1559, Elizabeth found it necessary to rely on Edwardians. Of the nine divines who presented the reform case at the Westminster Disputation, for example, eight ultimately became bishops under her. The majority were in their late thirties or early forties at her accession. Two,

1. If, as some do, we include Sandys, there were nine Protestant participants at Westminster.
at the most, were Oxford men: Jewel, and probably Whitehead. The rest had been students at Cambridge in the later part of Henry's reign. And though some had held ecclesiastical office under Elizabeth's father, it would be true to say that the vast majority had really come to prominence in her brother's time - Cox and Scory for instance, as protégés of Cranmer; and Grindal under the wing of Ridley. Scory had been a bishop under Edward VI; Horne is said to have refused a see; but most had held some kind of office in the universities. In a sense, they were men who had developed, not simply under, but along with the Edwardian settlement. And, not surprisingly, they were mostly among those who had defended the 1552 liturgy, in preference to more Calvinistic services, in the 'troubles' abroad.

The events of Mary's reign may have widened the horizons of men like these, but they certainly had not left them any less resolute about insisting on the final Edwardian Prayer Book as an absolute minimum for acceptal change. Deprivation of office, exile, and prolonged - in some cases, day-to-day - contact with the outstanding continental divines must have encouraged them to be more doctrinaire than ever in their defence of those, or similar, practices. But the dominant factor in their constancy was surely the persecution of their fellow gospellers in England, and the burning of Cranmer especially. Marian savagery had annihilated any possibility of compromise. It was almost a point of honour for the returned exiles to appear to deal moderately with their opponents in 1559,
yet it was obvious that the old issues were being canvassed with new passion - the more so as the bitterest resistance was coming from erstwhile colleagues, who had defected to Rome after 1553.

Intensity is one point of difference between the Edwardian and the Elizabethan debates. Feelings of Papists and Gospellers ran higher as time went by; both sides became increasingly entrenched; and, for a variety of reasons, the controversies of the first decade or so of Elizabeth's reign were far more prolific than earlier ones. Moreover, while the matters in dispute remained essentially the same and the technical manner of argument did not vary to any notable degree, emphases shifted in the later debates. For instance, the Queen's conservatism, coupled with the pressures of the foreign situation, made it prudent for the reform divines to labour the good pedigree of the revived Edwardian changes - with the result that the appeal to the past assumed an even greater prominence than before.

Almost at the very time Catharine of Suffolk was writing to Cecil in an effort to neutralise high-placed 'fear of innovation', John Jewel, one of the exile divines, was indicating to Peter Martyr the source of such fears. The

---

Queen, he said, openly favours our cause, but she is showing herself to be 'wonderfully afraid of allowing any innovations'. This same writer, a few years later, could concede that 'all changes of importance in the state are offensive and disagreeable' - 'particularly', as he said in another place, quite innocently and without any noticeable trace of cynicism, 'those changes that strike the eye'. Perhaps he had learnt the lesson in 1559.

Full of hopes for change, the more moderate of the exiles had quickly returned to England on hearing of Elizabeth's accession, only to find (with some disillusionment, judging from the letters that went back to the continent) that their position was anything but secure. As late as May 1559, Jewel was telling Bullinger: 'we scarcely seem to have returned from exile'.


3. J. Jewel (writing under the pseudonym of 'Nicholas N., Englishman'), Epistola cuiusdam Angli... (1561), Sig.A vR. His words are: '... omnes insignes mutationes, illae praesertim quae in oculos incurrunt, in rebuspublicis semper visae sint odiosae ...'. Booty has reprinted the text of this letter, together with a translation, John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England, pp.210-25.

4. Jewel to Bullinger, 22 May 1559, Zurich Letters, I, p.32. The context of the remark is that the property of the exiles had still not been restored.
The divines who had been abroad faced a problem of readjustment, in that their canons of propriety were at odds with those of the leading statesmen and the Queen. Possibly exile had made them forgetful of the conditions that apply when Church is conterminous with Commonwealth.¹ But they could be forgetful no longer. In Elizabeth they were dealing with a strong, independent-minded monarch who, though far from irreligious, was more concerned with establishing her conservatism and the good pedigree of her government's enactments than with appearing to adhere to those canons of godliness that weighed heavily with the reform-minded. Her statesman-like reluctance to sponsor novelties was a factor the divines had to contend with, and their efforts to do so are reflected in the early polemics of the reign.

Very soon after the Westminster Disputation some of the leading reform theologians presented a full statement of their doctrinal position to the Queen. It is not clear whether they were required to do so, but this was probably the case. Certainly, the document - usually referred to as The Declaration of Religion² - is cast in the form of an apologia, with the

¹. Collinson, Elizabethan Puritan Movement, pp.24-5.
². It seems, from a comment of Sandys, that the exiles anticipated publishing this document (cf. Parker Correspondence, p.66), and Jewel speaks of exhibiting it to the Queen. However, there is no evidence of its having been printed. The title inscribed on the manuscript is 'A Declaration of doctrine offered and exhibited by the protestants to the Queen at the first coming over of them', and R. W. Dixon provides the fullest printed account of its contents, History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction, IV (Oxford, 1878), pp.107-116.
divines anxious to establish their own probity in the face of well-defined charges. Though they had sufficiently set forth a sum of doctrine in the recent disputation, says the prologue, slanderers had reported:

'that our doctrine is detestable heresy, that we are fallen from the doctrine of Christ's Catholic Church, that we be subtle sectaries, that we dissent among ourselves, and that every man nourisheth and maintaineth his own opinion, that we be teachers of carnal liberty, condemning fasting, prayer, alms and like godly exercises'. 1

In the subsequent propositions - which mostly follow, but sometimes revealingly modify, the 42 Articles - these accusations are carefully refuted.

It is possible that The Declaration was drafted, not merely in an attempt to clear the Gospellers of slander, but also to influence the Queen's views. In the letter of 28 April 1559, in which he tells Peter Martyr that 'we have exhibited to the queen all our articles of religion and doctrine', Jewel makes one of his recurring references to the unwelcome possibility of England's joining the Smalcaldic League and assures Martyr that The Declaration had not departed 'in one iota' from the Zurich Confession. 2 None of the exile divines would have

relished the prospect of an alliance with the Lutherans: their sympathies were markedly Helvetian. Perhaps they hoped to dissuade Elizabeth from aligning herself too closely with the German princes. If so, it was an additional reason for the moderation which The Declaration displayed.

In most respects the English document is really a far cry indeed from the magnificent statement of eucharistic belief upon which Calvin and Bullinger had agreed in 1549. One wonders how Jewel dared compare the two formularies. The Declaration has none of the theological refinement of the Zurich Confession. It is tight-lipped, legalistic and cold where the other - compromise though it was - is warmly inspiring. Would it be too unkind to suggest that a comparison reveals the peculiar character, and the relative poverty, of the English theology? Still, in a purely formal sense, The Declaration does reduplicate the stand of the earlier confession with regard to the eucharistic presence, thereby mitigating somewhat the bald assertions of the Edwardian articles.¹

¹ Compare a.14 of The Declaration (Dixon, op.cit., pp.112-3) with the Consensus Tigurinus (text in Kidd, Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation, pp.651-6). The main points of agreement are: (1) the insistence that the Sacrament is not 'only a naked and a bare sign or figure' /Cf. Consensus Tigurinus, aa. VII, IX, X (Kidd, op.cit., pp.653-4)/; (2) the denial of 'corporal, carnal and real presence' - especially on the grounds that Christ is now present only in Heaven /Cf. Consensus Tigurinus, aa. XXI, XXII, XXV (Kidd, op.cit., pp.655-6)/; and (3) the denial of transubstantiation /Cf. Consensus Tigurinus, a.XXXII (Kidd, op.cit., p.656)/. The above correspond with a. 26, and especially a. 29, of the 42 Articles, but state the position more amply.
A notable difference between The Declaration and the Zurich Confession is the former's preoccupation with pedigree. It would be a mistake to press the comparison too hard, as the circumstances of the two statements were different. But perhaps this does reflect the situation of the English divines. Only once does the Zurich Confession advert to the question of novelty and bother to insist that a particular assertion is corroborated by 'the oldest and most approved writers of the Church'.

The Declaration, on the other hand, is constantly claiming the support of primitive practice for its stands. Indeed, its central contention is that the reformers may justly apply to themselves and their teachings the title 'catholic'.

Instructively, the English Gospellers vindicate their right to the name by appealing to an historical precedent.

'And therefore according to the ancient laws of the Christian emperors Gratianus, Valentinianus, and Theodosius, we do justly vindicate and challenge to ourselves the name of Christian Catholics: which emperors decreed that all they which according to the doctrine of the Apostles and Evangelists do confess one Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, under one Godly Majesty and Trinity, should have and enjoy the name of Christian Catholics'.

1. Consensus Tigurinus, a. XXII, where it refers to the interpretation given to the words of institution (Kidd, op.cit., p.656).
2. See, for instance, aa. 4, 10, 14 (Dixon, op.cit., pp.111-3).
It may not be fully obvious from this passage what The Declaration's criterion for catholicity was, but other statements elucidate the matter. Being 'true members of the Catholic Church of Christ' means adhering to 'that Church that is founded and grounded upon the doctrine of the prophets and apostles'. The prime token of one's adherence is a complete acceptance of the three ancient creeds - the Nicene, the Athanasian and the Apostles' - for these specify the principal articles of Christian belief and repudiate the classical aberrations of faith, the heresies. Sensitive to charges of heterodoxy, The Declaration enumerates them:

'We condemn all old heresies of the Ebionites, Cerinthians, Marcionites, Valentinians, Arians, Manichees, Eunomians, Sabellians, Macedonians, Nestorians, Eutychians, and all such like, which withstand any article of these Creeds'.

It will be seen that this acceptance of the ancient creeds qualifies somewhat the Protestant teaching that Scripture is the sole rule of faith. Yet it was not understood to contradict that teaching. The Declaration reiterates the view of the 42 Articles that Scripture contains all that is necessary for salvation; and if the doctrine of the creeds is mandatory it

is only because they clearly state what Scripture does contain. In short, the creeds witness to the scriptural faith and clarify it, but neither they nor the statements of General Councils possess any independent authority. This was essentially what the Edwardian Articles had proposed, and The Declaration, in spite of a few textual modifications, is patently trading on the same assumptions.

But there are already signs of the tail wagging the dog. Theoretically, the stand of the 1553 Articles was such that the prime criterion for catholicity ought to be Scripture, with a place left for an appeal to antiquity — although merely as secondary or corroborative evidence. In 1559 fears of innovation are at least threatening to upset the balance of the theological argument by reversing the priorities. The weight is passing from front to back foot. On the defensive, the Gospellers in The Declaration are intent on affirming that their teaching does in fact square with that of the ancient formularies. Of course, Scripture is still the prime norm in their minds. But it is being displaced as prime norm of authenticity in their polemics.

1. With regard to General Councils, a. 22 of the 42 Articles says: 'negue robur habent neque authoritatem nisi ostendi possunt /i.e. the decrees/ e sacris litteris esse desumpta'. Cf. aa. 7, 21.
The difference between The Declaration and the earlier Edwardian Articles is undoubtedly a subtle one, and may appear of little consequence. What difference there is lies in what the Protestant position is made to seem, rather than in what the Protestant divines meant. That is, the principles governing the two positions remained the same; but in the second statement of faith, Scripture seems to be thrust into the background. One is left with the impression that the doctrinal elucidations of the early Church provide the 'rule' - or at least, the most concrete criterion - of authentic Christian belief; and also that conformity with these is just as important to the reformed Church as conformity with Scripture. Minor though it might be, the change of emphasis does suggest that a process similar to the one described in the previous chapter was also taking place in the theology of some of the reformers: pressures of controversy and (as I have argued in this case) the conservatism of Elizabeth herself were bringing the historical question - of conformity or non-conformity with the standards of antiquity - to the fore. This, at any rate, is what I gather from The Declaration and the rather 'remarkable' way in which it modifies the articles.  

One would look in vain in so summary a statement as The Declaration for any careful delineation of the period to

which the reformers were prepared to make their historical appeal. Obviously they were not thinking simply of the 'apostolic' period - that is, the time between Christ's Ascension and the death of the last of his Apostles, when all the canonical writings of the New Testament were understood to have been composed. Terms such as 'the practice of the primitive church' and 'the testimony of the ancient writers' were extended to include an epoch that succeeded this as well. However, its limits are not set down. Presumably it went beyond the period in which the three creeds were produced, for some of the heresies mentioned in The Declaration - Nectarianism, for instance - are of later origin and are not explicitly repudiated in any of these creeds.

What is clear is that those who framed The Declaration did think of this period as having an end. Unlike the Papists who believed that the continuing history of the Church vindicated their present practices, the reformers looked back to a unique age of light and purity in order to support theirs - an age succeeded by a period of superstition and abuse, which was only now coming to an end. Like the earlier reformers, they espoused a concept of 'catholicity' that was radically different from that of their opponents. For the latter,
'A catholic faith is a universal faith taught and preached through all ages and so received and believed agreeably and consonant to the Scriptures, testified by such as in all ages have in their writings given knowledge thereof, which be the tokens and marks of a true Catholic faith'.

The Gospellers, on the other hand, saw 'catholicity' as an adherence to the apostolic faith witnessed in the pure churches of antiquity. It had nothing to do with strict temporal continuity; it was rather a matter of conformity of outlook and practice. 'Christian Catholics' were not so much heirs to a body of teaching and ritual accumulated over fifteen hundred years as exponents of the scriptural truth adequately summarised in the three creeds.

In the one case, the statement of essential Christian belief was seen to terminate, once and for all, in the primitive Church. Subsequently, catholicity meant holding fast to - and where necessary, reviving - those essentials, with particular churches remaining free to alter the non-essentials in accordance with changing needs. This latter, at any rate, was the position


2. 'It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one or utterly like. For at all times they have been diverse and may be changed not only by General 'Councils but also by particular churches, according to the diversities of the countries and men's manners, so that they, be not against God's word, and make to edification'. a. 17 (Dixon, op.cit., p.113).
of the 'liberal' wing of the reform movement. In the other case, the elucidation of Christian truth was believed to go on, in a Church guided by the Holy Spirit. As Fr. Tavard once put it, for the Papists 'a doctrine was Catholic if it was held by the present Church, in continuity with the early Church'. For theologians like Cranmer and those who became spokesmen for the Settlement, 'it was Catholic if it was held by the early Church, even in opposition to the present Church'.

Throughout the year 1559 the exile divines relentlessly pressed the case for their own catholicity, and for the catholicity of the practices the Parliament had reinstated. They showed signs of being very much on the defensive, for the rebuttal of charges of novelty was sometimes carried to incongruous lengths. In September, for example, Scory - then bishop-elect of Hereford - preached at the obsequies for Henry II of France and, according to Strype's account, took the opportunity of reading a lecture to the distinguished congregation on the antiquity of the revised funeral service. The new order, he insisted, should not be gainsaid. The other had been taken away because it was not according to 'the order of the old fathers and primitive church' - as Scory proceeded to show 'out of divers ancient authors'. An uncomplimentary farewell, perhaps, for

2. Strype, Annals, I, i, pp.190-1.
so repressive a Papist as Henry II.

This style of argument was not confined to a small group of zealots. It was also a feature of 'official' policy in the early years of Elizabeth's reign. No fully authoritative declaration of faith was issued by the Elizabethan Church until 1563, when the 38 Articles were approved. Around 1560, however, Archbishop Parker and the other newly-installed bishops formulated what are known now as the 11 Articles, using them as 'a provisional test of orthodoxy' for their clergy. Although not formally sanctioned by Convocation (which did not assemble between 1559 and 1563), these articles were thoroughly binding. It seems that they were published by the royal press; they were inscribed as being 'set out by the order of both archbishops metropolitans, and the rest of the bishops'; and they commanded to be used by parsons twice annually in their churches, and also when first

1. Hardwick, Articles, p.120. The text of the 11 Articles is in Wilkins, Concilia Magnae Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, IV, pp.195-9; and also in Hardwick, op.cit., pp.355-9. In Hardwick's opinion, they were compiled in 1559 or early in 1560, and first published in 1561 (op.cit., p.118). Another series of articles, "The Articles of the Principal Heads of Religion prescribed to Ministers" (see Strype, Annals, I, i, pp.514f.), were also prepared around this time, seemingly as an accompaniment to the Interpretations. Of these latter articles Hardwick says, however: 'whether from motives of prudence or from inability to gain the sanction of the Crown, they were not circulated among the clergy' (op.cit., p.118, n.4.

taking possession of their cures. They were cast in the form of a personal profession of faith, their purpose being to establish 'uniformity of doctrine' and to 'stop the mouths of them, that go about to slander the ministers of the church for diversity of judgment'. In the words of a contemporary, they were really a 'general confession for the renouncing of the pope and his doctrine'.

The 11 Articles usefully illustrate the remarks I have been making about the direction of Elizabethan polemics. If we compare them with the Edwardian Articles, we see, firstly, that they break no new ground. The central tenets of the 11 Articles are patently derivative. The same theoretical norms of christian authenticity are accepted; and the issues that are canvassed had already been defended in 1553.

At the same time, there are the differences in emphasis. Disciplinary matters loom very large indeed - even larger than in the 42 Articles and The Declaration. In fact,

3. Cited Hardwick, op.cit., p.120, n.3.
4. See a. 2 (Wilkins, op.cit., IV, p.195)
5. See aa. 3, 5-7, 9-11 (Wilkins, op.cit., IV, pp.195-6).
the 'speculative' is studiously avoided in favour of the 'practical'. On Baptism, for instance, the 42 Articles at least advert to the sacrament's spiritual effects, whereas the 11 Articles merely comment on features of the ritual: the propriety of abolishing the exorcisms, and of forbidding the use of oil and salt. Above all, there is evidence of what is virtually a fixation on antiquity.

In this respect, the 11 Articles are far more explicit than the earlier ones. The Pope's claim to be supreme head 'above all emperors, kings and princes' is contrary both to Scripture and 'the example of the primitive Church'. Private Masses - meaning 'public ministration and receiving of the sacrament by the priest alone, without a just number of communicants - were 'never used amongst the fathers of the primitive Church'. The doctrine that the Mass is a propitiatory sacrifice and a means of delivering souls from purgatory is 'neither agreeable to Christ's ordinance, nor grounded upon doctrine apostolic'. Administration of communion under one species is 'avouched by certain fathers of the church to be a plain sacrilege'. Moreover, 'in the

---

1. Compare a. 8 (Wilkins, op.cit., IV, p.195) with a. 28 of the 42 Articles.
2. a. 6 (Wilkins, op.cit., IV, p.195).
3. a. 9 (Wilkins, op.cit., IV, p.195).
4. a. 9 (Wilkins, op.cit., IV, pp.195-6).
5. a.10 (Wilkins, op.cit., IV, p.196).
time of the ancient doctors of the church, as Cyprian, Hierom, Augustine, Gelasius, and others six hundred years after Christ and more, both the parts of the sacrament were ministered to the people'.

The assertion of antiquity seems far more forthright here than previously. Certainly, claims that were merely implicit in the Edwardian teaching are now being stated roundly; and one feels that the question of conformity or non-conformity with ancient practice is assuming new importance. In regard to the liturgical revisions imposed by the Settlement, the official ecclesiastical position was quite sweeping. Parker summarised it perfectly in a letter to the deprived Marian bishops:

'...pray behold and see how we of the Church of England, reformed by our late King Edward and his clergy, and now by her Majesty and hers reviving the same, have but imitated and followed the example of the ancient and worthy fathers'.

1. a. 10 (Wilkins, op.cit., IV, p.196).

2. Archbishop Parker to Dr. Nicholas Heath and other deprived bishops, 26 March 1560, Correspondence, p.111.
One man in particular became the champion of this claim: Elizabeth's nominee for the see of Salisbury, John Jewel. He was to be an unrelenting and painstaking exponent of the Settlement's good lineage, initiating the remarkable debate on that subject. Bias aside, the comments of the generation that succeeded his are an accurate testimony to his prominence as a polemicist up to 1571, the year of his death. For Nicholas Fitzherbert, a Roman Catholic and Cardinal Allen's biographer, Jewel was 'the leader of English heretics'. To Hooker, on the other hand, he was 'the worthiest divine that Christendom hath bred for some hundreds of years'. 'So stout a champion of the true religion, so painful a prelate', said Whitgift of him, while Whitgift's successor, Archbishop Bancroft, lauded him for his 'confutation of all the principal points almost of popery'. The title of a collection of Bishop Jewel's works summarises his role, and says virtually the last word on his achievements: 'A Pill for Papists ...'.


5. J. Philadelphus (Pseud.), A Pill for Papists ... chiefly collected from the works of Bishop Jewel (1746).
Jewel was not conscripted for the task of apologist - not, at any rate, in the beginning. It is highly unlikely that the administration wanted to provoke controversy in 1559. The Westminster Disputation was the Queen's one concession to the need for debate on the religious issues, and it was formal and tight-reined - a token gesture to the propriety of at least letting the divines be heard when the nation's religious future was being decided. In official quarters, Goodrich's advice seems to have been heeded for as long as possible: the 'necessary' matters of religion were treated 'plainly and simply', and there was no 'meddling with any matter in controversy'.

To contain unrest at home and avoid offending the Catholic princes of Europe unnecessarily, this was prudent policy.

The Queen's aim in 1559 was not to justify the reformed church so much as to man it, and man it with men she could trust. For Elizabeth was anxious to have the workings of the church securely in the hands of her bishops, and out of the reach of future parliaments. Accordingly, the main preoccupation was to administer the oath and carry out an immediate visitation of the country, to discriminate between the loyal and the uncompliant and establish a modicum of outward conformity. At this stage, even polemics against the Papacy and Roman abuses were relatively restrained at the official level; and the Settlement was enforced, not by very

intensive efforts at religious persuasion, but largely by a
show of authority. If the official documents pleaded a case,
it was chiefly the case for 'ancient' prerogatives and the
sovereign's conservatism, her doctrinal impeccability being
haughtily assumed rather than defended.

We know that Gospellers were regularly commissioned
to preach at Paul's Cross from May 1559 onwards, and in some
cases this certainly meant they were expressly detailed for the
task by somebody at the Court - not, as was normal, by the
bishop of London. Machyn's diary lists the 'new preachers',
along with details of the disappearance of the 'old' ways ('and
masse a'Powlles was non that day', reads the entry for 11 June
when Sandys preached) and much news of the ejection of Marians
from office. Many of those taking the pulpit were bishops-

1. I say this because the Government was currently proceeding
against Bonner, the Marian bishop of London. He was
formally deposed around the end of May 1559, the temporalities
of the see being seized on 2 June. There is some doubt as
to when his successor, Grindal, was nominated: as early as
29 May 1559, Machyn mentions Grindal as Bonner's successor
(Diary, p.200); and Il Schifanoya, writing to the Castellan
of Mantua on 6 June, names him as the man to whom Bonner was
asked to yield his bishopric (Ven.Cal., VII, p.95). Birt,
however, says that the conge d'élie for Bonner's successor,
though issued on 22 June, did not name Grindal explicitly
(Birt, Elizabethan Religious Settlement, p.212); and it was
only on 1 August that Jewel announced to Martyr the news of
Grindal's election as bishop (Zurich Letters, I, p.40).
Booty believes that Grindal may have authorised some men to
preach before his consecration (Booty, op.cit., pp.32-3).
This may well have been so in November 1559 (the period Booty
is specifically commenting on), but it is hardly likely to
have happened as early as May and June.
One must assume that at this point the administration named
the Paul's Cross preachers.

2. Machyn, Diary, pp.197-220. Cf. M. Maclure's 'Register of
Sermons preached at Paul's Cross, 1534-1642', in The Paul's
elect. But there were others, like John Veron, John MacBray, Robert Crowley and John Huntington, whose views were probably less moderate. The Reformers seem to have been free to urge their case strongly, for they were openly contemptuous of the Papists. 'Where are the bishops and old preachers? Now they hide their heads', said Veron. For the moment, this was as far as Elizabeth needed to go. She manned the pulpits with 'new' men as she proceeded to put away their former occupants, without, it seems, feeling the need to mount any specific propaganda campaign on her own account.

But even if Elizabeth had been looking for an apologist in 1559, it is doubtful whether her eye would have lighted on John Jewel. As Southgate remarks, his move to the front among the churchmen was 'sudden' and unexpected. Jewel was far from being the most distinguished of the exile divines. At this stage, on his own admission, he had published virtually nothing; he had not been an active participant in any of the Edwardian or Marian disputations; he had held no important ecclesiastical office; and even his academic career at Oxford, first as rhetorician and then as theologue, had not brought him into prominence. Were it not for the persecuting zeal of

1. 17 September 1559. Machyn, Diary, p.211. It is interesting that Maclure makes this read (wrongly - if the Camden Society text of the Diary is accepted): 'byd ther bedes' (op.cit., p.201).
Richard Marshall, then dean of Christ Church, it is unlikely that he would have been forced to flee England in Mary's reign, for he had already recanted of Protestantism and publicly subscribed to the papist articles. His most obvious claim to fame was his close association with Peter Martyr Vermigli, first at Oxford and later at Strassburg and Zurich - a fact that would scarcely have recommended him to the Queen, however, who was still dallying with the possibility of an alliance with the Lutheran princes. A point in his favour, perhaps, was that he was unmarried. At all events, Jewel's progress under Elizabeth was at first steady rather than startling. He was one of the disputants at Westminster soon after his return from the continent; he was among the commissioners named to carry out the visitation in the dioceses of the south-west; and just prior to his departure on this task, early in August 1559, received the royal congé d'élire for the bishopric of Salisbury.

Jewel's emergence as semi-official spokesman for the Settlement was really the result of a chance combination of circumstances. Worn out from his exertions on what he termed a 'very tedious and troublesome commission', 1 Jewel returned to London from the west country around the beginning of November; and in this same month preached, for the first time, the challenge to Papists that was to earn him notoriety. Machyn does not mention the challenge, but records the occasion in his diary:

1. Jewel to Martyr, 2 November 1559, Zurich Letters, I, p.44.
'The twenty sixth day of November did preach at Paul's Cross master Jewel, bishop of Salisbury, and there was my lord mayor and the aldermen and many of the court, and there was great audience as has ever been at Paul's Cross'.

There survive a number of the letters which the bishop-elect wrote about this time. They contain no reference to the challenge either, but they do permit us to reconstruct Jewel's state of mind when making it. He was currently receiving the congratulations of his continental friends over the bishopric and of course, with the visitation, was having his first taste of power. Just a little pompously, he writes to Martyr that he is 'often absent from London, and (is) much taken up by (his) engagements in different parts of the country'; and to Gualter of the transition from 'inactivity and obscurity' to government of the church and management of the affairs of others. Let us say simply that he was showing signs of feeling his responsibility. And he was even more preoccupied than usual with the obstinacy of the papist clergy and their hold over the common folk. While he found some reason for optimism in the visitation, he had also been confronted with the incredible harvest of superstition sprung up in the darkness of the Marian times. The priests especially were hardened in their resistance, and were throwing

1. Machyn, Diary, p.218.
all things into confusion. One can see that Jewel is dedicated to the task of uprooting the papist clerics, not only from office, but from the esteem of the people, whose respect, he sees, has to be won. At the same time, he wants more exertion from his own party and a mite less prudence: as he put it, 'The slow-paced horses retard the chariot ...'. Finally, the letters show his particular concern for the intellectual side of the restoration: the universities are theologically impoverished; learning is silenced. If we think of Jewel as visitor and fledgling bishop - earnest, a trifle impatient and perhaps even a shade precious, donnish, and singularly devoted to 'diminishing the insolence of the papists' - it is easy enough to find the proper context for his first challenge.

His opponents would later say that, in making the challenge, Jewel had been carried away by his own rhetoric. Obviously it was rhetorical: one can imagine it being declaimed

2. It is interesting to see that, in a letter to Martyr on 5 November 1559, Jewel seems to concede the need to retain clerical dress, on the grounds that the people are impressed by it and the papists trade on it to win their respect. _Zurich Letters_, I, p. 52.
4. For example, Jewel to Martyr, 2, 5 and 16 November, 1559, _Zurich Letters_, I, pp. 46, 52, 55.
5. Cf. Jewel to Bullinger, 22 May 1559, _Zurich Letters_, I, p. 34. This is actually a reference to the activities of Lord Russel, not Jewel.
con brio at the preaching-place. And the terms of the challenge were remarkably generous. Jewel defied the catholic divines to 'bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old catholic doctor, or father: Or out of any old general council: Or out of the holy scriptures of God: Or any one example of the primitive church' within the first six centuries to justify any one of fifteen practices he mentioned.¹ Virtually all of these concerned the Eucharist. Most were disciplinary matters that the reformers unanimously regarded as abuses: the celebration of private mass, and of many masses daily in the one church; administration of communion under one kind; recitation of the common prayers in a strange tongue; veneration of the sacrament; and the setting up of images in the churches.² Some aspects of the Roman Church's

1. J. Jewel, The copie of a Sermon pronounced by the Byshop of Salisbury at Paules Crosse the Second Sondaye before Ester in the yere of our Lord, 1560 ... (1560) (= Sermon/ Sig. F vii r (Works, I, p.20). There were two printings of the Sermon in 1560 (or around that time): the first, an unpaginated edition, contained the Challenge Sermon only; the second, a paginated edition, contained the correspondence between Jewel and Dr. Cole, along with the Challenge Sermon. I am citing here from the first, unpaginated, edition. The Challenge Sermon was the address preached when Jewel issued his challenge for the third time. But in it he claims to reproduce accurately the words of the challenge as he first made it. ¹ Cf. Sigs. F vii r, F viii v (Works, I, pp.20-1)²

2. Sermon, Sigs. F vii- viii v (Works, I, pp.20-1). Because of the subsequent debate on the challenge, it is useful to number the articles. They were: a.1 (private mass); a.2 (communion in one kind); a.3 (common prayers in a strange tongue); a.7 (holding up the sacrament); a.8 (falling down to worship the sacrament); a.11 (the priest dividing the host, and receiving it alone); a.13 (many masses in one church); and a.14 (images).
teaching were mentioned, all bearing on the Real Presence. And finally, Jewel questioned the propriety of calling the bishop of Rome 'universal bishop, or the head of the universal Church'; and of forbidding the laity to read the Scriptures in their own tongue.

Open-handed and swaggering it may have seemed, but Jewel undoubtedly meant his challenge to be taken seriously. He himself was a serious man, and normally used words with care. He was more the formal rhetorician than the orator swept into exaggeration by his own eloquence. And he was quite adamant about the terms of the challenge: 'when I say, not one, I speak not this in vehemency of spirit ...'. In fact, further reflection suggests that he had chosen his position with some shrewdness. Just as the administration had done in the Westminster Disputation, he was loading the onus of proof on the papists: taking up the

---

   a.5: 'Or that, the people was then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally or naturally, in the sacrament'.
   a.6: 'Or that, his body is or may be in a thousand places, or more, at the one time'.
   a.10: 'Or that, in the Sacrament after the words of Consecration there remaineth only the accidents and shews without the substance of bread and wine'.
   a.12: 'Or that, whosoever had said the Sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ's body, had therefore been judged for an heretic'.

   a.4 (bishop of Rome); a.15 (reading the Scriptures in the vernacular).

challenge meant, of course, authenticating the established practices, thereby abdicating the claim that they were 'in possession' and that it was the reform practices alone which needed to be justified. Moreover, though Jewel made the terms of reference seem large, he was really claiming no more than the reformers habitually did. He specified the first six centuries, as did the 11 Articles; and simply spelt out the criteria of catholicity that were accepted there and in The Declaration. Some of the topics he chose to raise might seem petty in themselves, but all the matters mentioned in the first challenge were pertinent to the Settlement. In short, Jewel was not being frivolous. He could only have imagined he was restating the Reformers' case and putting the Papists on the defensive - hopefully, discrediting them also - by issuing the challenge.

The incongruities of the challenge are somewhat subtle, and really spring from Jewel's literal-mindedness. There was no place for the delicate shades on Jewel's canvas. We may, perhaps, say he forged absolutes on behalf of the Settlement; and in this he was, all unknowingly, reckless. In the first place, there was no room for discriminating between the matters he listed for debate. All, apparently, were given the same weight; and the same claim was urged in regard to them all. By taking it on himself to defend the Settlement in its totality, Jewel made it appear something that it was not: both inflexible and ideal. Secondly, he over-reached himself with regard to antiquity. Perhaps wishing to meet the Papists on their own ground (again, following
the precedent of the Westminster Disputation), he gave the appeal to antiquity a prominence that not all reformers would have wished it to have. Instructively, he makes no distinction in the challenge between citing a text from Scripture and citing a sentence from the writings of a church father - as if both were equally valuable in authenticating a particular practice. Moreover, his confidence that nothing can be found in the first six centuries to substantiate papist positions is staggering. So is his readiness to rely on 'any sufficient sentence' out of the enormous body of writings - complex, occasional, often (as even the scholastics acknowledged, with a deal of historical sophistication) contradictory - that were then known to survive from that period. In closing the door against the Papists, Jewel shuts himself in, relinquishing his freedom to manoeuvre.

Overstatement is invariably an accompaniment to polemics and could scarcely have been avoided in the type of challenge Jewel manfully devised. Yet, without meaning to be cruel or forgetful of Jewel's talents, it must be said that overstatement of the kind I have mentioned came easily to him. Hooker greatly exaggerated Jewel's abilities as a divine - understandably, for he was Jewel's protégé, an in an ideological sense, his heir. In fact, to catalogue Jewel's best qualities is to suggest his limitations. He was an intelligent recipient of ideas and a clear-minded purveyor of them. His flair was for documenting a case, for he was a painstaking worker, apparently gifted with a prodigious memory, a man who had devised his own
system of shorthand for taking notes and who employed scribes to aid him in compiling lists of suitable citations. If we were to dare to categorise him, we might lodge him with those useful, but sometimes dangerous, people who aim at systematising the insights of others. One tends to think of Jewel as the contented, generous and lovable drudge: reading Tyndale's version of the scriptures aloud, so that his Oxford tutor, John Parkhurst, could collate the text with Coverdale's; laboriously recording the proceedings at the trial of Cranmer and Ridley in 1554; and working as a kind of secretary to Peter Martyr, copying the texts of his lectures for publication and aiding him in his research. Still, Parkhurst was right in his prediction of the youthful scholar: 'Surely Paul's Cross will, one day, ring of this boy'.

It did.

Seemingly the first response to Jewel's initial challenge came from the Court. There is no record of any papist rejoinder, but Jewel continued to be used as a prominent preacher.

1. As an instance of the care with which Jewel collected pertinent references, the following may be cited: Jewel to Martyr, 14 April 1559, Zurich Letters, I, pp.18-9. 'I remember, when you were lecturing at Strasburg respecting the power that sovereigns have over bishops, you stated that Sylverius and Vigilius were removed from their office of patriarch by the Emperor Justinian. When you next write, I will thank you briefly to point out the place where this circumstance is recorded'. Jewel later used the citations in the debate with the Louvainists.

2. Le Bas, op.cit., p.4.
throughout the winter of 1559-60. Early in December, he delivered the oration at the funeral of the Duchess of Suffolk; and in his entry for 30 January, speaking of another funeral, Machyn writes: 'And there did preach master Jewel the new bishop of Salisbury, and there he said plainly that there was no purgatory...'. On 21 January, Jewel had been consecrated at Lambeth by Archbishop Parker, assisted by Grindal, Cox and Hodgkins; and with the exception of Hodgkins, all of these were the participants in a royal-inspired disputation that took place on 5 February regarding the crucifix. There are a number of unanswered questions about this debate ("lis illa crucularia", as Jewel termed it), but, in advance, Jewel himself was extremely pessimistic about its possible outcome. He even thought it might cost him his bishopric. However, his fears proved groundless. A little over a month later, in March, Jewel was repeating his challenge, first at Court and then again at the Cross; and there is good reason for thinking that, on these occasions, he was being deliberately promoted as propagandist for the Settlement.

4. Machyn's entry for 17 March 1560 reads: 'The same day at afternoon did preach at the court /at/ the preaching place master Jewel the new bishop of Salisbury, in his rochet and chimer'. (Diary, p.228). Jewel preached the challenge again at Paul's Cross on Passion Sunday, 31 March 1560. The diary does not, however, corroborate this. The entry for that day reads: 'The xxxi day of March did preach at Paul's Cross Crolly the which was Passion Sunday, some time a /exile, and a learned writer, afterwards minister of St. Giles, Cripplegate'. (Diary, p.229. Strype has added the missing words). Commenting on the discrepancy, the editor of the diary, J. G. Nichols, adds: 'This last date (31 March) is from the contemporary title-page of the sermon itself; and therefore is not to be doubted'. (Diary, p.406). The editor of the Parker Society edition of Jewel's works agrees (Works, I, p.3, n.1).
Though merely circumstantial, the evidence for this is persuasive. The sequence of events suggests official patronage for the reiteration of the challenge at Paul's Cross. So, too, does Jewel's subsequent career; and the relatively prompt publication of the Challenge Sermon together with certain correspondence between Jewel and Dr. Henry Cole, the papist spokesman at the Westminster Disputation, that had resulted from the bishop's preaching. Moreover, happenings in the spring of 1560 give added likelihood to the suggestion that Jewel's challenge was now being sponsored by somebody in the administration—probably Cecil.

When Jewel was repeating the challenge for the second and third times, Elizabeth's encounter with the French in Scotland was approaching its climax. Having first aided the Scottish insurgents secretly—in order, as Cecil put it with his accustomed pungency, to deliver a realm from conquest, and consequently save our own—the Queen's intervention in the north had become thoroughly apparent by the beginning of 1560. In January, ships

1. It is almost certain that the Challenge Sermon was printed before the end of 1560. The entry in the Stationers' Register for the correspondence between Jewel and Cole is 26 September 1560 (E. Arber, Transcript of the Register of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640, I/London, 1875, p.151). Of some significance, perhaps, is the fact that relatively few volumes of sermons were printed in the first years of Elizabeth's reign. Cf. A. F. Herr, The Elizabethan Sermon. A Survey and a Bibliography (Philadelphia, 1940), p.27.

2. Cited in Read, Mr. Secretary Cecil, pp.163-4. Read's treatment of the intervention in Scotland (see esp. chs. 7-8) is thorough: he uses the episode to present 'a picture of Cecil in action'. Cf. also Bayne, Anglo-Roman Relations, pp.45ff.
of the English fleet were sent to engage the French in the Firth of Forth; and around the time Jewel was preaching at Court, the Council was ordering Norfolk to lead the army into Scotland, for Elizabeth had demanded that the evacuation of the French garrisons should commence by 21 March. The situation was a delicate one for England, even though Francis II had difficulties enough at home.¹ The character of the newly-appointed French ambassador to the English court seemed to foreshadow, in Throckmorton's estimation, 'a soon broken peace';² and there were open fears of a French invasion.³ Cecil was gambling against it, but the uncertainties are reflected in a letter he wrote in March:

'We here to trust well that the bravery of the French will be cooled, at home they have enough to do with trouble, partly for religion, partly for governance ...'⁴

To aggravate the situation further, Elizabeth was doubtful as to Philip II's intentions at this point. There was just the chance he might ally himself with Francis II and the Catholic Guises. Officially, of course, France and Spain were at peace; and in 1559, Philip had taken cordiality a step further

¹ The Bourbon-inspired Conspiracy of Amboise took place in March 1560.
² Noailles was recalled and replaced by Michel de Seurre in February 1560 - a move that reflected the influence of the Guise. Read, op.cit., p.162.
³ Jewel voices these fears, somewhat after the event, in his letters to Martyr: 22 May, 1 June 1560, Zurich Letters, I, pp. 79, 83.
⁴ Read, op.cit., p.163.
by marrying the daughter of Henry II. In January 1560, Elizabeth had sent envoys to Spain in an effort to ensure Philip's support for her Scottish venture. But by March no firm reply had been received: Philip had done no more than name a special emissary to the queen, and he did not reach London until April. Meanwhile, the possibility of an entente between the Catholic powers had to be reckoned with; and Cecil outlined, in a memorandum to Elizabeth, the 'Things necessary to be considered upon the doubt of King Philip's break with England.\\1\\n
In fact, none of the possible threats to England's security ripened into real ones, and the Queen's campaign in Scotland turned out to be very successful indeed. The Conspiracy of Amboise, though abortive, heightened internal dissension in France. Philip II was soon to be hampered by his defeat at the hands of the Turks in the Mediterranean; and even apart from this, was in no mind to forsake his conciliatory policy towards England. However, it was some months before all this became clear. In the meantime, England's position seemed straitened enough for the new pope, Pius IV, to think it opportune to despatch his envoy, Parpaglia - half in friendship, half in menace - to Elizabeth, in an effort to regain her allegiance.\\2\\n
For the first, but not the last, time in Elizabeth's reign, papist hopes

\\1\\n1. Read, op.cit., p.167.

\\2\\n2. On this point, see Bayne, op.cit., pp.48-9. Also Pollen, English Catholics in the reign of Queen Elizabeth ..., p.67; Meyer, England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth, pp.39-40.
rose in the spring of 1560 as the nation's political prospects appeared to decline.

After meeting a similar contingency with great success in 1561, Cecil candidly explained to Sir Nicholas Throckmorton how he had acted on that occasion: 'I thought it necessary to dull the papists' expectations by discovering of certain mass-mongers and punishing of them ...'.

It would seem that Cecil was equally alert to the need 'for ... rebating of the papists' humours' in 1560, and that he adopted much the same measures then - for a number of reasons: firstly, to force caution on the Papists and dampen their hopes; secondly, to foster a sense of emergency, reminding the people who the realm's real enemies were and sharpening their spirits for war; and also, finally, to overcome the queen's hesitancies with regard to his own policies in Scotland. Something of the mood in which the administration met the 1560 crisis is reflected in the royal proclamation of 24 March 1560 - which Read maintains was drafted jointly by Cecil and Petrie. In effect, it holds papist ambitions responsible for French aggression, exonerating the young king and queen and the princes of the blood from blame, and hea;ing all its enmity on the House of Guise.


2. Read, op.cit., p.164.
We know of some gestures that were made to bring the point home. On Candlemas Day (2 February), for instance, the French embassy had been raided and Englishmen attending Mass there imprisoned - a token, as in 1563, of heightening repression.¹ Just a few months later, the administration's handling of the deprived bishops became noticeably more severe. Now in the unfortunate position of being pawns in the political game, they were cast into prison - again, to dull papist expectations.² It would seem highly likely that Bishop Jewel's repetition of the challenge was yet another gesture in this same direction, and that on these two occasions in March 1560 he was probably commissioned by Cecil to carry the battle to the Papists and discredit their

1. Quadra to the Duchess of Parma, 7 February 1560, Span.Cal. 1558-67, p.126. Quadra adds that on the same day an Englishman came to his own house while mass was being said and entered the chapel to see those present. He explains the raid on the French Ambassador's residence by saying that the queen feared the Papists might be carrying on clandestine communications with the French.

2. Cecil to Throckmorton, 22 May 1560: 'Yesterday Watson (quondam Lincoln), Pater (quondam Wigorn), Feckenham (quondam Abbot) were committed to the Tower, as men obstinate. More will or must follow, ad terrorem. Bonner is in the Marshalsea. If the French begin open play, we must not dissemble with these men'. Cited Read, op.cit., p.263 (after Forbes, i, p.460. Not in Foreign Cal.). Read believes the incarceration of the bishops was 'probably a war measure' (ibid.); and Pollen seems to agree (op.cit., p.64). See, however, Bayne's interpretation of the incident (op.cit., p.55). On 26 March, Quadra, writing to the Duchess of Parma, was speculating about the possibility of a 'general rising' Span.Cal. 1558-67, p.138); and on 23 May, he wrote to Feria: 'Since His Majesty warned the Queen not to help the rebels the Catholics have been persecuted worse than ever, and all those that are known have been cast into prison. Oxford students and the law students in London have been taken in great numbers. They have also arrested those who came to my house on Easter day to hear Mass and have declared my house suspect'. (Span.Cal. 1558-67, p.156).
arguments. Perhaps it is significant that in this same month Jewel was assuring Peter Martyr: 'Cecil is your friend'.

We may begin to think of Jewel at this point as the propagandist. That is to say, his theological case, though no doubt sincere, was sensitive to political needs as well as to merely pastoral ones. Whatever scruples Jewel may have voiced about accepting a bishopric, he very rapidly emerged as a dutiful servant of the Queen's policies and apologist for them - a role he continued to play until his death, and one which was entirely congenial to him, both on grounds of principle and by reason of his own temperament.

In reiterating the challenge, Jewel was more aggressively polemical. At Paul's Cross, on 31 March 1560, he saw fit to widen the terms of the original one, adding a further twelve propositions to the fifteen he had already listed. All referred to the Eucharist with the exception of the last, which Jewel seems to have culled from Dr. Cole's contribution to the Westminster Disputation. It might appear frivolous to have accused papists of teaching that 'ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion and obedience', yet the charge was

1. Jewel to Martyr, 5 March 1560, Zurich Letters, I, p.71. Earlier Jewel had reported that Cecil 'most ardently' favours our cause: Jewel to Martyr, 16 November 1559, Zurich Letters, I, p.55. And he dined with Cecil at court on the day prior to his departure for Salisbury: Jewel to Martyr, 22 May 1560, Zurich Letters, I, p.80.

2. This was a.27 in the challenge. Sermon, Sig. G. ii (Works, I, p.21).
relevant enough to the issues in debate. Some of Jewel's additional items were little better than a caricature of scholastic positions; others simply named more practices that Jewel considered indefensible; but a few touched on substantial matters that had been neglected in the first challenge — notably papist belief in the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. Once again, however, the specious and the inconsequential rubbed shoulders with the significant; and the increased boldness made Jewel's stand appear even less defensible, from a theological point of view, than before.

   a.20: 'Or that, it was then thought a sound doctrine, to teach the people, that the mass *ex opere operato*: That is, even for that it is said, and done, is able to remove any part of our sin'; a.23: 'Or that, a mouse, or any other worm, or beast may eat the body of Christ (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught)'; a.24: 'Or that, when Christ said *Hoc est corpus meum*, this word, hoc, pointeth not the bread, but *individuum vagum*; as some of them say'.

   a.16: 'that it was then lawful, for the priest, to pronounce the words of consecration closely, and in silence to himself'; a.18: 'Or, to communicate and receive the sacrament for another, as they do'; a.21: 'Or that then any christian man called the sacrament his Lord and God'.

   a.17: 'Or that, the priest had then authority, to offer up Christ unto his Father'; a.19: 'Or, to apply the virtue of Christ's death and passion to any man by the mean of the mass'. Cf. a.22: 'Or that, the people was then taught to believe, that the body of Christ remaineth in the sacrament as long as the accidents of the bread remain there without corruption'; a.25: 'Or that, the accidents, or forms, or shews of bread and wine, be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself'; a.26: 'Or that, the sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ that lieth hidden underneath it'.
Jewel's thinking with regard to the challenge is clarified somewhat by the sermon he preached when issuing it for third and last time, on Passion Sunday 1560. Presumably he delivered other addresses when making the challenge on the two previous occasions, but this is only one that has survived and is known now as The Challenge Sermon. Its tone substantiates Jewel's claim to be speaking 'not in vehemency of spirit, or heat of talk, but even, as before God, by the way of simplicity, and truth'. It is moderate and lucid - the lean product of a tidy mind, and carefully constructed in what might be termed the 'classical' fashion. Yet it is not a cold sermon: Jewel's reforming zeal comes through strongly and impressively. The discourse is woven around words of Paul to the Corinthians, which Jewel interprets as a mandate to reformers: 'For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread ...' (I Cor. 11:23). Its theme is the abuse, or 'missensing', of the Eucharist.

The central proposition in the bishop's defence of the Settlement is that there have been abuses in the Roman Mass.

1. Sermon, Sig. F v (Works, I, p.20).

2. Discussing the 'form', or construction, of Elizabethan sermons, Blench remarks that some of Jewel's sermons are 'notable examples' of what he calls the 'modern' style, that approximates to classical models. Preaching in England in the late Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries, pp. 100, 102.
Most of the Challenge Sermon dwells on those specific abuses which Elizabeth's legislation claimed to rectify. But Jewel is also concerned to establish a principle: that the church can become corrupt, both in its beliefs and in its administration of the sacraments. Here he was expressly contesting an important papist assumption, and one which Cole had reiterated at the Westminster Disputation.

Papists held that the Universal Church 'cannot err'; and in the context of the sacraments, this assertion meant two things. Firstly, and more obviously, it meant that the Church is constantly guided by the Spirit and is therefore free from institutional abuses. No matter how sinful the individual rulers and members of the Church may be, the whole Church's fidelity to Christ's intentions is assured. That is, the common teaching about the sacraments remains substantially true to what Christ had taught; and even when changes take place, the Church's handling of the sacraments is always in substantial conformity with Christ's commands. As a consequence, there was no possibility of Papists passing adverse judgments on the Church's immediate past, or of ever conceding that there could be a period of corruption in the Church's history. The total restoration of the ancient practices in Mary's reign was, as Jewel recognised, an assertion of this inflexible principle:
'... after that the mass had been once abolished, by that noble prince of godly memory king Edward the Sixth, and the next prince for that she knew none other religion, and thought well of the thing that she had been so long trained in, would needs have it put in use again, through all her dominions; it was forthwith restored, in like manner, in all points as it had been used before, without any kind of alteration, or change: as I believe, that their very doings therein might stand for proof sufficient, that neither the mass itself, nor any parcel or point thereof, had ever been abused'. 1

But there was a second claim implicit in the papist position which was equally unacceptable to Jewel the reformer. It concerned the efficacy, or value, of the sacraments the Church administered - the Papists maintaining that they acted necessarily and inevitably, or *ex opere operato*. Because the Spirit is constantly at work in the Church - so the argument would run in this case - the sacraments always achieve some kind of effect in those who receive them at the church's hands. Sinfulness and lack of devotion may, in certain cases, hinder the sacrament from being totally fruitful, but something is always achieved in the recipient. In short, there was the complacency that God acted in the Church's sacraments no matter how unfavourable the circumstances of their administration appeared to be. For Papists, 'comfort' or 'solace' or felt 'profit' were not the yard-stick of spiritual value that they were for Jewel. 2

Jewel's theoretical position with regard to church-abuses is stated firmly in the Challenge Sermon. Tyndale once wrote of Papists that there is nothing so sweet that they do not make it sour with their traditions. Jewel frames the same thought a trifle more generically. 'True it is', he says:

'the sacrament is an holy thing, the ordinance of Christ, the mystery of our salvation: yet is there nothing so good, no ordinance so holy, no mystery so heavenly, but through the folly, and frowardness of man, it may be abused'.

This repudiates both of the claims which Papists made regarding the Church's handling of the sacraments. Jewel's term, 'abuse', refers to a double failure: it is at once a 'deformity' - a departure from the 'true pattern',\(^2\) 'the standard, and original of the first appointing of the holy sacrament',\(^3\) - and the destruction of the sacrament's true efficacy. At one and the same time, Christ's word is spurned and 'the people of God is deceived and mocked, and instead of precious stones, driven to take counterfeits'.\(^4\) This is why the sole redress for profitless ritual is to return to 'the first original' as Christ, the founder of the sacraments, determined it.

---

1. Sermon, Sig. A viii (Works, I, p.5).
2. Sermon, Sig. A vi (Works, I, p.4).
Jewel, of course, subscribes to the view that there is a recurring need for the Christian Church to undertake such a return. Over against the sanguine view of the Church taken by Papists, he sets the more pessimistic ecclesia semper reformanda - and for the reasons normally advanced by his fellow-reformers. Jewel, like them, finds patterns in history that support such a view: Jesus himself initiated a reform; and even Paul, when the Church was still in its youth, found it necessary to remind the Corinthians of Christ's original mandate for the Eucharist.

The need for reform continues because of man's 'folly and frowardness'. He necessarily subverts what is godly. His 'inventions' and 'phantasies' have so filled the Mass, for example, that 'they quite covered, and shadowed the death of Christ, and the holy mysteries of our salvation', frustrating their efficacy.

Quite clearly, Jewel and the Papists were working on different conceptions of the Church. Or, one might phrase this another way and say that they understood God's action in history differently. For the Papists, God's presence (to put it baldly) was manifest in the on-going Church. God had acted in Christ, and he continued to act in Christ's church. His active presence there was, in fact, reflected in the Church's qualities: its inerrancy and unswerving rectitude, its otherwise-inexplicable continuance, and so on. As Papists saw it, God and men worked

1. Sermon, Sigs. A iv\textsuperscript{r} - iv\textsuperscript{v} (Works, I, p.4).
2. Sermon, Sigs. A iii\textsuperscript{v}, A iv\textsuperscript{v} - v\textsuperscript{r}, H i\textsuperscript{r} - ii\textsuperscript{r} (Works, I, pp.3, 4, 24).
3. Sermon, Sig. H ii\textsuperscript{r} (Works, I, p.24).
together in the Church; and man's all-too-infim 'inventions' were there, mysteriously, turned to a divine purpose. In contrast, Jewel saw God intervening in a 'once-for-all' fashion in Christ. With his coming, divine standards were set; and that original rule totally enunciated in God's word, the Scriptures. Subsequently, the Christian Church must struggle, through the power of the Spirit, to meet that rule, constantly subordinating man's presumption to Christ's ordinances. For the two are at variance: the wilfulness of man - even in the Church - forever threatens God's truth. One would hesitate to say that the positions of Jewel and his opponents were antithetical. But the emphases were so different that, at the time, each held the other's view anathema.

The burden of the Challenge Sermon (and, of course, the challenge itself) is to reveal the Roman liturgical traditions as so many human 'inventions' - not a new theme for the exile-divines, who had been preaching this assiduously since their return.¹ All that can be said of Jewel is that he appears to have made his case more comprehensive and more pointed; and that he focussed attention clearly on the terms of this claim by his appeal to antiquity. As has been said, he called on the papists

¹. Cf. Cox to Weidner, 20 May 1559, Zurich Letters, I, p.27: 'Meanwhile we, that little flock, who for these last five years, by the blessing of God, have been hidden among you in Germany, are thundering forth in our pulpits, and especially before our queen Elizabeth, that the Roman pontiff is truly antichrist, and that traditions are for the most part mere blasphemies'.
to demonstrate from the history of the church - the first six centuries specifically - that their practices were not 'innovations'. With some pretence at thoroughness, he himself argued that they were. Of the veneration of the Eucharist, for instance, he says:

'It is a very new device, and, as it is well known, came but lately into the church ... about three hundred years ago, it was first found out, and put in practice ... for the space of a thousand, and two hundred years, after Christ's ascension into heaven this worshipping of the sacrament was never known or practised, in any place within the whole catholic church of Christ throughout the whole world'. 1

Similar charges are made with regard to the other four practices that Jewel singles out for detailed treatment in the sermon. 2 And in a lengthy oratorical peroration he contrasts - with more imagination than historical precision - the 'mass' of the apostle, St. James, with the Roman liturgy, concluding:

'... St. James in his mass had Christ's institution: They, in their mass have well near nothing else but man's invention'. 3

In a word, this was the essence of Jewel's accusation against the Papists - and indeed, the essence of his case on behalf of the Settlement, since he was only concerned with

---

1. Sermon, Sigs. C v \textsuperscript{r} - v \textsuperscript{v} (Works, I, p.10).
2. Regarding the use of a strange tongue in the liturgy, communion under one kind, the canon of the mass, Sermon, Sigs. C \textsuperscript{r} - iii \textsuperscript{r} (Works, I, p.9); and the private mass, Sig. E iv \textsuperscript{r} (Works, I, p.16).
justifying a rejection. From his theological standpoint, 'man's invention' was entirely synonymous with 'abuse': it spelt 'new evil', which necessarily conflicted with the 'old good' adequately outlined in Christ's ordinances. And tactically, it made good sense to mount a popular attack that contested the antiquity of the apparently-ancient practices. He certainly did not devise it, but Jewel popularised the 'new or old?' debate, launching it eloquently, and with great polemical success, into the public forum. To the educated and simple alike, he took the liberty of proposing history as a ready criterion of authenticity. 'Ye have heard men, in times past, allege unto you councils, doctors, antiquities, successions, and long continuance of time' in support of the mass, he said; but the pressing question is: whom do the fathers of the past favour?

'... good people, (there) is ... now a siege laid to your walls: an army of doctors and councils shew themselves upon an hill: The adversary, that would have you yield, beareth you in hand, that they are their soldiers, and stand on their side. But keep your hold, the doctors and old catholic fathers, in the points that I have spoken of, are yours, ye shall see the siege raised, ye shall see your adversaries discomfited, and put to flight.' 2

On the face of it, Jewel seemed to be setting great store by the opinions of the early Fathers. One could be excused

for believing that he accepted their verdict as an authoritative norm of theological propriety. But this was not the case, as I shall point out. It must be insisted that his appeal to antiquity was primarily a polemical device aimed at discomforting Papists. Jewel's stance in the Challenge Sermon was modeled, in all major respects, on the tactics used in the Westminster Disputation. His challenge dwelt on the same issues, highlighting those that would help to promote at least outward conformity in worship; he studiously adopted the same ruse of forcing the onus of proof on the Papists; and, as at Westminster, his aim in the challenge was to undermine the Papists' exclusive right to the title 'catholic' and dislodge their apparent hold on the past. Jewel used the Fathers, not to demonstrate the propriety of the Settlement, but to show that the Papists' case was not what it seemed. For, in his opinion, positive support for the liturgical changes was patently provided by the Scriptures; and indeed, Scripture was the only positive norm that was acceptable to him.¹ The patristic

---

¹. Jewel is confident that the administration of the sacraments now conforms to scriptural usage (Sermon, Sig. A vii /Works, I, p. 57); and is equally sure he can accurately determine what does, or does not, conform to the scriptural injunctions (Sermon, Sig. B iv /Works, I, p. 77). As to the primacy of Scripture for Jewel, the following passages might be cited: 'Now, good people, judge ye in your conscience indifferently us both, whether of us bringeth you the better and sounder arguments. We bring you nothing but God's holy word; which is a sure rock to build upon, and will never fleet or shrink'. (Sermon, Sig. E ii /Works, I, p. 167); 'O that our adversaries, and all them that stand in the defence of the mass this day, would content themselves to be judged by this rule. O that in all the controversies that lie between us and them they would remit the judgment unto God's word...'. (Sermon, Sig. H iv /Works, I, p. 257). Cf. Sermon, Sig. A v /Works, I, p. 47).
argument he treated mainly as a weapon.

Writing against Latomus in 1521, Luther made a distinction which would have been perfectly congenial to Jewel. Luther's comment was that, in the discussion he and Latomus were engaged in, it was necessary to rely on evident divine testimony (meaning the Scriptures); and he continued, apropos of such things as the opinions of the Fathers: 'human testimony is useful in familiar persuasion and popular preaching'. There can be little doubt that Jewel subscribed to the view that the statements of ancient Fathers, and even the decrees of the ancient councils and the formulae of the three creeds, were no more than human utterances. If they were acceptable, it was only in so far as they accurately portrayed scriptural truth, which alone was divine and normative. The three creeds and the early councils usefully summarised the essential doctrines contained in the Scriptures, and (in the case of the councils) detailed the principal aberrations of belief. As such, they were an aid to the simple believer - or, to cite Luther once again, a kind of layman's bible. Similarly, the views of the early Fathers and examples from the practice of the primitive Church provided, in some instances at least, apt historical illustrations of scriptural truth; and in this respect, were a

veritable arsenal from which the preacher or popular polemicist might draw telling images. This, of course, contrasted with the outlook of the Roman theologians, for whom all conciliar decrees (as expressions of the universal church's common consent) were normative, and for whom a general consensus of opinion among the Fathers of any period was - as far as essential matters of belief were concerned - yet another criterion of orthodoxy.

Jewel's appeal to the first six centuries might suggest that he found this earlier period especially sacrosanct or noteworthy. To a limited degree, he did. His terminology suggests a contrast between 'this later age of the world' and the primitive period in which, as he says, 'the religion of Christ seemed to be in highest perfection'. 1 He refers to it as the time 'before the church grew to corruption'. 2 And pretty clearly, there is no comparison in Jewel's mind between the authority of the 'old godly bishops and fathers of the church' on the one hand, and that of the so-called 'young fathers and doctors' (meaning the schoolmen) on the other. He lampoons the esoteric arguments of the latter, with disdain, and more than a little unfairly, in the Challenge Sermon. 3 Moreover, while he is prepared to cite from the early councils and, in fact,

1. Sermon, Sig. B ii	extsuperscript{r} (Works, I, p.6).
2. Sermon, Sig. C i	extsuperscript{r} (Works, I, p.9).
It is obvious, however, that Bishop Jewel discovers no absolute purity of doctrine or practice in the primitive Church. 'Even at the beginning of the church', he says, 'even when the Apostles of Christ were yet alive: and the blood of Christ as yet fresh and green before their eyes', there were many abuses which Paul and others found it necessary to correct. And Jewel catalogues a large number, in establishing the principle that even the holiest things are likely to be corrupted. One must assume that Jewel recognises the need for discrimination when citing the ancient Fathers and examples of primitive church-practice; and that if he gives precedence to the earlier statements, it is simply on the grounds that they are less likely to be corrupt than later ones. In short, antiquity only seems to be a criterion for Jewel. He opposes the 'new' merely because it is an 'invention' and therefore a departure from the scriptural norm. He appears to champion the 'old', but does not do so unequivocally: the 'old' is really valid only when it patently conforms with the scriptural norm. Jewel was not prepared to let the past be the judge of the

2. Sermon, Sig. B i⁻ i⁺ (Works, I, p.5).
present in quite the way the Papists would have it be. Aimed at winning a polemical point, his appeal to history must be classed chiefly as an effort at 'familiar persuasion'.

If one searches for what is distinctive in Jewel's stand, one finds it, not at the deeper level of principle, but closer to the surface, in what might be termed the 'complexion' of his remarks, or their tone. One can scarcely regard Jewel's theological principles as other than derivative: they conform quite rigidly to the 'classical' reform pattern - so much so that, were it not misleading in this context, one might want to name them 'puritan'. For Jewel gives every impression of being the complete reformer: his stance is essentially that of the moralist; he eschews the speculative and distrusts the 'mystical follies' of Papists; and with all the relentlessness of the evangelical, he moves from a literalist reading of the Scriptures to a ready diagnosis of latter-day abuses, charging his audience to remit all to the 'rule' of God's holy Word, and to be sure they derive 'comfort' from ritual. Nor does he differ from the major reformers in his theoretical attitude towards Christian antiquity. In principle, he believes only in a return to Gospel simplicity, reverencing the Fathers only when - and in so far as - they conform to the Gospel ideal. Yet the tone of the Challenge Sermon does suggest a somewhat more substantial attachment to historical continuity. One thinks of the many statements in which Jewel assures the queen's subjects that they had happily
reverted:

'... to the same order that was delivered and appointed by Christ, and after practised by the Apostles, and continued by the holy doctors and fathers, for the space of five or six hundred years, throughout all the whole Catholic church of Christ without exception, or any one sufficient example to be shewed to the contrary...'. 1

Or of such words as:

'O Gregory: 0 Augustine: 0 Hierome: 0 Chrysostom: 0 Leo: 0 Dionysse: 0 Anacletus: 0 Sixtus: 0 Paul: 0 Christ:
If we be deceived herein, ye are they that have deceived us... Thus ye ordered the holy communion in your time, the same we received at your hand, and have faithfully delivered it unto the people'. 2

Jewel was never much given to drawing distinctions between his own views and those of more radical Protestants. As far as he was concerned, it was pretty much a case of pas d'enemi à gauche, to cite Professor Collinson's phrase.3

Jewel's concern was normally to conceal differences within the Protestant ranks, and to unite all Gospellers in a concerted onslaught on Rome. Where he and other exponents of the emerging 'middle way' did differ from the so-called 'Puritans', however, was in their willingness to accede to the limits - and also, in a sense, the tone - of the Elizabethan legislation. In the

3. Collinson, Elizabethan Puritan Movement, p.64.
Challenge Sermon, one detects this acquiescence in Jewel's stringent concentration on the matters directly at stake in the Settlement - and indeed, in his general readiness to be such a conscientious and undeviating apologist. One sees it also, I think, in the way Jewel loyally echoes the tone of the statutes and the Injunctions and the 11 Articles, by insisting that the Settlement restores an 'ancient' order of things. As a reformer, he would have been quite content to urge that the new legislation was in accordance with the Scriptures. But as the Queen's servant and an active polemicist, he was drawn to contest continuity with the Papists, becoming (as if by accident) an exponent of what was to be a distinctive system of churchmanship.
III

To justify the length of a rejoinder he composed on one occasion, Jewel remarked: 'a little poison requireth ofttimes a great deal of treacle'. Any reader of the literature that grew out of his challenge might relish the image and be inclined to apply it to the ensuing debate. Venomous or not, Jewel's vaunting, in an age that set great store by argument, represented a real enough threat to the survival of the papist outlook in England; and the ideological antidotes were very liberally administered. C. S. Lewis writes of the 'jungle of controversies' occasioned by the Challenge Sermon, adding with some justice: it 'stands at about the same distance from literature proper as the debates in Hansard'. But as well as being a massive exchange, it was also quite momentous from standpoints other than the purely literary one.

2. The significance of the controversy is, perhaps, debatable. There are those like A. C. Southern and Le Bas who describe the controversy as 'one of the most remarkable things in the history of English writing' (A. C. Southern, *Elizabethan recusant prose, 1559-82* (London, 1950), p.66. Cf. Le Bas, op.cit., p.138). Others like Maclure would say its 'one enduring good' was that it produced Jewel's *Apologetis Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (Maclure, op.cit., p.57).

Judgments are saner, I think, when they advert chiefly to the short-term effects of the controversy: the influence it may have had on the Northern Rising of 1569, for instance (cf. P. K. Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795*, I (London, 1914), p.9); and, more relevant still, its influence on subsequent theological controversy.
The beginnings of the debate were hardly promising however. The first polemical response to the challenge came from Dr. Henry Cole, who wrote privately to Jewel immediately after his sermon at court on 17 March 1560. Before the end of the month, four notes had passed between the two parties; and early in April, Cole seems to have circulated among his friends a cryptic point-by-point analysis of Jewel's statements which, for some reason, he withheld from the bishop himself. Jewel countered with a long reply, written in May, just prior to his departure for Salisbury to take possession of his see. This, along with the rest of the correspondence and the Challenge Sermon itself, was published soon afterwards at the insistence, as Jewel said, of 'certain persons both honourable and worshipful that would gladly have our doings to the print'.

Although the encounter did lead to the elucidation of one or two points in Jewel's argument, and of course popularised the challenge even further, it was largely inconclusive and little more than a preliminary skirmish. Heylyn has perhaps found the right word for it: a 'velitation'.

1. The True Copies of The Letters betwene the reuerend father in God Iohn Bisshop of Sarum and D. Cole ... (1560 edition, in which the Challenge Sermon is not included. [= Letters] Sig. E v (Works, I, p. 40).

One of Jewel's biographers contends that Cole was not a worthy opponent for the bishop; and Strype regards Cole as 'a person more earnest than wise'. Certainly, he was not in a good position to engage in profitable debate, and that he should have tried to do so is, indeed, a sign of his earnestness, and his courage. He was more than twenty years older than Jewel, and his training was in the law rather than theology. Honorary doctorates in divinity had been conferred on him by the two universities in Mary's reign, for, as Dean of St. Paul's under Bishop Bonner, he had been active in the heresy trials and a prominent spokesman for the old faith. It was Cole who preached at Cranmer's execution, and who introduced the papist case at Westminster in 1559 - so Jewel was quite entitled to name him 'the chiefest man on the other side'. Yet it is doubtful whether he possessed either the learning or the energy of Thomas Harding and his colleagues, Jewel's later opponents. Cole was of an earlier generation of Wykehamists, having been Warden of New College before most of the Louvainists, the controversialists who fled to the Low Countries after Elizabeth's accession, were students there. Perhaps, after surviving much change, he was (as Jewel thought) 'dictatorial', and somewhat prone to ridicule

1. Le Bas, op.cit., p. 97.
arguments rather than refute them. But in Cole's favour, it must be remembered that he was in no position to press his complaints against Jewel freely.

Both the bishop's letters and his own acknowledge a specific restraint on Cole: at the time of writing, he was 'bound in recognisance'. As he says to Jewel:

'Ye bid me to a feast, where, while I should take on me to prove your doctrine nought: I were like to forfeit my Recognisance, which you guilefully allure me unto'. 1

'You require that is dangerous for me to do, as you know'. 2

It is difficult to determine precisely the reason for this bond, or the terms of it, as the acts of the Privy Council for 1560 are not extant. Jewel seems to regard it as the outcome of Cole's conduct at the Westminster Disputation; 3 and we do know that, after the collapse of that debate, he was commanded to remain in the city of London and appear daily before the Council until a suitable punishment could be decided on. 4 However,

2. Letters, Sig. D v (Works, I, p.36).

The conditions of Cole's recognisance are stated in the Privy Council entry for 4 April 1559 (Acts of the Privy Council of England, New Series ed. J. R. Dasent, VII /London, 1893/, p.79). Thenceforth Cole's appearance before the Council is daily reported in the Acts, although the entry for 5 April notes that 'Raff Browne, servant to Dr. Cole' appeared to say his master was 'evil at ease, and not well able to come abroad' (op.cit., p.79). On 21 May 1559, a fine of 500 marks was imposed on Cole - a far more severe penalty than that decreed for the other participants (op.cit., p.103). The surviving Acts cease with the entry for 22 May 1559, and they mention that 'Doctor Cole came this day and desired to have his appearance
this was some twelve months prior to Cole's encounter with Jewel; and in the meantime, a specific fine had been imposed on Cole for the 'disobedience and contempt' shown at Westminster. But in June 1559, he appears to have been bound in recognisance once again - this time for supporting Bonner in his resistance to the Settlement.

Although all the other churches of London conformed to what Il Schifanoya called 'the Lutheran fashion' before 24 June 1559, the statutory date for the enforcement of the Act of Uniformity, St. Paul's did not - in spite of express commands from the Council to 'remove the service of the Mass and of the Divine office' in that church. Accordingly, Bonner, the bishop of London, was the first of the prelates to be proceeded against when inducements to have them take the Oath of Supremacy failed. Early in June, the Spanish ambassador reported that he had been 'mulcted' of his possessions, and that on the following day the other senior ecclesiastics of the city, Cole and the Abbot of Westminster, had been summoned into 'lengthy conferences', at

__recorded' (op.cit., p.103).__

It might be added that on 28 July 1562 the Council ordered the authorities at the Fleet to keep Cole 'in close prison', and restrain him from having conference with any having resort to him (op.cit., p.119).

1. Il Schifanoya to the Castellan of Mantua, 30 May 1559, _Ven.Cal._, VII, p.94).
which they were threatened and eventually removed from office also. 1 Il Schifanoya's despatch of the same date added the information that Cole and the chancellors of St. Paul's had resisted the Queen's invitation to proceed with the election of a new bishop of London. 2

Not surprisingly, severe restrictions were imposed on the recalcitrants, although they were not immediately imprisoned. Writing towards the end of June 1559, Il Schifanoya reported of the bishops that as well as being deprived of their office and revenues, they were

'bound also not to depart from England, and not to preach or exhort whatever in public or private, and still less to write anything against the orders and statutes of this Parliament, nor to give occasion to insurrection or any other scandalous act, under pain of perpetual imprisonment; the Queen's ministers demanding security and promise to be given by one bishop for the other'. 3

1. Quadra to Philip II, 6 June 1559. Cf. 19 June 1559: '... they have just begun to carry out the Act of Parliament against the bishops, and have actually deprived the Bishop and the Dean of London, ejecting them from their church, where also they have altered the divine service, and removed thence the Blessed Sacrament; this took place on Sunday the 11th of this month'. Cited Birt, Elizabethan Religious Settlement, p.212, from Chron. Belg., i pp. 535, 539 (not in Span. Cal. 1558-67). Cf. Machyn's entry for 29 May 1559 (Diary, p.200) and 11 June: 'mass at Paul's was none that day, and the new dean took possession that was afore, by my lord of Bedford, and this was on saint Barnabas' day; and the same night they had no evensong at Paul's' (ibid.).

2. Il Schifanoya to the Castellan of Mantua, 6 June 1559, Ven. Cal., VII, pp.94-5.

3. Il Schifanoya to Ottaviano Vivaldino (Mantuan Ambassador with Philip II), 27 June 1559, Ven. Cal., VII, p.104. Il Schifanoya added that the deprived prelates had received orders from the Council where they were to dwell; and in this same despatch, he also mentioned that the French Ambassador was currently living in the house lately inhabited by Cole (p.105) - a fact of interest to Il Schifanoya for, apparently, he had lodged
One may safely assume that these conditions applied to Dr. Cole when he took issue with Jewel in March 1560. We do know that he was brought before the Queen's commissioners and questioned regarding the statement he had circulated in reply to Jewel's second letter - which suggests he may have been impeached for writing against the statutes. And almost certainly, perpetual imprisonment was Cole's fate. With other Marian prelates he was sent to the Tower on 20 May 1560, being transferred some days afterwards to the Fleet where - unlike at least some of the others - he seems to have remained until his death, twenty years later. Under the circumstances, it was gross of Jewel to ridicule his opponent's caution and dub him 'a faint Soldier'.

Cole's bonds were all too real, and his premonitions of danger well-founded.


2. Machyn, Diary, pp.235, 238. There is some doubt as to whether Cole remained in prison until the end of his life (cf. DNB, s. v. 'Cole'). However, his name appears in a list of prisoners in the Fleet in 1579; and Gillow believes he died there (A Literary and Biographical History, or Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics ..., I /London, 1885/ p.531)

As an instance of the sentiment that may have been responsible for Cole's prolonged imprisonment, the following may be cited: Quadra to Philip II, 3 February 1560. 'Doctor Cole sent two days since to tell me that if your Majesty abandoned them they would appeal to the French, or even to the Turks, rather than put up with these heretics'. (Span.Cal. 1558-67, p.124).

3. Letters, Sig. I iii (Works, I, p.52).
With Cole not at liberty to discuss the enactments of
the Parliament, there was little chance of useful debate. Posing
(none too innocently) as an inquirer, he aimed at dislodging Jewel
from his negative position, but could not take up the challenge
expressly. The two champions merely jostled for the high ground,
without really doing battle. Moreover, the letters of both were
very hastily drafted and are tendentious rather than thoughtful.
The surface pleasantries do not hide the bitterness of the
exchange: one is constantly hearing overtones of the recent clash
at Westminster and (more resounding still) of the bloodier
arguments of 'sword and fire', and 'your terrible guard of bills
and halberds, your grinning and scoffing, with other like your
demeanour, as ye used in the disputations at Oxford'. 1 Both he
and Cole were too personally involved in these incidents to be
dispasionate with one another now. Out of caution, Cole is
tentative and devious and given to insinuation. Jewel, on the
other hand, is often pedantic and over-concerned with tactics.
Yet he undoubtedly has the better of the debate, in that he is
restrained where Cole is intemperate and even abusive. Reading
the correspondence, one is reminded of the remark Jewel reputedly
made to his pupils at Oxford: 'I would chastise you, were I not
angry'. 2 But neither participant emerges as an attractive figure:
Jewel is acidic in his control; and his opponent is all bluster and

---

2. Le Bas, op.cit., p.11.
sarcasm - like 'St. George a horseback', Jewel said: 'evermore riding, and yet evermore standing still'. The polemical intent obscures the nobler, and mellower, traits.

The exchange did manage to elucidate one or two aspects of the bishop's defence of the Settlement. In his very first letter, for instance, Cole questioned Jewel's choice of topics for debate. He remarks that, in the sermon at court and earlier at Paul's Cross, Jewel had avoided 'the chief matters that lie in question betwixt the Church of Rome and the Protestants' He has concentrated on issues that papists admit could be revised by a General Council. Catholics do not give 'a plat and plain answer ... without "if", or "and"' to the questions Jewel raises, says Cole:

'So /i.e. give a plain answer/ we do not, whether the Service ought to be in English or not. Or whether the people ought to receive in both kinds or no. Or whether any private Mass ought to be said in the Church or no'.

But, he adds, there are questions about which Catholics are entirely unequivocal, and these are matters Jewel avoids:

'the Article of the presence of Christ's Body and blood in the Sacrament, the article of our justification, the value of a Christian man's good works, whether the Mass used in the church of Rome be tolerable yea, or no, yea whether that the mass be not a very sacrifice acceptable to God indeed, and good both for the quick and the dead, whether any Scripture forbiddeth a man to desire the blessed Apostles and Martyrs in heaven to pray for us, whether it be lawful to honour them, and whether it be lawful for us, and good for them, to pray for all christian Souls ...'

Cole's complaint reveals the dilemma of the Papists: in theory, many of them were prepared to grant that the practical steps taken in the Settlement were theologically indifferent in themselves, and could be authorised by a General Council. In one sense, he concedes that there is room for compromise; but, at the same time, it is very clear there can be no compromise in respect to the Church's authority - or, more explicitly in this case, the Church's probity. Cole is adamant that the Roman Church's past practice in the liturgy must be held 'tolerable'.

At first sight, Jewel's reply seems ingenuous. He appears to grant that his main concern was to gain a polemical advantage:

'... to answer the truth, why I passed by these matters at the first, and rather began with other, the cause was, not for that I doubted in any of the premises, but only for that I knew the matters that you move question of, might at least have some colour or shadow of the doctors. But I thought it best to make my entry with such things, as wherein I was well assured ye should be able to find not so much as any colour at all. And if ye will first grant this to be true, as I believe you will, notwithstanding the people have been long told the contrary, afterward I am well content to travail with you farther in the rest'.

1. Letters, Sigs. A ii\textsuperscript{v} - iii\textsuperscript{v} (Works, I, pp.26-7).
2. Letters, Sigs. A vii\textsuperscript{r} - vii\textsuperscript{v} (Works, I, p.28).
It will be seen from this passage that Jewel is not nearly as artless as he wishes to appear. In this case, winning a polemical point is only a means of establishing a principle - the very principle papists like Cole would not accept: that the Church can be proven wrong, and shown to be guilty of harbouring abuse. Papists might think the issues he raised 'light and childish, and not worth the hearing', but in Jewel's estimation the weightiness of the matters was immaterial, provided the reform-principle could be demonstrated against his opponents. As he said in the Challenge Sermon, if there were no more than one abuse it should be spoken of and amended; and it would be sufficient to show the Church's corruption.¹ This was the point he aimed at pressing home by means of the challenge. And however much one sympathises with Cole's impatience at Jewel's choice of topics, it must be conceded that the bishop was isolating a major point of disagreement between the 'old' and the 'new' preachers.

In arguing that the use of the vernacular, for instance, could be introduced by a General Council - thereby implying it was an 'indifferent' matter - Cole was also at odds with Jewel, on two scores. Firstly, Jewel would not have agreed that the use of a strange tongue in the common prayer, or the administration of

---

¹ For example: '... if there were but one of these abuses in it (the mass), yet were it worthy to be spoken of, and to be amended' (Sermon, Sig. B vii /Works, I, p.87); 'When he /Paul/ had espied but one fault in the holy communion amongst the Corinthians, straightway he rebuked them, and called them back to Christ's institution ...' (Sermon, Sig. G viii /Works, I, p.247). Cf. Sermon, Sig. D vi (Works, I, p.14).
communion under one species, could be classed as 'adiaphora', or 'things indifferent'. This was already plain at the Westminster Disputation; and Jewel removes any lingering doubts on this score in the correspondence with Cole. Taking the cup 'is not a ceremony, but a part of the sacrament' as Christ instituted it; praying in the vernacular 'is not a ceremony to be changed at man's pleasure, but the commandment of God'. Consequently - and this was a second area of divergence - Jewel did not believe it was within the competence of General Councils to legislate about such matters.

'These things, and other like, because they have their foundation in God's word, may not be changed by any order of the church. For the church, as she is lady of her own laws: so is she but a handmaid, to the laws of Christ'.

'... the Council cannot make the falsehood truth, but the thing that is taken to be true, it certifieth only to be true...'.

In any case, Jewel must be judged more realistic than Cole in his appraisal of what was to be expected of future councils. He saw little hope of their sponsoring reform, given what had already occurred at Trent:

1. Cf. page 92, n.2.
3. Letters, Sig. Q ii–r (Works, I, p.76).
... if the indifferent using of the matter may be tried by experience, in this your last general council holden at Trident, ye know that not one man of our side, notwithstanding there were a great number of them there, sent thither of purpose by their Princes, could be suffered to sit among the rest, or to have a voice, or to yield a reason of his faith. And the Pope, Julius third, gave out under his brief, that none of them all should be heard there, unless it were, as he said, to recant their errors ... in the same council they concluded among themselves, that no manner of things should be changed at all that had been once received in their Church'.

The concluding words are significant: they summarise Jewel's essential complaint against Rome, and bring out the real meaning of the challenge. It was not entirely accurate to accuse Trent of deciding that 'no manner of thing should be changed ... that had been once received' in the Roman Church. Theoretically, Papists held that changes could be made. Their position, however, would have been that change is not necessitated by the Church's failure: it is a concession to growth, but never an admission of corruption. And it was, of course, here that Papists and Reformers parted company. For Jewel, the church's immediate past was replete with abuses. His opponents were committed to the view that it was not, because (on their view of the Christian Church) it could not be - and it was partly to preserve this

1. Letters, Sigs. M iV - iiF (Works, I, p.62). Cf. 'But what redress can there be looked for of such a Council, whereas no man shall be judge or suffered to speak one way or other, but only such as be openly and justly accused and found faulty, and whereas he that is himself most out of order, shall be head, and reformer of the whole?' (Letters, Sigs. C viii - viiiF /Works, I, p.347).
principle that Trent had (as Jewel saw) refused to accept any of the changes advocated by the reformers. Rome's resistance to the principle of reform made Jewel's challenge meaningful, though some of the issues it raised seemed trivial in themselves. At root, it challenged the a priori view of the church that Papists espoused, and, to this extent, was potentially constructive.

But if the exchange with Cole assures us of the underlying point in Jewel's polemics, it also raises serious doubts about the usefulness of his appeal to antiquity. In general, both correspondents are quick to affirm their readiness to let the ancient church be the judge of their positions. The testimonies of the old doctors and councils are 'good grounds to build upon', according to Jewel.¹ And Cole seems to be in full agreement:

'Here if ye say what weights or balance will ye weigh them by, let us hardly do herein, as men do when the question is which of two pieces of gold or two pieces of cloth is best, then they take a fine piece of Gold or Cloth and that that goeth nearest the best, that ought to be so taken for best. Let you and me weigh your men's reasons and ours by the fathers' weights and balance, and see who reasoneth most like St. Augustine, St. Basil, St. Cyprian, Tertullian, Irenaeus, and Dionysius, the Councils, and such other weights fit for that purpose'. ²

---

¹ Letters, Sig. B vii (Works, I, p.31).
² Letters, Sig. B v (Works, I, p.30).
However, it is already obvious from this preliminary encounter that neither side regards the witness of antiquity as entirely normative, and that the appeal to the past implies something different in each case.

Cole reverts to the path he trod at Westminster. We revere the primitive church, he declares, but its practice serves merely as 'an example' and is 'no bond'. The practice of the Christian Church now cannot be expected to conform in every respect to the primitive discipline. Nor should we condemn the Church for no longer observing those things which were 'practised, and accounted for good, wholesome, and holy' in earlier times.

'For the church of Christ hath his childhood, his manhood, and his hoar hairs; and as that that is meet for a man in one age, is unmeet in another; so were many things meet, requisite, and necessary in the primitive church, which in our days were like to do more harm than good'.

Cole has some sense of historical distance: ages are different, what is valuable in one might be destructive in another; the past cannot be wholly recaptured, and so is but an illustration for the present. He even seems to be appealing to the needs of growth, as if the Church's wisdom matured with the years.

Certainly, Cole believes that a vital (as opposed to a literal) conformity with the past is preserved in the on-going Church. It is on these grounds that he defends the Church's right to depart from the primitive discipline - firstly, by leaving 'undone that /which/ was in the primitive church commanded'.
One can see that Cole subordinates the witness of antiquity to the decisions taken 'by common assent' in the latter-day church. But he appears to do so in the conviction that the past is automatically reverenced in such decisions - in much the same way as the decisions of the mature man grow out of, and are consonant with, his childhood experience.¹

Jewel works on quite different principles. His tendency, once again, is to establish a sharp contrast between divine and human ordinances, this time in relation to the primitive church:

'... there were some orders in the primitive church commanded by God; and some other were devised by men, for the better training of the people. Such orders as were commanded by God may not be changed in any case, only because God commanded them: for, as God is everlasting, so is his word and commandment everlasting. On the other side, such orders as have been devised by men may be broken, upon some good consideration, only because they were men that devised them; for as men themself be mortal, so all their wisdoms and inventions be but mortal ...'.

Very obviously, Jewel is as reluctant as Cole to accept the practice of the primitive Church as entirely normative, although he would prefer to say that he accepted part of it as binding. Where the witness of antiquity accurately reflects the divine ordinances outlined in the Scriptures, it is permanently binding. In all other respects it is transient, and of even less

significance for him than for Cole: 'some good consideration' is sufficient reason for departing from these primitive norms. Jewel makes generous concessions, of course, to the need for religious change; and, pretty clearly, he anticipates diversity between the church-discipline of one period and that of another. But where Cole envisages a kind of linear progression in the church's history, Jewel is more attracted to a cyclic view of things, with corruption recurring and creating a need for recurring reform. In some areas, Jewel believes, the past can be recaptured, because it must be recaptured: divine ordinances, once practised in the Church, must henceforward be implemented to the letter. If a doctrinaire view of the Church's incorruptibility imposes an optimistic vision of history on Cole, an equally doctrinaire view of the permanence of God's word imposes a less sanguine one on Jewel.¹

The encounter with Cole underlines the limited usefulness of antiquity for Jewel. He clearly intends to discriminate between the utterances of the early Fathers, on the grounds that some faithfully retail divine commands and others do not. The letters reinforce the contention that the

¹. Letters, Sigs. P v - Q ii (Works, I, pp. 75-6). But the argument continues to Sig. R iii (Works, I, p. 80).
Scriptures were Jewel's sole criterion of authenticity, and that he was appealing to the past simply to prove a point against the Papists. Even so, it is sobering to realise how much it mattered to Jewel to establish that 'our doctrine is old, and that yours is new'.

1. Cf. for instance, Jewel's closing appeal to Cole to 'have recourse only unto the truth that God hath revealed to us in his holy word .... For it is possible the Church may err; but it is not possible the scriptures may err'; and his image: 'like as the errors of the clock be revealed by the constant course of the sun, even so the errors of the church are revealed by the everlasting and infallible word of God' (Letters, Sig. R ii†/Works, I, p.807) - reminiscent of Luther's rebuke to Emser in 1521, that he had abandoned the sun (meaning the Scriptures) to use lanterns (meaning the Fathers), cited in Polman, L'Elément historique, p.20.

2. Letters, Sig. P v (Works, I, p.75).
When it comes to locating the theological teaching, or the churchmanship, of John Jewel those labels one often sees applied to reformers, like 'Lutheran', 'Zwinglian', 'Calvinist', 'moderate', 'extreme' (even 'Anglican', or 'Puritan'), seem more than usually inappropriate. One can readily conclude that his views approximate to one school of thought rather than another of course. But the more closely they are scrutinised the less representative those views are likely to appear. This, unfortunately, is not to claim that Jewel was an exceptionally original theologian. He was more the eclectic; a borrower who, nevertheless, left his own stamp on things. One recalls Dugmore's attempt to categorize Jewel's teaching on the Eucharist: 'non-papist Catholic doctrine ... with an admixture of moderate Calvinism of the Tigurine type';¹ and Frere's provocative remark that he represented a Protestantism which was too learned to be merely protestant.² Such verdicts reinforce the suggestion of a recent historian that, even if one is attempting to do no more than identify the allegiances of the first batch of Elizabethan bishops, there is reason for thinking of Jewel as a case apart.³ The reflexion is relevant to Jewel's

use of the argument from antiquity, for I have found that, while there are clear antecedents for his appeals to the past, certain emphases in the challenge carry the mark of Jewel's own temperament and circumstances, rendering it distinctive.

Even that 'tradition' on which Jewel was partially drawing by appealing to the testimony of the first centuries was not, of course, fully representative of reform thinking. There was a disaffection for historical arguments of this type among those who might be termed 'puritan'. Indeed, not all of those who accepted office in the Elizabethan Church and became defenders of the Settlement would have approved of the bishop's approach. For as the debate with the Louvainists developed, dissensions between Jewel and some of his colleagues as to the wisdom of making so much of the testimony of the Fathers were to become apparent.

Grounds for such differences existed almost from the beginning of the reform movement in England. Yearning 'to dig again the wells of Abraham, and to purge and cleanse them of the

2. Cf. T. Stapleton referring to Nowell's criticism of the 'very large scope' which Jewel gave to the Papists in the challenge, A Fortresse of the Faith (Antwerp, 1565), fol. 41 v.. The text of Nowell's referred to in Booty, op.cit., p.29 was not available to me.
earth of worldly wisdom, wherewith these Philistines have
stopped them', 1 Tyndale had appealed to the 'open' Scriptures,
confident in the ability of ordinary layfolk to understand their
godly meaning. His distinctions between God's word and man's
tended to be unrelenting: ecclesiastics had nailed 'a veil of
false glosses on Moses' face, to corrupt the true understanding
of the law'; 2 the scholastics could only 'rend and tear the
scriptures with their distinctions, and expound them violently',
perverting the pure word of God 'to confirm their Aristotle
withal'. 3 This, and Tyndale's concern to expound the Scriptures
simply - 'not to dispute, as the pope's disciples do' 4 -
certainly meant that there was little emphasis on the Fathers in
his works. He occasionally appealed to them to establish his
interpretations of key texts, and could agree in an aside that
Augustine was 'the best, or one of the best, that ever wrote upon
the scripture', 5 but, generally speaking, Tyndale showed no

1. W. Tyndale, The Parable of the Wicked Mammon (1527) in
   Doctrinal Treatises and Introductions to Different Portions
   of the Holy Scriptures (= Doctrinal Treatises), ed. H. Walter
   (Cambridge, 1848), p.46.
2. Tyndale, A Pathway into Holy Scripture (originally 1525-6),
   Doctrinal Treatises, p.28.
3. Tyndale, Parable, Doctrinal Treatises, p.46.
4. Tyndale, The Obedience of a Christian Man (1528), Doctrinal
   Treatises, p.137.
5. Tyndale, Obedience, Doctrinal Treatises, p.154. In the full
   passage Tyndale is actually arguing that the Fathers can be
   in error, and that Scripture is the touchstone of Christian
   truth.
esteem for the testimony of antiquity.

'If I must first believe the doctor, then is the doctor first true, and the truth of the scripture dependeth on his truth; and so the truth of God springeth of the truth of man. Thus antichrist turneth the roots of the trees upward'. 1

'... get thee to God's word, and thereby try all doctrine, and against that receive nothing; neither any exposition contrary unto the open texts, neither contrary to the general articles of the faith, neither contrary to the living and practising of Christ and his apostles. And when they cry, "Fathers, fathers", remember that it were the fathers that blinded and robbed the whole world, and brought us into this captivity, wherein these enforce to keep us still ... If God's word appeared anywhere, they agreed all against it'. 2

God's word sufficed for the believer, and the word was clear.

Latimer's attitude was only slightly less hostile.

He too could cite the ancient writers on occasions (especially as a defence-measure, it would seem); and he admitted they had

1. Tyndale, Obedience, Doctrinal Treatises, p.154. 'Doctor' in this context is not exactly a synonym for 'early Church Father': previously Tyndale had been discussing the scholastics (pp.149ff.); but at the conclusion of the text cited he proceeds immediately to talk of Origen and Augustine. If the term does not refer to the early Fathers alone, it does include them.

something to teach the Christian. Yet the Fathers were no oracles for him; and he apparently deplored the tendency to haggle over their opinions:

'They the doctors have handled many points of our faith very godly; and we may have a great stay in them in many things; we might not well lack them: but yet I would not have men to be sworn to them, and so addict, as to take hand over head whatsoever they say: it were a great inconvenience so to do'. 1

Such qualifications persisted among one school of reformers: those who so espoused the Gospel simplicities that they would do away with every last vestige of papist practice, and countenance only those customs which the Scriptures explicitly enjoined - literal-minded, if admirable, men like Hooper and Gilby for instance, the latter conceding in 1547 that 'the doctors are to be suspected because they please the Papists so well'. 2


2. A. Gilby, An Answer to the devillish detection of Stephane Gardiner (London, 1547), fol. clxvi. The citation, which I owe originally to G. H. Tavard /Holy Writ or Holy Church (London, 1959), p.216/ is a comment in the margin of the printed sermon. The text itself reads: 'I know your doctors are glorious. You call them saints, and I trust they be so accepted of God. But Christ and his Apostles, though they were not so glorious and well taken in the world: yet was there more truth in their words and writings. Yea sure it is to be feared, there is some privy flattery and untruth closely cloaked in the dark sentence of their long books, where the writings are so commendable in the world, and so plausible in general to all the heap of the papists, the upholders of Antichrist'. On the views of Hooper, see Tavard, op.cit., p.217; Dugmore, op.cit., p.150.
In theory they and their fellow reformers shared the same convictions as to the primacy—and indeed, the all-sufficiency—of Scripture. All agreed that a radical distinction was to be made between the divine words of Holy Writ and the human utterances of the Church Fathers: the latter could never be anything more than 'a second line of defence to Holy Scripture', to be judged always by the Scriptures. In the early years of the reform movement there was no open disagreement among English Gospellers over these principles. But, in practice, differences had emerged. For some, the principle of the all-sufficiency of Scripture meant that only the Scriptures need be appealed to. Others felt the principle was consonant with using antiquity to illustrate and corroborate scriptural truth. The greater degree of tolerance of human judgments in the latter case really concealed a significant difference in outlook. Events in Edward's reign were already beginning to suggest as much. Those of the sixties and later would demonstrate it conclusively. In opposing the Puritans when the rift came, Jewel was (in one respect, at any rate) acting consistently. For his affinities were broadly with those who conceded some value to the traditional: divines such as Frith, Ridley, and, above all, Thomas Cranmer.


One minor fact suggests even earlier antecedents for Jewel's reliance on the evidence of antiquity. Both the citations which he inscribed on the title-page of the Challenge Sermon to bring out his attachment to the 'old ways' - from the Council of Nicea, and Tertullian - were much-favoured by Philip Melanchthon. This need hardly be taken as evidence of direct dependence, as the texts had become standard catchwords in subsequent debates. But certainly Melanchthon had established the pattern of argument which both Cranmer and Jewel adhered to, each in his own way. As early as the twenties, in his disputes with the theologians of the Sorbonne, Melanchthon had begun invoking the Fathers in support of Luther's teachings, contesting the Papists' assurance that they professed the ancient faith. By the thirties he had developed 'a veritable system of patristic argument' from which, according to Fraenkel, he did not deviate in any of his subsequent writings, although later his emphasis on the testimony of antiquity became increasingly pronounced.

In Melanchthon's case this argument was as much the outcome of the humanist's taste for the 'honey' of the early

1. On Melanchthon's use of the passages from Tertullian ('... id esse verum, quodcunque primum ...') and Nicea ('mores antiqui obtineant ...'), see Fraenkel, Testimonia Patrum, pp.15, 187.

2. Fraenkel, op.cit., pp.34, 36, 42.
Christian writers as it was the product of polemics. Melanchthon shared the delight of scholars like Lefèvre d'Étaples and, of course, Erasmus - the 'humanistae theologizantes', as one of their scholastic opponents so inelegantly called them - in the eloquent, scripturally-oriented works of the Fathers, now being rescued from oblivion and misunderstanding. He was a student of them, an editor of texts, and an assiduous collector of patristic citations, caught up as a scholar (and also by temperament, it might be claimed) in the enterprise of reviving the pure teachings of antiquity. Melanchthon became convinced that there was a correspondence between the positions of Luther and those of the most reputable doctors. As he said in his controversy with the Sorbonne, it would not matter if Luther had abandoned patristic teaching in favour of Scripture, but in fact he had not done so: the return to Sacred Scripture was also a return to the best teachings of the Fathers. On this basis of learning and conviction Melanchthon's polemics on behalf of the antiquity, or catholicity, of the reform teachings were built -

buttressed somewhat by the growing need to defend Lutheran positions (on the Eucharist particularly) against the more radical Gospellers.

Archbishop Cranmer's situation was rather similar, although it should be said immediately that his arguments from antiquity were probably a good deal less systematized than those of the continental reformer. If Fraenkel's analysis of Melanchthon's views is correct, the latter incorporated his appeals to the primitive Church into an elaborate doctrinal framework - more sophisticated than anything Cranmer would have been capable of, but one that would (almost certainly) have also been uncongenial to the archbishop for theological reasons. Melanchthon had articulated, for example, a fairly precise theory as to the periods of the Church's history and the process of corruption in the Church for which I have not discovered any close English parallels. Redolent of Luther's own 'theologia crucis', the picture Melanchthon drew of the Church was strongly eschatological. That is, he laboured the inevitability of conflict and impoverishment in a community established, not under the sign of 'glory', but under that of the 'cross'. And yet he managed to reconcile this with the possibility of an unbroken continuity in the true Church, postulating a theory of 'personal' (as opposed to 'organisational', or 'ministerial') succession.¹

¹ Fraenkel, op.cit., pp.114, 131, 152, 182. Fraenkel believes that it was probably around 1542 that Melanchthon first articulated his views on 'personal succession'.

If these ideas were carried into the English debates, it was only in a truncated and less-systematic form. Melanchthon's principles gave a theoretical relevance to the past history of the Church which even the traditionalists among the English reformers were not prone to emphasise. However, such refinements aside, Cranmer did reproduce Melanchthon's central contention that antiquity favoured the reform case, coming to this style of argumentation for much the same reasons as his colleague abroad.

Consulting 'the old doctors' was congenial to Cranmer. As early as 1537 (admittedly, when his theological views were still rather conservative) he reacted coldly to certain aspects of the teaching of Zwingli and Oecolampadius, wishing, as he put it, that they had not trodden down the wheat along with the tares,

'that is, had not at the same time done violence to the authority of the ancient doctors and chief writers in the church of Christ'.

For, he went on,

'this catholic faith which we hold respecting the real presence has been declared to the church from the beginning ... with so much clearness and diligence by the first ecclesiastical writers'.

---

1. On the difference between Melanchthon and the more radical reformers who could write off whole periods of the Church's history as times of universal apostasy, see Fraenkel, op. cit., p.182. Melanchthon's views on continuity gave him a more tolerant view of the Church's past.
And he concluded his letter by hoping that agreement could be reached by all professing 'one sound, pure, evangelical doctrine, conformable to the discipline of the primitive church'. Like Melanchthon, Cranmer was also a student of the Fathers and rather prided himself on his familiarity with them. As he once put it to Gardiner, having exercised myself from youth in 'weighty matters of scripture and ancient authors', I 'have learned now to go alone, and do examine, judge, and write all such weighty matters myself' - whereas he suspected his opponent of never having read 'any printed book of Hilarius', and of using citations gathered by others. The archbishop's own industry, and his interest in patristics, are apparently evidenced by his books of common-places which have survived, and also his remarkable library.

The most direct indication, however, of Cranmer's concern for the testimony of the early ecclesiastical writers is to be found in his first contributions to the debates on the Eucharist: the intervention in the famous discussions that took place in the House of Lords during 1548, and especially his

1. Archbishop of Canterbury to Joachim Vadian (who was a Swiss Gospeller), 1537, in Miscellaneous Writings and Letters, ed. J. E. Cox (Cambridge, 1846), pp.343-4.

2. T. Cranmer, An Answer ... unto a crafty and sophistical cavillation (1551), in Writings and Disputations relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, ed. J. E. Cox /= Writings & Disputations/ (Cambridge, 1844), pp.163, 223-4. For Cranmer's studies into the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, as early as 1544, see Dugmore, op.cit., p.115.

3. Cf. Dugmore, op.cit., p.115, n.3; Brooks, op.cit., p.11.
Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament which appeared just a few years later. Here he accepts the Fathers as a reputable source for demonstrating the truth of the matter in dispute. One might say he uses them as a conventional criterion, perhaps anxious to establish common ground with those who opposed him. Having argued from Scripture and reason, he proceeds to invoke, in the classical way,

>'the faith and doctrine of the old authors of Christ's Church, beginning at those authors, which were nearest unto Christ's time, and therefore might best know the truth herein'. 1

But the demonstration which Cranmer then proceeds to marshal is anything but formal: the Fathers are treated chronologically, pertinent passages from each major writer are brought forward and explained, the texts are reputable, and are handled with an assurance which certainly suggests first-hand acquaintance with the area traversed. Estimates of the quality of Cranmer's patristic learning fall outside the scope of this study. All I would want to say is that the Defence provides an outstanding example of the conventional use of the argument from Christian antiquity in support of a doctrinal stand. 2


2. Cranmer, Defence, Work, pp. 88ff, 98ff, 107ff. See also A Conutation of Unwritten Verities (1548), Miscellaneous Writings, pp. 22-36, where Cranmer establishes the proposition that the old Fathers, without the written Word of God, are not able to prove any doctrine in religion, by citing the Fathers themselves.
It is useful, however, to compare this work with Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner which appeared very soon afterwards. The contrast between the two treatises is instructive, especially in the light of my remarks in the previous chapter on the change in Catholic polemics from refutation to historical justification. This is the hub of the difference between Cranmer's two tracts: the Defence is of course a work of controversy, but it presents a theological case by drawing on the recognised sources (the Fathers among them) in a way that, say, John Fisher might have done; whereas in the Answer, moved by his opponents' charges of novelty and heterodoxy, Cranmer is at pains to demonstrate his own conformity with the Scriptures as interpreted by the old writers. Subtly an historical question becomes the dominant one as the archbishop insists on his own catholicity.

Being a point by point rebuttal of the arguments of Gardiner and Richard Smith, the Answer is naturally less coherent than the earlier work. But it at least asserts a position consistently: Gardiner has not provided 'an explanation and assertion of the true catholic faith in the matter of the sacrament'; it is the Papists who have 'set up a new faith' of their own devising — in a word, 'the doctrine of the papists is not the doctrine of the church'.

By contrast, Cranmer's is the 'catholic' position. 'I impugne not the true catholic faith which was taught by Christ and the apostles', he says: 'I impugne the false papistical faith'.
His view of the Eucharist is
'tested by all old writers and learned men of all ages; so was it universally taught and preached, received and believed, until the see of Rome, the chief adversary unto Christ, corrupted all together'.
So the issue between them is plain:
'I will join with you this issue, that neither scripture nor ancient author writeth in express words the doctrine of your faith'.

Strictly speaking, Cranmer was more concerned about 'catholicity' than 'antiquity'. In itself, the latter was an empty title for him. As he said:
'If the trial of true religion should rest upon antiquity of time, or upon worldly prosperity, then should the gentiles and pagans have a great advantage of us Christians, and their religion should be better than ours'.

1. Cranmer, Answer, Writings and Disputations, p.10. Cranmer's contrast between true and false 'faiths' does come rather close, on occasions, to being a contrast between true and false 'churches' - or at least, he speaks of needing to know which is the true church, see Confutation, Miscellaneous Writings, pp.11, 13.
2. Cranmer, Answer, Writings and Disputations, p.12. Notice the precision of Cranmer's terminology: 'learned men of all ages' (with its suggestion of personal succession) being distinguished from the universal consent of the primitive Church. The ideas here would seem to be close to Melanchthon's.
This is an important comment, for it shows the distance between
the true reformer and the more popular exponents of the antiquity
argument. 'Antiquity' was no end in itself as far as Cranmer
was concerned. But arguing within the context of Christianity,
and recognising its criteria of validity, he did see significance
in attempting to demonstrate that the reform teachings were more
ancient than the papist ones. As someone has remarked, he gave
more eloquent testimony to this principle than any other reformer
by offering his life for it in the end; and the best summary of
his position is to be found in his well-known words to Queen Mary:

'I would be judged by the old church, and
which doctrine could be proved the elder
I would stand unto ... to deface the old,
they say that the new is the old: wherein
for my part I am content to stand to the
trial'.

Cranmer's appeal to the Fathers was not, I agree, a
'mere controversial device for anti-Roman polemics'. In this
respect I believe he was closer to Melanchthon than to Jewel - or
at least, to the Jewel of the challenge. Time, and possibly
temperament, may help to explain the difference. Initially the
archbishop's views on, say, the decisive issue of the Eucharist
were conservative; and against the more extreme reformers he

1. Cranmer, Miscellaneous Writings, p.144.
2. J. I. Packer, intro. to Work, p.xii: 'This was no mere
controversial device for anti-Roman polemics; it reflected
a scholar's verdict that the Fathers had demonstrably been
expounding the essence of biblical Catholicism, and that
therefore they fully deserved the regard traditionally paid
them as authoritative guides in doctrine'.
argued, as Melanchthon had done, for a teaching consonant with that of the ancient Church. When - or perhaps, if (the question is a moot one) - his opinions changed, one can be sure Cranmer wanted to see that those opinions squared with the teaching of the best of the old doctors. His works (and I think his life too) suggest that this was a personal issue for him. So that in the debates with Gardiner and others, it is difficult to accuse Cranmer of deviously choosing to discomfit his opponents by his insistence that antiquity supported him.

This is not to say that the on-going polemic with the Papists had no effect on the archbishop's position. On the contrary, I consider his treatises reflect the current tendency to let polemics turn theological questions into an historical one, with Cranmer bringing things to a point where a controversialist like Jewel could, so to speak, begin with that historical question - or certainly, set it at the very centre of his argument. To substantiate this contention there is the fact that Cranmer was already dallying with the project of expressly challenging his opponents on the historical issue - although his efforts show a great deal more restraint than those of Bishop Jewel.

Those challenges Cranmer makes grow easily and naturally out of the argument he has been conducting; and, it should be noted, they appear only after Cranmer has patiently marshalled the patristic evidence in support of his own case.
Behind them all there stands the Defence. An example is his challenge to Smith:

'... here I require Doctor Smith, as proctor for the papists, either to bring forth some ancient council or doctor, that saith as he saith, that Christ's own natural body is eaten corporally with our mouths ... or else let him confess that my saying is true'. 1

On another occasion Cranmer implicitly challenges Gardiner, in an obvious attempt to fine the debate down:

'I will join with you this issue, that neither scripture nor ancient author writeth in express words the doctrine of your faith. And to make the issue plain, and to join directly with you therein, thus I say: that no ancient and catholic author hath your doctrine in plain terms'. 2

But even at his most fulsome Cranmer remains discreet, as the second version of his offer to Smith shows. Having displayed my own authorities on the matters in dispute, he says, and having made a challenge to Dr. Smith, I now repeat:

'Let all the papists together shew any one authority for them, either of scripture or ancient author, either Greek or Latin, and for my part I shall give them place'. 3

Again one must say that, while there are no obvious differences in principle between the position of Cranmer and

that of Jewel, the difference in emphasis is considerable. To make the distinction, I have used the rather harsh word, 'popular', of the Elizabethan - or at least, of his challenge. Were I describing Cranmer or Melanchthon, a term like 'scholarly conservatism' might have seemed the right one.

Possibly Jewel was every bit as learned as Cranmer: deciding that lies outside the ambit of this work. But the extravagance of Jewel's challenge sets it apart from earlier appeals to antiquity: the historical issue is made more blatant; the terms imply that hard-and-fast periodization is possible; the range of the challenge is of course immense, with Jewel canvassing issues that no one scholar could hope to resolve; the call to bring forward 'any one sentence' contrasts markedly with the cautious terms used in Cranmer's challenges; and even Jewel's promise to recant seems highly theatrical when set beside the archbishop's offers. That, perhaps, was the sum of it: Jewel introduced high drama into what was essentially a scholarly question.

Doubtless the reasons for this lay partly in the circumstances surrounding the challenge. The growing tendency of Papists to assert the antiquity of their position was one determining factor. The conservatism of the Queen was another. Already, as I have argued, the official and semi-official theological statements being produced by the new prelates were beginning to reflect this. Also, the tactics used by the
reform divines at the Westminster Disputation had proved a success, and the challenge helped ensure that the Papists were kept on the defensive.

But extrinsic factors alone cannot explain the popular treatment of the argument from antiquity in the Challenge Sermon: one must obviously appeal to Jewel's personality also. To state the position in the least flattering terms, first of all: Jewel showed some eagerness to become an outspoken apologist for the Settlement, and perhaps also to court the Queen's favour (not simply for himself, one can be sure, but for the reform-party generally) by his enthusiastic defence of it. As I have said there are reasons for thinking that the repetitions of the challenge were government-sponsored, and this may have contributed to the theological overstatement.

On the other hand, however, it would be ridiculous to accuse Jewel of insincerity; or even to suggest that he was utterly insensitive to theological niceties. It is very likely indeed that in appealing so confidently to the past, he was aware of being supported by a 'tradition' of reform-thinking on the point - having in mind Cranmer, no doubt; and also the work of continental divines like Peter Martyr (whose influence on Jewel in this respect will be referred to later). Yet perhaps because he was the kind of divine who did lean heavily on others, Jewel
was sometimes prone to overstatement. In his hands qualified conclusions tended to harden, for he was, after all, a superb polemicist. This, I think, was the case with the reformers' argument from antiquity in the challenge.

1. Noting how Jewel 'modified in certain respects' Cranmer's teaching on the Eucharist (op.cit., p.232), Dugmore refers to some of Jewel's bald statements on the subject, commenting that they come dangerously close to a doctrine of 'Real Absence' (op.cit., p.228). The position with regard to the argument from antiquity is analogous.
'... you may see how he would mingle policy and religion together'

(Sir William Cecil)
The polemics on behalf of the Elizabethan Settlement reached a new level of maturity with the publication of the Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae in 1562. In many respects its argumentation is similar to that used in earlier works. Yet the Apologia must be set apart from the other attempts to justify the 1559 legislation because of its greater authority.

This is not simply to say that the Apologia came closer to being an 'official' defence than earlier statements - although that is certainly true. In the manner peculiar to the age, it managed to represent the 'official' position of both the Queen and the Church of England without being formally authorised by either, suitably 'mingling policy and religion together'. Published anonymously, and originally in Latin, it was obviously aimed, not at recalcitrant or wavering Englishmen, but at a European audience largely distrustful of Elizabeth's intentions. The Apologia spoke for the establishment; and the fact that it is more cogent and more comprehensive than any prior defence is a partial reflection of its weightier, and quasi-official, purpose. But there is an authority in the tone of this work that stems from yet another factor. The Apologia asserts a position more confidently, and more aggressively,

1. Cecil to Parker, 1 January 1562, Parker Correspondence, pp. 161-2. The Secretary is referring (with approval) to what Sir Nicholas Throckmorton, the Ambassador in France, was hoping for.
than earlier polemical works had done, because it grew out of a heightened determination on the part of the Queen and her administration to continue on an independent religious course.

Legally, there was of course no alteration in the position of the English Church between 1559 and 1562. Factually, however, a significant change had taken place, in that Elizabeth had at last found it necessary to be categorical about her attitude to the Papacy - and this, not simply in a domestic context, but before the eyes of Europe. The reopening of the Council of Trent had forced decision on the Queen - an inevitable decision perhaps, yet one that Elizabeth had hitherto stopped short of taking. It was a decision that took England a step closer towards unequivocal estrangement from Rome; and the Apologia - which may be read as a justification of the Queen's refusal to take part in the council - very eloquently reflects that changed state of affairs.

The general council convened by Pius IV was to be Christendom's last opportunity for achieving a compromise between the Papacy and the dissident states. And for a brief moment in 1560-1 it even seemed that some measure of dialogue might possibly take place. Pius was somewhat more liberal than his predecessor, Caraffa. His desire for a council was one of a number of signals that indicated a reaction against the policies of the inquisitorial Paul IV; and he was known to be pliant about some of the disciplinary changes for which the reformers
pressed. Apparently anxious to capitalise on the opportunities which the peace in Europe provided, Pius had been surprisingly resolute about demanding a council from the very beginning of his pontificate. Upon hearing that France was contemplating a national synod, he became doubly insistent, fearing that schism might result from a merely local compromise with the Huguenots. In announcing the general council to the ambassadors of the Catholic princes on 3 June 1560, Pius seemed to express the hope that it would be a truly representative gathering. He had been emphatic about his desire for the council; and said that he wished it to be 'free and general'.

Many others at this time - including the pope in Geneva - were paying lip service to the need for a 'free and general' assembly. In fact, there was considerable pressure on Pius from Catholic quarters to move in a conciliatory direction. Both the Emperor Ferdinand and Francis II were

---

anxious that the proposed council should represent a fresh start. They argued that instead of reconvening the Council of Trent — prorogued for two years in 1552 because of war, and never formally concluded — the Pope ought to sponsor an entirely new council at which the Protestant estates of the Empire and those kingdoms that had dissociated themselves from Rome could be granted a hearing. From the outset Pius was adamant that Trent should at least be the site of the opening sessions, but during the summer and autumn of 1560 the debate concerning the precise status of the council (and, by implication, Rome's openness to compromise) continued. Even the bull of convocation, dated 29 November 1560 and made public on 2 December, was studiously vague as to whether the council was to be a continuation of Trent.

If we sift the shadows from the substance, however, it must be confessed that magnanimity on the part of Rome (or its opponents) was unlikely in 1560-1. Pius' bull was discreetly silent as to the validity or otherwise of the decrees already formulated at Trent. But it is clear, in retrospect, that the Pope had no intention of reversing that council's decisions; and he won Philip II's support for the new assembly.

1. See the instruction of Francis II to his envoy in Rome, and the first response of Ferdinand concerning the council, 20, 26 June 1560, C.T., 8, pp.35f., 39ff.
by giving him confidential assurances on this score. Pius IV, 
moderate and diplomatic though he was, had the essential 
qualities of the Counter-Reformation pope - notably the 
determination to see religious truth (as he understood it) prevail, 
in spite of political considerations. Political compromise was 
not his aim. As he told Ferdinand, to strive for this was often 
to check the advancement of religion - so that his overtures 
to the Protestant princes were really little more than gestures. 
His stance was that of the kindly but unyielding father: ready 
to forgive, but only if his authority was recognised. To 
rulers such as Elizabeth, Rome's invitation to a council, 
however courteous, was scarcely more than an invitation to 
recant.

Elizabeth was not a party to the negotiations taking 
place between Pius and the Catholic princes in 1560, but the

1. Pastor refers to a confidential letter of Pius IV to 
Philip II, 5 October 1560, in the Simancas Archives, op.cit., 
XV, p. 201. Cf. Cardinal Borromeo to the Nuncio in Spain, 
5 October 1560, C.T., 8, pp. 78-9.
Pastor believes the Pope was anxious to be conciliatory with 
the Catholic princes, and that he explained his position in 
rather different terms to the French and Spanish envoys; 
but that his own personal view on the validity of the 
decrees promulgated at earlier sessions of the council was 
'firm and clear', op.cit., XV, p. 194.

2. Cardinal Borromeo replying, in the Pope's name, to Ferdinand, 
30 August 1560, C.T., 8, p. 60.

3. See Pastor's account of the Pope's words at his meeting with 
the ambassadors, 23 September 1560, op.cit., XV, p. 200. Cf. 
pp. 181, 185, 196.

4. Abbot Parpaglia's mission to England, in the summer of 1560, 
was not in connection with the proposed council. Cf. Bayne, 
Anglo-Roman Relations, pp. 44-60; Meyer, England and the 
Catholic Church, pp. 39-41. Parpaglia's brief, dated 5 May 
1560, is printed in Dodd-Tierney, Church History of 
England, II, appendix 47.
news of the council had obviously reached her. As early as July 1560, Bishop Jewel - writing from Salisbury where, as he complained a month or two previously, he was 'far distant from the crowd and bustle of London', and ... much less conversant with passing events' - was able to report to Peter Martyr that a general council was expected. And at the very time the papal nuncio to England was named, in January 1561, the Queen was taking steps to test the feelings of France and the Protestant princes of Germany on the matter, and to press discreetly for opposition to the assembly.

Although the council was originally convened for Easter 1561, the nuncio to Elizabeth, Abbot Martinengo, did not leave Rome until March of that year. The terms of his invitation would hardly have seemed attractive to the Queen. Pius' brief was warm, but it envisaged a 'return' on the part of England to its traditional allegiance. And it referred only to the sending of ambassadors, not bishops, to Trent - an implicit judgment on the status of Elizabeth's new prelates, and an insulting...

2. Jewel to Martyr, 17 July 1560, Zurich Letters, I, p. 90. The bishop was not confident, however, of a truly representative assembly being held.
3. On the activities of the Earl of Bedford in France and Mundt in Germany, see Bayne, op. cit., pp. 79ff.
4. Brief of Pius IV to Elizabeth, 4 March 1561, printed Bayne, op. cit., appendix 30. It refers to the sending of 'oratoribus idoneis viris', op. cit., p. 271. Bayne believes the omission of any reference to bishops was calculated and significant, op. cit., p. 98.
provision, in the light of the invitation currently being forwarded to Scotland.¹

By the time Martinengo reached Brussels in April the Queen was assured of companions (if not allies) should she see fit to reject the Pope's summons. At Naumburg the Diet of Protestant electors and princes had already rebuffed the papal messengers, Cardinals Delfino and Commendone, in no uncertain terms. France could not afford to be so forthright. But with Catherine De Medici now regent, the country's support for the council was even less assured than formerly. To Elizabeth's satisfaction, the influence of the Huguenots was growing; and in spite of Pius' objections, Catherine continued to lay plans for a colloquy between the Catholics and Calvinists at Poissy, the final decision for the project being taken on 22 April. Admittedly, there was small likelihood of Elizabeth being able to persuade France and the German princes to join her in a concerted opposition to the council. But at least the situation made an English rejection of papal invitation increasingly feasible.

And yet, even in the middle of April 1561, it was

¹. Pius IV to Mary, Queen of Scotland, 6 March 1561, invited the Queen to cause the prelates of her kingdom to assemble at the council and to send ambassadors, Roman Cal., I, p.33. Cf. Pius IV to Mary, 3 December 1561, Roman Cal., I, p.60. Eventually Mary sent a personal representative to the council, but no envoys or prelates from the kingdom, Newsletter, 6 April 1562, Roman Cal., I, p.79.
by no means certain that Elizabeth would boycott the general council; and still less, decline to receive the nuncio. Although pretty much on his guard against the risk of deception at the time, Philip II's ambassador in London, Bishop De Quadra, remained cautiously optimistic: on 12 April he reported that he anticipated Martinengo's arrival within a matter of days, and that he had taken lodgings at Greenwich where the Queen was expected to meet the envoy.¹ To say the least of it, there was considerable fluctuation in the messages from court that Quadra was struggling to monitor. On the one hand, the discouraging signs were plentiful enough. In March, Cecil had pretended to outline for him the conditions under which the Queen would accept an invitation to the council, and these included the stipulation that such an assembly judge questions of faith according to the precepts of Scripture and the declarations of the first four general councils.² Later the Queen herself insisted that Martinengo could be received only as the ambassador of the bishop of Rome, and not as the nuncio of the so-called vicar of Christ.³

2. Quadra to Philip II, 25 March 1561, Span. Cal. 1558-67, p.190. Cecil was said to be 'very emphatic' that only the first four councils would be recognised.
But counterbalacing this was the fact that Cecil had openly insulted the bishop of Winchester, Robert Horne, because he had preached against the authority of general councils¹ – indeed, at this time Elizabeth was known to be disaffected with the Protestant preachers. Most important of all, the Spanish ambassador's hopes had been raised somewhat through his recent dealings with Lord Robert Dudley whose influence with the Queen he still believed to be very high indeed.

For a time in 1560, as Conyers Read remarks, the woman in Elizabeth had had the better of the queen.² She gave every indication of being deeply in love with Dudley. And as the fortunes of the new favourite rose, Cecil's spun into decline, bringing the possibility of a change in policy. It may be that the mysterious death of Lord Robert's wife, in September 1560, and the scandal it generated, opened the Queen's eyes to the impracticability of a match with the Master of the Horse. But for a considerable time, nobody at court, not even Cecil, could be sure of the extent of Dudley's influence. And in the opening months of 1561 the latter had begun canvassing Philip's support for his suit with Elizabeth, assuring him that the Queen was now out of sympathy with the Protestants and was anxious to restore religion by taking part in the general council.

². Read, Mr. Secretary Cecil, p.198. Read's account of the infatuation, and the political moves it generated, is particularly good.
In fact, Dudley had intimated that he would be prepared to attend the council personally as England's representative. As late as March it even appears that Elizabeth herself—rather surprisingly, through Cecil—was soliciting Spanish backing for a match with Lord Robert.

One can do no more than speculate about the intentions underlying these complex manoeuvres. Who would doubt that Elizabeth was capable of a volte-face in her relations with Rome? Even Cecil, it has been said, was plagued by the fear that the Queen might change her creed if the situation ever necessitated it. However, it is highly unlikely that she was considering anything so radical as a rapprochement with the papacy in 1561. The political motivation would seem to have been lacking—so one is left wondering whether caprice, and her infatuation for Dudley, could possibly have been drawing Elizabeth, not merely to forsake her earlier policies, but also to jeopardize her cherished independence by lodging herself under the mantle of Spain. Granted that generous concessions need to be made to the vagaries of passion in the Tudors, it is still difficult to believe that the woman who would later press Robert Dudley on Mary Queen of Scots as a suitor was seriously tempted by so constricting a course of action.


On the other hand, the Queen does appear to have been genuinely reluctant to repudiate the Pope's invitation openly. No doubt many of her actions were deliberately calculated to keep Spain guessing for as long as possible. But the fluctuations cannot be written off entirely as so much deception. The truth seems to be that Elizabeth herself was procrastinating, anxious as always to keep her options open, and unwilling to commit herself to that clear-cut decision which Cecil and the new bishops were wanting her to take. Her secretary's letters to Throckmorton in May, after the final verdict was reached, suggest that Cecil believed he had won a victory over 'the Queen Majesty's lenity': they speak of her 'yielding'.¹ Probably Elizabeth's innate caution - not, one may safely assume, some vestige of Catholic feeling - was prompting her to hope that, as in the case of the Parpaglia mission, the responsibility for saying 'no' to Pius might somehow be laid on other shoulders. In part, the Queen's hesitations may be taken as an index of the political and religious importance of the refusal to admit the papal envoy.

The evidence of Catholic intrigues, which Cecil conveniently uncovered in April, put an end to the vacillation.²

---


². For the details, see Pollen, op.cit., pp.69f. Also Domestic Cal. 1547-80, 17,19,20,22,23 April 1561, pp.173-5. Read (op. cit., pp.208-9) follows Pollen (op.cit., p.69) in believing this was a 'bogus plot' invented by Cecil. Bayne (op.cit., pp.114f.) disagrees.
Not merely did the Privy Council (in its meeting of 1 May) unanimously withhold permission for Martinengo to land in England, but it rejected the Pope's council as well.¹ The Council argued that to receive the envoy would, firstly, be 'against the ancient laws and late laws of this realm'; that it would be detrimental to the Queen's position;² and finally, that it might well prove perilous to the domestic peace of the kingdom - as recent events already intimated.

'For whereas in winter-time the only sound of coming of a Nuncio hath wrought, in sundry evil-disposed persons, such a boldness and courage, as they have not let both to break the laws with great audacity, and disperse abroad false and scandalous reports of the Queen's disposition to change her religion and government of this realm; but also in some places have conjured with the devil ... how may it be thought, without great and evident danger, to have the said Nuncio come hither after these preparations, and against Summer, in which time the Devil hath most opportunities to make trouble and tumults?'.³

As for the council, while approving in principle the idea of a representative assembly, the English statement was both critical

---

1. A Note of Consultation had at Greenwich ..., 1 May 1561, printed Hardwicke, Miscellaneous State Papers, 1, pp.180-6. Domestic Cal.1547-80 notes the decision to translate the report into Latin, 5 May 1561, p.175.

2. Hardwicke, op.cit., 1, pp.181-2. The statement tends to corroborate the conclusion reached in the first chapter of this study: '... it is manifest, that allowing the authority of the Pope, according to such jurisdiction as he claimeth, there will follow one great peril to the surety and truth of the Queen's undoubted title to the Crown of England ... especially being contrary to the truth of the Queen's Majesty's interest and right; as, amongst other things, evidently appeareth by the travel that her Majesty's adversaries have made to disprove her title by colour of the Pope's laws, being contrary to the laws of God; a matter of greater consequence, than can be expressed in a few words', op.cit., 1, p.182.

3. Hardwicke, op.cit., 1, p.182.
of the steps Pius had taken to convene the council and outspokenly pessimistic about its likely results. The Queen, it said, could hope for nothing of it 'but a determination, as much as in the Pope shall lie, to prejudice her Majesty and her realm ... and to establish and confirm the authority of the Pope with all his abuse and errors.  

This was aggressive language, and the most direct statement of non-compliance that Elizabeth's administration had made to the Papacy up to this time. Neither the Queen nor the Pope were to act as if this were a definitive parting of the ways, although the Roman Curia was shocked by England's insolence and the question of excommunication seems to have been raised. Other, less formal, efforts would be made to win Elizabeth's support for the council; and she herself continued to brandish possible English participation at Trent as a diplomatic weapon for some years afterwards. But this will still a portentous action, and historians have rightly described it as a kind of turning-point. In the broad perspective, it was a step that further articulated the central implication of the 1559 legislation, namely, that the English Crown meant to plot the course of the national church independently of Rome and the Roman Church's adherents.

The rejection of the council concretized that resolve, sharpening the national church's sense of its separation. On a narrower scale, it sharpened the belligerence of 'official' English attitudes towards Rome. With this refusal, the hostility was allowed to surface; and it became more and more obvious as a result of the realm's adventures in France and the massacre of Huguenots at Vassy in 1562, reaching something of a peak in the 1563 Parliament when the Queen would find it necessary to contain it.

The Apologia grew out of this changed situation and provides one of the very best illustrations of the mood that it generated. As the title of course indicates, the work was defensive. But it assumed - and in fact, was at pains to create the impression of - unanimity in the national church and, adverting to none of the problems that might arise from within English Protestantism, 'erected all its defences on one flank only'. ¹ That is to say, its concern was focussed exclusively on Rome.

One is asked to think that the Church of England was currently the subject of a slanderous propaganda campaign mounted by the Pope. The Papists 'darkly and craftily charge and batter us with lies', says the treatise; and much mention is made of accusations of heresy and innovation and the like, the work claiming that certain learned persons have been 'wilily

¹. Collinson, op.cit., p.61. Cf. Throckmorton's complaints that work had not answered the Calvinists, Throckmorton to Cecil, 24, 26 January 1562, Foreign Cal.1561-2, pp.504, 506.
procured by the bishop of Rome' to 'polish and set forth ... both in books, and with long tales' the case against the English Church. ¹ This should perhaps be read as a rhetorical introduction. The Apologia was, quite obviously, designed to counter charges of heresy and schism. But it was not so much tilting at specific polemical works as arguing England's case before Christendom, on the occasion of the opening of the council, with which the publication of the book coincided.² It is difficult to be certain about the precise reasons that motivated the commissioning of the work, as we shall see. The chances, however, are, that it was meant to win allies for England in the stand it was taking - which would account for the expressions of solidarity with Continental Protestantism that are to be found in the book,³ and the lengthy explanation of England's reasons for boycotting Trent. Certainly, the realm's separation from Rome is accepted in the Apologia as both manifest and necessary, the suspicion being that it is also likely to prove enduring.

One indication of its forthright stand is the book's treatment of the papacy. Here the Apologia is more outspoken

---


2. Cecil was acknowledging receipt of the printed book on 1 January 1562, Parker Correspondence, pp. 161f. The council finally opened on 18 January, see Borromeo to Hippolytus d'Este, Legate in France, 28 January 1562, Roman Cal., 1, p. 75.

3. Apologia, Sigs. A vr, C ii ff., C viii (Works, III, pp. 55, 68ff., 74)
in its condemnations than any of the earlier official, or semi-official, formularies of the English Church had been. The doctrinal statements of Henry VIII's reign had of course insisted that the power exercised by the Pope was 'usurped'. Yet it would be true to say that, while The Bishops' Book (1537) had explained that the Pope's claim to primacy was a perversion of the true meaning of God's word, contrary to the usage of the primitive church, and also a violation of ecclesiastical canons, the emphasis was principally on the injustice and arrogance of the papacy. The bishop of Rome was described as a 'tyrant', the main charge being that he had usurped powers which rightfully belonged to princes. ¹ The 'godly' view-point was more explicit, but only slightly so, and still guarded, in subsequent statements. The Edwardian Articles, it will be remembered, said that Rome had erred, even in matters of essential doctrine; and they repudiated the bishop of Rome's claims to jurisdiction in England. ² While the 11 Articles of 1559 returned to the theme of usurpation:

'... the power, which he [the bishop of Rome] now challengeth, that is, to be the supreme head of the universal Church of Christ, and to be above

¹. The Institution of a Christian Man (The Bishops' Book), Lloyd, Formularies of the Faith, pp. 117-8. Cf. A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man (1543. The King's Book), which also speaks of 'unjust usurpation', 'unlawful exactions' etc, noting that the Pope 'giveth himself more to worldly policy than to the execution of his duty ... contrary to God's law', Lloyd, op.cit., pp.246-7, 288-9.

². Articles 20, 36. Regarding the latter, see art. 10 of the 13 Articles (1538), printed in Hardwick, Articles, pp. 237ff.
all emperors, kings, and princes, is an
usurped power, contrary to the Scriptures and the
Word of God, and contrary to the example of the
primitive Church, and therefore is for most just
causes taken away and abolished in this realm'. 1

The Apologia continues in the same line, but seems to go further
by declaring the rejection of the papacy to be an article of the
Church of England's faith.

Ostensibly to disprove the charge of heresy, there
is given, in the opening section of the book, an extended account
of the doctrines the national church professed. This has every
appearance of being a formal statement of belief. Firstly, its
structure suggests that it is credal, since it follows the
traditional pattern of confessions of faith by summarising the
articles of the creed and then outlining the church's teaching
on the sacraments, concluding with an explanation of the church's
disciplinary enactments. Moreover, the sentences normally begin
with the words, 'We believe', or 'We say'. 2 When dealing with
the Church - and specifically, the 'divers degrees of ministers'
in it - the treatise predictably rejects the idea that any one
bishop is entitled to claim a universal jurisdiction, adding:

'And therefore, sithence the bishop of Rome will
now-a-days so be called, and challengeth unto
himself an authority that is none of his; besides
that he doth plainly contrary to the ancient
councils and contrary to the old fathers, we

1. Article 6, printed Hardwick, Articles, pp.355ff.
believe that he doth give unto himself, as it is written by his own companion, Gregory, a presumptuous, a profane, a sacrilegious, and an antichristian name; that he is also the king of pride: that he is Lucifer, which preferreth himself before his brethren; that he hath forsaken the faith, and is the forerunner of antichrist'.

The villification is striking enough. But even more so is the fact that this rejection figures so prominently in what is virtually a formulary of faith. It is on this very substantial base that the differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome are set in the Apologia.

Statements such as the one above amount to a declaration of radical incompatibility—something not always implied in the standard complaints about Roman abuses. One might say that it was possible to launch accusations against Rome at two levels. At the first, one could judge the popes and their satellites guilty of moral and pastoral enormities—in the way that the Apologia does, for instance, when it describes the 'vicious and abominable life' of the Roman court; or catalogues the 'notorious deeds' by which popes usurped the lawful authority of princes; or accuses Rome of countenancing immorality by its teachings; or even argues that Papists had 'bid the holy scriptures away, as dumb and fruitless' and kept Christians

---

1. Apologia, Sig. B ii
   (Works, III, p.60). Cf. Sig. D viii
   (Works, III, p.81), where the work again toys with the application of the term 'antichrist' to the Pope, using, once more, it claims, the statements of Papists themselves as a basis for doing so. The references to the epistles of Gregory given in the margin of the Apologia are useless if one is consulting the Maurist (Migne, P.L., vol.77) or Ewald and Hartmann (M.G.H., Registrum Epistolarum) editions. Some help is given in the editor's notes, Jewel, Works, I, pp.344-5.
from them. Indeed, one might go further than this and include in one's charge of corruption the notion of doctrinal failure, as Jewel had done in the Challenge Sermon, and as the Apologia does also in this forthright passage:

'No doubt, if that church may err which hath departed from God's word, from Christ's commandments, from the apostles' ordinances, from the primitive church's examples, from the old fathers' and councils' orders, and from their own decrees, and which will be bound within the compass of none, neither old nor new, nor their own, nor other folks', nor man's law, nor God's law; then it is out of all question that the Romish church hath not only had power to err, but that it hath shamefully and most wickedly erred in very deed'.

Grave though such accusations were, they could still be made without anathematizing the Roman Church as such, or despairing of its reformation. Generations of Catholic reformers had railed against the Church's moral defects without forsaking it; and Erasmians had spoken of doctrinal abuse in much the same terms as Jewel - again, without drawing the conclusion that apostasy was the only course open to the reformer. But yet another species of criticism was possible. In this the total vitiation of the Roman Church was assumed. As well as finding a wealth of practical abuse in the Church, it was inclined to posit a principle of corruption there, so that the whole was seen not merely as a debilitated form of Christianity but as 'antichristian' and abhorrent, and fit only to be forsaken and

1. Apologia, Sigs. C \textsuperscript{V}-vi\textsuperscript{f}, D ii\textsuperscript{f}, E iii\textsuperscript{f} (Works, III, pp. 71f., 75f., 84).
3. Apologia, Sig. F i\textsuperscript{v} (Works, III, pp.90-1).
combatted. Whereas the very early statements of the Elizabethan
polemicists seem to have done no more than suggest such a view
of Rome, in the Apologia that harsher judgment is openly (and
commonly) passed.

There is one passage particularly that broaches the
matter; and at first sight, it appears to stop short of a total
rejection of the Church of Rome. It begins:

'And to say truly, we do not despise the church of
these men (howsoever it be ordered by them now-a-days),
partly for the name sake itself, and partly for that
the gospel of Jesu Christ hath once been therein
truly and purely set forth'.

However, what follows thoroughly negates the introductory
concession. A thief has laid hold of the Church of God, says the
passage: antichrist has entered the temple and has said, 'This
house is mine own; and Christ hath nothing to do withal'. The
desolation of the holy place is complete, and it is made a
living lie.

'For these men now, after they have left nothing
remaining in the church of God that hath any
likeness of this church, yet will they seem the
patrons and valiant maintainers of the church;
very like as Gracchus, amongst the Romans, stood
in defence of the treasury, notwithstanding with
his prodigality and fond expenses he had utterly
wasted the whole stock of the treasury ... they
be not straightway the people of God, which are
called the people of God'. 1

What the Apologia claims to see is the total collapse
of the Church of Rome as an effective Christian institution. It

has become 'a lamentable form of God's church', it says: 'these men have broken in pieces all the pipes and conduits: they have stopped up all the springs, and choked up the fountain of living water with dirt and mire'. In it Christ's 'light was already thoroughly quenched out', so that 'It was a misery to live therein, without the gospel, without light, and without all comfort'. In the Roman Church Christ's religion has been 'utterly corrupted'. 'All things were quite trodden under foot of these men, and ... nothing remained in the temple of God but pitiful spoils and decays ...'. Indeed, the treatise goes on to characterize Rome as the very antithesis of a Christian church - an organisation in which none of the essential ministries are achieved:

'We truly have renounced that church, wherein we could neither have the word of God sincerely taught, nor the sacraments rightly administered, nor the name of God duly called upon; which church also themselves confess to be faulty in many points; and wherein was nothing able to stay any wise man, or one that hath consideration of his own safety'.

The Church of England frankly acknowledges that it has separated itself from Rome, says the book, for, in a word, 'so the case stood that, unless we left him / the bishop of Rome/, we could not come to Christ'.

---

1. Apologia, Sig. F iiT (Works, III, p.91).
2. Apologia, Sig. G ivT, '... religionem ab istis turpiter neglectam et depravatam' (Works, III, p.100).
For all the rhetoric, there is consistency in these utterances. And in fact, they are complemented by what the Apologia says on the subject of the general council. The treatise explains why England has sought no conciliar approval for the religious changes that had been introduced; and among the excuses it advances is the complaint that the Roman Church had shown itself to be entirely incapable of reform. Papists were closed to the possibility of change:

'... these men will neither have the case to be freely disputed, nor yet, how many errors soever there be, suffer they any to be changed. For it is a common custom of theirs, often and shamelessly to boast that their church cannot err; that in it there is no fault; and that they must give place to us in nothing'; ¹

and their efforts at the earlier sessions of Trent had proved utterly sterile:

'Let us see, in all that while, of so many, so manifest, so often confessed by them, and so evident errors, what one error have they amended? From what kind of idolatry have they reclaimed the people? What superstition have they taken away? What piece of their tyranny and pomp have they diminished'. ²

The Roman system, the Apologia implies, is incorrigible. How is reform possible, it asks, in such a clericalist institution, when the guilty persons are themselves the judges, ³ and when all the council's decisions must win the Pope's approval before they have binding force? ⁴ As it is presently constituted, Trent

2. Apologia, Sig. F vii⁻r (Works, III, p.96).
3. Apologia, Sig. F vi⁻r (Works, III, p.95).
is 'a conspiracy and not a council', for the participants are pledged to uphold papal authority. One might therefore say that the Apologia sees in the council a symptom of that fatal malaise which has gripped the Roman Church, and which stems inevitably from the infection of the papacy.

It is, perhaps, not surprising that the work which takes up the question of England's separation from Rome (and the authority of general councils) should raise echoes of earlier Henrician teaching. The Apologia reiterates (although only gently) the notion of the imperial rights of princes, which Henry's polemicists had forged (or claimed to rediscover) - along, of course, with the now-traditional arguments in favour of the Royal Supremacy. More to the point, it also trades on the Henrician concept of the 'particular church' and its rights, stretching the truth somewhat by contending that England had solved its religious problems by means of 'a provincial synod'. These and other similarities might suggest that the Apologia was equally derivative in its reading of England's relationship with Rome and the Church Universal. Yet it might be said, I think, that on this matter the Elizabethan treatise broke new ground. For it was more outspoken with regard to the realm's


separation from Rome than any official English statement from the time of the 10 Articles (1536) onwards. In addition, it marks a departure (if only a subtle one) from the conception of the universal church which had been implicit in Henrician, and possibly also, Edwardian, formularies of faith.

Though equally critical of Roman abuses, the Henrician theologians were rather more lenient than the Apologia in their assessment of the Roman Church's status. Outlining its idea of how the Church in general ought to be envisaged, The Bishops' Book, for example, was intolerant of papal usurpation, as I have said. Yet it recognised Rome as a constituent member of the 'catholic church'. The book's aim, in this instance, was apparently to save the unity of Christendom while insisting on the right of the particular church to its own local ordinances and traditions. It saw Rome and the national churches united in what it termed 'a mere spiritual unity', which, reduced to essentials, still involved a unity 'in the right doctrine of Christ, and in the uniform using of the sacraments consonant unto the same doctrine'.

Henry's claim, of course, was that he had not separated the realm from 'the whole corps of Christendom'.

And his polemists did not expressly repudiate the implication that the English Church recognised the need to coexist with Rome - or even the implication that Rome, for all its unjust (and indeed, unscriptural) pretensions to a universal jurisdiction, did substantially retain the true doctrine and administer the Christian sacraments correctly. Taking, perhaps, an idealistic view of things, the Henricians continued to speak as if England were part of a universal church in which there was all the requisite doctrinal harmony.\(^1\) And in the main, they still tended to invoke the general council as a feasible means of resolving the differences of the particular churches.\(^2\) Frank though they were about England's rejection of papal supremacy, they stopped short of conceding any final rift with the Roman Church as such.

The Edwardian Articles (1553) were rather less benign. In a number of important respects they modified the Henrician view of the Church of Rome - both by what they said and by what they did not say. Firstly, they carried the attack against Rome one crucial step further. The article on the Church, for instance, insisted that Rome had erred, not merely in its disciplinary decisions, but in its teaching of the Christian faith as well (a.20). And, as has been mentioned, specific

---

instances of Rome's doctrinal errors were either expressly cited or heavily implied in other articles. Moreover, a grave condemnation of the Roman Church was implicit in the article which stated – only a few years after the Council of Trent, in the opening decree of the fourth session in 1546, had given every appearance of affirming the contrary – that the Church had no authority to demand acceptance of certain truths as necessary for salvation if they were not taught in the Scriptures (a.21). In a word, the 42 Articles openly charged Rome with institutional failures – failures that might well have seemed to prejudice its right to be regarded as a part of the true Church.

Their silences, too, were suggestive. The Articles nowhere described Rome as a member of the 'catholic church'. Nor, for that matter, did they advert to Henry's conception of the universal church as a confederation of particular churches; or express any real confidence in general councils. On the whole, the Edwardian Articles seem to have favoured a more fundamentalist norm of catholicity than the Henrician formularies. What delineated the visible church of Christ, according to article 20, was acceptance of the Scriptures, or the 'preaching of the pure

1. For instance, articles 23 (Purgatory), 25 (vernacular), 26 (efficacy of the sacraments), 29 (transubstantiation), 30 (mass), 31 (celibacy), 33 (traditions).

2. Article 22 said that even the decrees of general councils proposing matters as necessary for salvation 'neque robur habent neque authoritatem, nisi ostendi possunt e sacris litteris esse desumpta'. And it added that councils have erred 'etiam in his quae ad normam pietatis pertinent'. 
word of God'. The decrees of councils, and the creeds, were declared acceptable (and this meant, acceptable as 'catholic' truth) only when they patently conformed to the Scriptures (aa.7, 22). What, then, of the church whose doctrines were considered to be so manifestly at odds with the Scriptures? It would be reasonable to say that the 42 Articles implied an answer to the question. However, they did not state it, or refer to any total alienation from Rome.

More than anything else, polemics had changed the situation by 1562. Rome's intransigence and the approach of the papist controversialists had virtually forced the question of 'separation' into the theological discussions. As the Apologia itself shows, the much-reiterated complaint of Rome was that the reform-churches had 'broken unity' and had cut themselves off from the 'true' church of Christ. It was scarcely surprising that the rejoinders denied Rome's right to that title - not merely, indeed, her exclusive right to it, but more commonly (in the heat of controversy) her right to be regarded as 'catholic', or even 'christian', at all. This was the contention of the Apologia. And for that reason it was correct to say of it that 'neither in King Henry nor King Edward's time our late sovereigns was any such keen sword drawn to cut the adversaries' as there.  

---

The Apologia's rather blatant 'unchurching' of Rome sets it closer to the works of Puritans such as Thomas Cartwright and John Field than to the Anglicanism of Richard Hooker. Admittedly, Hooker's tolerant view of the Church of Rome was exceptional. Scarcely any of the Anglican divines of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries appear to have shared it entirely; and at least some of them (nourished, no doubt, by the sentiments expressed in the Elizabethan manifesto) did defend the proposition that Rome was not a sound member of the Church Universal. Yet, if they did not make the same concessions to Rome's catholicity as Hooker, the works of the later divines often displayed hesitations, and a degree of theological refinement, lacking in the Apologia. They seem to have been more sensitive to the implications of affirming a total separation from Rome.Apparently full of evangelical fervour, the Apologia grants virtually nothing to Rome and adverts to none of the theological consequences of separation. 'Keen sword drawn', it cuts away polemically and immoderately, recognising only one adversary and allowing no quarter. Rome and England are declared utterly at odds with each other: from the Christian point of view, only one can be right. Naturally, the antithesis tends to control the book's argument, and is one explanation for its black-and-white reading of the Church's past.

To account fully for the Apologia's intransigence towards Rome (and therefore, for the style of argument it adopted), one must also recall that it was a work, not simply of polemics, but of propaganda. That is to say, it was officially commissioned as a result of rather pressing political circumstances; and its function was to plead a religious case in the political arena—all with a view to the realm's political advantage. It was sponsored by Cecil, as another of his efforts at persuasion through the printed word. And once again, his diligent collaborator in the venture was John Jewel.

On this occasion, the evidence of Cecil's patronage is more than circumstantial. Towards the end of March 1561 Quadra had reported to Philip that 'the bishops frequently meet in the archbishop of Canterbury's house and are drawing up a profession of faith to send to the Concilio'. And in the same despatch in which he told of the Privy Council's decision not to admit Martinengo, the Spanish ambassador noted, on 5 May:

'Every day since then [around 29 April] the archbishops of Canterbury and York and the bishops of Winchester and Salisbury with the Chancellor and

1. The relevant documents are very well assembled in Booty, op.cit., p.51.
2. Read comments: this was 'the weapon he understood best', op.cit., p.241. J.E. Neale has noted the way in which Cecil became a great believer in propaganda, adding: 'The Queen herself was even more alive to the value of propaganda than Cecil; and the extent to which she had a part in this activity of her reign has yet to be fully discovered', intro. to The Queenes Maisties Passage... (Yale, 1960), p.15.
Cecil have met on this business the admission of the nuncio, and participation in the general council. 1

Quadra was convinced this group had drawn up the Privy Council's reply to him, and blamed them for the harshness of it. 2 He was probably correct. It seems likely that Cecil was anxious to have a doctrinaire rejection of the Pope's overtures expounded, officially sanctioned and circulated as quickly as possible - perhaps in order to commit the Queen finally to the policy he was advocating. But the secretary's eyes were also set on wider horizons. He had already turned his mind to the need for overseas propaganda on behalf of the English Church, and had enlisted Jewel's aid for the purpose. Significantly, the same letter from Cecil to Throckmorton, in which the secretary said

'I have caused an Apology to be written but not printed, in the name of the whole clergy, which surely is wisely, learnedly, eloquently, and gravely written, but I stay the publication of it until it be further pondered, for so it is requisite',

added

'for satisfaction of such doubts made in France regarding the English clergy and their variety.

I have caused the Bishop of Sarum to feign an epistle sent from hence thither, and have it printed secretly, and send you herewith certain copies. If more be printed there, the matter shall have more probability'. 3

3. Cecil to Throckmorton, 8 May 1561, Foreign Cal.1561-2, p. 104.
The pamphlet, or 'feigned epistle', which Cecil spoke of was not expressly concerned with the general council or, indeed, with the rights and wrongs of England's separation from Rome. Dated April 1561, it purported to be a letter written by 'Nicholas N., Englishman' to an old friend in Paris, 'John N.'; and was printed under the title, Epistola cuiusdam Angli ... 1. It countered charges of division in the ranks of the English clergy, apparently made by certain French preachers ('monks' they are called) earlier in that same year. The claims had been that the Church of England was split by factions; that nothing was held with any certainty, since bishops and preachers could not agree among themselves; and that each one was intent on constructing a church according to his own tastes. 2 In a fashion typical of Jewel, the reply made light of the 'friendly dissension' in England, dealing in turn with the church's uniformity in doctrine and ceremonies, and interspersing pointed comments on the need for understanding among 'allies'. 3 What the Epistola demonstrates, of course, is the bishop's willingness to serve in Cecil's propaganda exercises abroad, which, it should be emphasised, appear to have been quite numerous about this time. 4

2. Epistola, Sig. A iiΓ. Booty's text here should read 'fabricare', not 'fabricari', pp.210-11.
4. Examples at the time include: (i) the document regarding the coming of Martinengo, which was published, according to
Jewel himself provides very little information about these activities. No letters to his friend, Peter Martyr, are extant for 1561. Writing from Salisbury early in November 1560, he announced that he was preparing for an assembly of his clergy and a visitation of the diocese, which he expected would take two months. But it was not until February 1562 (when he was once more back in his see) that he told Martyr of the Queen's decision not to send representatives to Trent, adding the information that a work explaining the reasons for this was contemplated, and also that

'We have lately published an Apology for the change of religion among us, and our departure from the church of Rome'

- a copy of which he forwarded, with protestations that it was 'hardly worth sending to such a distance' and apologies for the faulty printing. Cecil was critical of typography also, but had none of the author's reservations about the book's worthiness for circulation. He had plans for its prompt distribution, as he told Archbishop Parker on New Year's Day

Quadra, under another title, and lengthened, Quadra to Philip II, 13 September 1561, Span. Cal. 1558-67, p. 215;
(ii) the publication of Haddon's reply to Osorius abroad, which Cecil organised, probably in 1561, Read, op. cit., p. 486, n. 3;
(iii) possibly the Epistola ad Scipionem, mentioned earlier, should be lodged in this category also.

1. Jewel to Martyr, 6 November 1560, Zurich Letters, I, p. 91. There is extant a short letter to Simler, 4 May 1561, written from London, in which Jewel complains of many occupations, Zurich Letters, I, p. 96.

1562. Copies were to be sent immediately into France and Scotland; and like the Epistola, the Apologia was to be published (in Latin) from Paris - later being distributed into French and other languages, and achieving a wide distribution with rather astonishing speed.\(^2\)

It would appear that the Apologia's special fate was to be (in the words of Archbishop Parker) 'scattered in France'. We cannot know what prompted Cecil to stay the publication of the work until January 1562. But it is surely significant that it was in this month that the Council of Trent finally opened - with the question of French participation in it still unresolved. Until the time England actively intervened in French affairs, later in 1562, her policies towards her neighbour remained flexible. That is to say, no firm alliances were made with the Huguenot party; neither were any great efforts made, seemingly, to form a common front with those in France who favoured a compromise religious settlement similar to the English one. Flexibility, however, was by no means synonymous with lack of concern. France loomed very large in English reckonings even in 1561. For although Cecil cannot justly be accused of interfering too directly in French affairs at this time, he was, from the beginning of that year, nursing two ambitions at least: to see

1. Cecil to Parker, 1 January 1562: 'I mean to send five or six copies into France, and as many into Scotland', Parker Correspondence, p. 162.
2. Cf. Booty, op.cit., p. 56.
a withholding of French support for the council; and more broadly, to see the authority of the French Papists challenged, especially (it would appear) through vigorous polemical writings.\(^1\) Drafted around this time, the Apologia was probably conceived with both of these purposes in mind. And its appearance, several months later, may have been timed to further them.

Correspondence between Cecil and Throckmorton and a letter to Archbishop Parker early in 1562 all suggest that the Apologia was published with an eye to the situation in France.\(^2\) The secretary was convinced the book appeared 'in good season'.\(^3\) One can be sure he was thoroughly alive to the dangers of enthusiastic French backing for Trent. A crusading neighbour, in a mind to enforce a possible papal excommunication, would not have been to his liking, to say the least. It was therefore to England's advantage in 1562 to press its religious case before the French particularly. At best, it might win England a measure of French support for its rejection of Trent. But in any event it was insurance against French hostility, firstly, to seek to weaken French Papists, and secondly, to have the English Settlement recognised as moderate. At the Colloquy of Poissy,

---

1. Read, op.cit., p.241. The Roman view at the time was that Elizabeth 'stirs up and foments to the best of her power the prevalent turmoil' in France; 'she longs to see some evil turn of French affairs', Commendone to Borromeo, 26 October 1561, 1 January 1562, Roman Cal., 1, pp.53, 72.
3. Cecil to Parker, 1 January 1562, Parker Correspondence, p.161.
held in the summer of 1561, even the Catholic party was divided over some of the liturgical modifications which England now accepted. Under the circumstances, it made sense for the Apologia to seek to identify England with religious views which a French monarch - because of his country's domestic situation - could not afford to see anathematized.

The impact of this political motivation on the Apologia's theological case was, nevertheless, discreet. It is unlikely that Cecil's sponsorship of the book implied a meticulous control over its contents. He said he 'caused' it to be written; and its appearance would seem to have been one very clear token of the triumph of his policies with regard to Martinengo and Trent. Also, his reference to a 'further pondering' of the initial draft as 'requisite' may indicate (as a recent author has argued) a revision of the text under his - and no doubt, Parker's - supervision.¹ We must certainly grant that the work was scrutinized before publication. Yet there are no convincing reasons for regarding it as a composite production, in the strict sense of the term.²

1. See Booty, op.cit., pp.46f.
2. I disagree here with Booty, op.cit., pp.51-5, on these grounds: (i) texts which show a certain proprietorial attitude towards the book on the part of some prominent churchmen need only mean that it was 'official'; (ii) I do find some indication of authorship in Jewel's words to Martyr, and apparently the latter regarded the book as Jewel's (Zurich Letters, I, p.339); (iii) I suspect Booty attributes too much importance to the activity of exiles in committee, especially when he holds them responsible for 'the whole propaganda effort of the Government'. It will be obvious also that I have a different idea of the aim of the work from Booty, cf. pp. 48-9.
The book has traditionally been ascribed to Jewel; and lacking any definite information to the contrary, we must accept the material in it as his. Which is to say that, although the *Apologia* is rightly regarded as 'propaganda', it was not this in the sense that it merelyretailed officially-manufactured arguments; or indeed, in the sense that it pleaded a political case simply under the guise of theology. The *Apologia* deserves to be called 'political' chiefly because of the way it was used; and also because it does display a certain sensitivity to current political needs, accurately reproducing the mood of the Queen's chief advisers in their rejection of the Martinengo mission and the general council.

The fact that the treatise was an 'official' one - sponsored (if not formally authorised) by the highest authorities of Church and State, and written 'in the name of the whole clergy' expressly to defend the probity both of the realm and the national church - has had an inevitable impact on its argument. The circumstances have of course led to an accentuating of the polemical stance. Jewel's earlier belligerence towards Rome is now, so to speak, canonised and encouraged to issue, as we have seen, in a more forthright attack on that church and its religious standing. Moreover, the propagandist character of the *Apologia* may be held responsible for the transformation of Jewel's defence of the Church of England from predominantly negative (as in the Challenge Sermon) into something more positive. Earlier Jewel had tended to justify the Settlement by declaring the papist
practices indefensible and loading the onus of proof onto his opponents. Arguing in 1562 in a wider arena he is forced to be somewhat more constructive, and to accept the burden of demonstrating that England had, in fact, returned to the practices of the Church 'as it was in old time'.
The praises of the *Apologia* have often been sung, and in most respects the plaudits are well-deserved. The book is obviously one of the major literary products of the English Reformation, and a brilliant piece of pleading—more notable, perhaps, for its discreetly compelling rhetoric than for its cogency of argument, but convincing none the less. What the *Apologia* does superbly is to strike a stance; it manages to make the terms of the English Church's position seem crystal-clear, neatly blending moderation with idealism, while gathering a strength from the fact of opposition. Judged as a rationale of a religious programme, or of a system of churchmanship, it may be open to serious criticism. But in its mindfulness of the nation's political needs, its middle-of-the-road reforming zeal (summed-up in the concern for 'comeliness' and 'good order'¹), or even its ability to identify the English with all godly minorities who have ever been persecuted by the half-truths and the threats of the world's pharisees, it embodies much of the spirit, not only of the Elizabethan Settlement, but of the whole movement of state-sponsored religious reform in England. This has given the work an abiding value.

One cannot fail to be conscious of precedents when examining the *Apologia*'s appeals to Christian antiquity. A

---

1. *Apologia*, Sig. B vii. *Cf.* Sig. F iii (Works, III, p.65. *Cf.* p.92). These are important statements: in effect, they are the *Apologia*'s justification for retaining ceremonies not explicitly approved by the Scriptures.
recognition of at least the corroborative value of the testimony of the early church - found both in the declarations of Councils and in the writings of the Fathers - had been a consistent feature of the state-sponsored reform from its beginnings under Henry. Those semi-official documents, already mentioned in this chapter, which invite comparison with the *Apolo gia* bear this fact out abundantly.

To counter the fundamentalism of the Anabaptists, the Augsburg Confession of 1530 had declared its opposition to 'new dogmas' and stated it had no wish to diverge either from the Scriptures or the teaching of the ancient church. Perhaps partly with a similar intention in mind, but also reflecting Henry's own doctrinal conservatism, the first of the Ten Articles (1536) insisted that the three Creeds and the decrees of the first four general councils were to be accepted as an authentic summary of Christian belief. The article recognised these ancient statements as normative - to this extent that it said a denial of the articles of the creeds was incompatible with membership of the Church, and argued that the 'form and manner of speaking' of the creeds was to be retained.

1. Augsburg Confession, part I, art. 22; and epilogue. For appeals to the Fathers in the Confession, see I, art. 6; II, art. 1; II, art. 3; II, art. 6. Hardwick discusses the Confession (*Articles*, pp.13-30), and speaks of it 'breathing the same cordial deference for the teachings of the past, which characterises nearly all the writings of Melanchthon' (*op.cit.*, p.16).

2. Art. 1, Lloyd, *Formularies*, pp.xvii-xviii. Reading the Ten Articles against the background of the current doctrinal unrest and radicalism, Hardwick suggests that art. I was directed against the Anabaptists, *op.cit.*, pp.31ff.
The ampler Henrician confessions, the Bishops' Book and the King's Book, took the same view, and elaborated on the need to respect the primitive church. Even the first and more conservative of these two formularies accepted the principle of sola Scriptura, although it was somewhat more restrained than the King's Book in its statement of it. However, while conceding that the Scripture 'alone showeth men the right path to come to God', both books attached great importance to the witness of the first centuries: in part they were an extended commentary on the articles of the creed; they frequently argued from the teaching of the Fathers and the practice of the primitive church; and, clearly, the norm they espoused was not the naked text of the Scriptures, but the Scriptures as interpreted in 'the apostolical doctrine received and maintained from the beginning'. The Bishops' Book, in fact, explained its predilection for the primitive church in this way:

'For it is out of all doubt that Christ's faith was then most firm and pure, and the scriptures of God were then best understood, and virtue did then most

---

2. Lloyd, op.cit., pp.24, 217. In fact, neither was very explicit on the point. The King's Book speaks of maintaining 'a perfect and sufficient doctrine, grounded and established in holy scriptures'.
abound and excel. And therefore it must needs follow, that the customs and ordinances then used and made must needs be more conform and agreeable unto the true doctrine of Christ, and more conducing to the edifying and benefit of the church of Christ, than any customs or laws used or made sith that time'.

The Forty-two Articles were more explicitly evangelical, and possibly do provide evidence of the change from Lutheran to Swiss dominance which some believe occurred in Edward's reign. Certainly, they did emphasise that the Scriptures in themselves must be held 'sufficient'. And while stating strongly that the three creeds were to be 'received', the articles went on to explain (in words that would be repeated in subsequent formularies) that this was because the creeds' tenets were patently scriptural. This clarification brought the primacy of the Scriptures into suitable prominence, and showed how appeals to the practice and teaching of the primitive church should be construed. Such arguments could only be held

---

1. Lloyd, op.cit., p.122. The statement is repeated in The King's Book, although the final clause is extended thus: 'than any customs or laws used or made by the bishop of Rome, or any other addicted to that see and usurped power sith that time', Lloyd, op.cit., pp.287-8.


4. Art. 7, the phrase being 'omnino recipienda' (to which was added in 1563, 'et credenda'). And the reason for their 'reception' is stated thus: 'Nam firmissimis divinarum Scripturarum testimoniiis probari possunt'.
subordinate to the argument from Scripture. Yet their usefulness was by no means denied. And in practice, the Edwardians set quite as much store on the patristic argument as their predecessors, since they remained confident that the pure doctrine of Christ was faithfully retained in the primitive church.

Relics of this mitigated religious conservatism in some of the early pronouncements of Elizabeth's reign have already been noted. So the Apologia's general advertence to the testimony of Christian antiquity comes as no surprise. What is striking, however, is the very great weight placed on the patristic evidence in the work, and the kind of use that is made of it.

The Apologia accepts 'antiquity' as a prime authenticator of the true religion. The pivotal contention of the treatise is that England has 'forsaken the church as it is now, not as it was in old time'. The national church has been 'called home again to the original and first foundation' and has 'returned' to the true and ancient order of things:

'... we have returned again unto the primitive church of the ancient fathers and apostles, that is to say, to the first ground and beginning of things, as unto the very foundations and head-springs of Christ's church'.

1. Apologia, Sig. F iii\(^T\). Cf. Sig. F i\(^V\) (Works, III, p.92, cf. p.91).
Whereas the Challenge Sermon was mainly condemnatory—its positive defence of the Settlement being implied rather than stated—the Apologia perhaps goes to the other extreme: it forges direct claims to the point of courting overstatement. With regard to doctrine, says Jewel, 'God's holy gospel, the ancient bishops, and the primitive church do make on our side. These are England's 'schoolmasters' in the faith, not merely in the sense that the church's teaching has taken its beginnings from them, but because it had been 'appointed' by them in the terms in which it is now professed. The ancient doctrine has been totally regained:

'As for our doctrine, which we may rightlier call Christ's catholic doctrine than the papists, it is so far off from new, that God, who is above all most ancient, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, hath left the same unto us in the gospel, in the prophets' and apostles' works, being monuments of greatest age. So that no man can now think our doctrine to be new, unless the same think either the prophets' faith, or the gospel, or else Christ himself to be new'.

Moreover, this return to antiquity is complete in yet another sense. It extends to all significant aspects of church-life, including methods of administering the sacraments and modes of prayer as well as doctrine. 'Ww have gone', the Apologia says, 'from that church which had power to err' and

'we are come, as near as we possibly could, 
to the church of the apostles and of the 
old catholic bishops and fathers; which 
church we know hath hitherunto been sound 
and perfite, as as Tertullian termeth it, 
a pure virgin, spotted as yet with no 
 idolatry, nor with any foul or shameful 
fault; and have directed according to 
their customs and ordinances not only our 
doctrine, but also the sacraments, and the 
form of common prayer'. 1

There is the clear suggestion of all essentials being recaptured 
(and even of their being revived in quite a literal fashion) 
when the book speaks of the religion of Christ being 'restored, 
and as it were coming up again anew' in the refurbished English 
Church. 2

The work is just as peremptory in developing the 
expected corollary to these statements. If antiquity 
unequivocally favours the English position, it also 
unequivocally discredits the major Roman tenets, seemingly in 
their entirety. In spite of their 'high brag' that 'all 
antiquity and a continual consent of all ages doth make on 
their side', Papists are 'against all antiquity', according 
to the Apologia. Where England has returned to 'the very 
foundations and head-springs of Christ's church', Rome has cut 
itself off from those foundations. Its adherents 'have gone 
both from the holy fathers, and from the apostles, and from 
Christ his own self, and from the primitive and catholic church'

1. Apologia, Sig. G iv R (Works, III, p.100).
- in particular, they have 'forsaken the Greeks, from whom they first received their faith'. This defection is, in fact, assumed to be manifest: 'we ourselves did evidently see \( \text{it} \) with our eyes', says Jewel.\(^1\)

Clearly the Apologia assumes a more combative stance with regard to antiquity than any of the Henrician or Edwardian formularies; and it labours a claim that had been alluded to, but rarely pressed, in those earlier declarations of faith. Naturally, when they accepted the standards of the primitive church as normative, these pronouncements had wanted it to be known that the English Church did adhere, in all essential respects, to the ancient teachings and practices. It was only occasionally, however, that the Henrician statements bothered to make this explicit. Mostly the correspondence was taken to be obvious, and it was only on matters like the Royal Supremacy, where there was some insecurity, that the note of 'return' was deliberately struck. Edwardian divines found it necessary to be somewhat more insistent on the congruity between the enactments of the reformed church and the ancient discipline. As the intensity of the debate between Papists and supporters of the English reforms mounted, the greater the prominence this issue assumed, until, in the Apologia, it is conceded a place of central importance.

\(^1\) Apologia, Sigs. E \( \text{iii}^\text{r} \), F \( \text{ii}^\text{v} \) (Works, III, pp.84, 92.)
This meant more than the emergence of a new issue in the debate: it signalled the advent of a new type of concern. Without entirely abandoning the standard methods of theological demonstration, the Elizabethan treatise moves into the field of apologetics. That is, it shows some concern for constructing a kind of rational, or semi-theological, criterion which any intelligent person might use to verify religious positions. Instead of broaching the question of theological truth or falsehood directly, it sometimes acquiesces in the search for extrinsic 'marks' (or 'notes') of orthodoxy, obviously accepting 'antiquity' as one of them. The tract says, in effect: let conformity with the primitive Christian model be taken as the index of the true religion. 'True' in this context has the primary connotation of 'authentic': the initial aim is to discern which of the competing forms of religion deserves the appellation 'Christian' (or 'catholic'); and once this is discovered, the veracity of its teachings may then be assumed to follow. Here theology proper is passing into apologetics; or, to revert to the terms favoured earlier in this study, the classical forms of theological 'refutation' are being replaced by a technique of rational (or, in the case of the antiquity-criterion, historical) 'verification'.

The one is not, as I have said, totally supplanted by the other. But the desire to turn conformity with the
primitive church into an effective yard-stick of religious propriety does dominate in the Apologia. One sees this in Jewel's assessment of the polemical course open to the Papists:

"these men's part had been, first to have clearly and truly proved that the Romish church is the true and right-instructed church of God; and that the same, as they do order it at this day, doth agree with the primitive church of Christ, of the apostles, and of the holy fathers, which we doubt not but was indeed the true catholic church."

"And as for their religion, if it be of so long continuance as they would have men ween it is, why do they not prove it so by the examples of the primitive church, and by the fathers and councils of old times? Why lieth so ancient a cause thus long in the dust destitute of an advocate? Fire and sword they have had always ready at hand; but as for the old councils and the fathers, all mum, not a word."

Such taunts hearken back to the terms of the challenge. But as I have suggested, there is a slight difference here. While the earlier appeal to antiquity might have seemed no more than a ploy to keep Papists on the defensive, the Apologia is more confident about having both the English and the Roman churches judged according to the antiquity-criterion. 'Let them compare our churches and theirs together', it says, on the score of their conformity with the primitive discipline. There is now no muting of the call to 'verify' the status of the respective

---

1. Apologia, Sig. D v (Works, III, pp.78-9).
institutions in the light of the testimony of antiquity.

The strengthening of this tendency to validate sets of religious practices from the outside, as it were, by substantiating their antiquity, is hardly a surprising development. One is always aware of what might loosely be called 'political' considerations that made it opportune for English controversialists to emphasise the moderation of the nation's religious changes. Just prior to the Apologia's appearance, Throckmorton was writing to Cecil of the need to have English spokesmen 'fortify' the ceremonies, rites and observances of the national church with 'the authority of the ancient writers, and the examples of the old churches'. 'For', he says,

'these ministers [the supporters of Geneva] fare as men that would pluck down an old building which consists of good and bad stuff, and when they have plucked down that patched building they leave the world often without any covered house, unless it be some hovels hastily set up to keep themselves dry withal; whereby they bring themselves into contempt, and are noted rather spoilers than builders. Therefore the ecclesiastical form retained in England will have more allowance when the matter shall come in question if the ceremonies were but quoted, with such authorities as make for them gathered forth of the ancient ecclesiastical histories and writers'.

Obviously Throckmorton is more concerned with the respectability of the English measures in this instance than with theological

considerations. His eyes, no doubt, are on the political advantages to be gained in France from evidence of Elizabeth's moderation. But there is another side to his advice also: his words reveal the cultivated man's distrust of reckless innovation. His sympathies are with the 'builders', not the 'spoilers'. He sees that the religious zealots court contempt by their apparently-negative, and over-ruthless, programmes. It is better to sift good from bad, and show respect for precedent. If only as the symbol of a constructive and conservative intent, the title, 'ancient', is worth striving for in Throckmorton's estimation. The influence of this type of thinking on the Apologia has to be recognised.

It is likely, too, that the tract's emphasis on antiquity owes something to popular assessments of the religious debates. To win support for their religion among the 'foolish' and 'such as cast little whereabouts they or other do go', says Jewel, the Papists 'are wont to say they had it from Augustine, Hierome, Chrysostom, from the apostles, and from Christ himself'. And he adds,

'Full well know they that nothing is more in the people's favour, or better liketh the common sort than these names'.¹

Probably it was the 'new' versus 'old' dilemma, more than any other of the theological niceties, that had captured the imaginations of the populace.

¹. Apologia, Sig. E iv² (Works, III, p.85).
However, in addition to these factors, the trend towards 'verification' in the Apologia is also a symptom of the break-down that had occurred between the English and the Roman Churches. The corollary to the more-outspoken condemnations of the Papacy and the frank acknowledgment of separation, mentioned earlier, is that the English and Roman 'religions' are now openly contrasted. The treatise is therefore forced to confront the problem of how to recognise the true church. As it remarks, the name 'church' is no longer an indication of where true doctrine and the proper administration of the sacraments is to be found: the title can be a deception, and the status of the institution claiming it must be verified.¹ To say, as the Papists do, that the Church is self-authenticating is 'in manner a fantastical and a mad way' of proceeding — for it is a 'very uncertain, and exceeding dangerous' way of finding out the truth.² Accordingly, the Apologia seeks to distinguish what is the 'proper mark and badge' of God's Church, confident that the signs are clear:

'I wis it is not so hard a matter to find out God's church, if a man will seek it earnestly and diligently. For the church of God is set upon a high and glistening place, in the top of an hill, and built upon the "foundation of the apostles and prophets". ³

¹ Apologia, Sig. D vii (Works, III, p.80).
² Apologia, Sig. E iii (Works, III, p.84).
³ Apologia, Sig. E i (Works, III, p.82).
It is, of course, its conformity with the doctrine of the apostles and prophets that alone guarantees a church's authenticity in Jewel's estimation. God's word is the instrument that must be used to discriminate between true and false. If the Apologia finally settles for the broader criterion of 'antiquity' as a means of discrimination, it is firstly in the conviction that there is no dichotomy between the Scriptures and the best teaching of the Fathers, and secondly because the Papists themselves have made so much of this ingredient of catholicity. Or so it would seem.

One must make some allowance for the fact that the whole treatise is framed as a rejoinder. Quite literally, it is structured around the standard accusations levelled against the reformers. It treats (in this order) the charges that they are supporters of heresy, 'men of trouble', divided among themselves and abettors of division, and finally, innovators. All the positive statements of the English Church's credentials grow out of the repudiation of such claims. For instance, the detailed summary of the church's discipline and essential beliefs, with which the book begins, is meant as a counter to the charge of heresy. 'Because these men take us to be mad, and appeach us for heretics', it says,

1. Apologia, Sig. D vii (Works, III, p.80).
'we have judged it should be to good purpose, and not unprofitable, if we do openly and frankly set forth our faith wherein we stand ... to the intent all men may see what is our judgment of every part of christian religion, and may resolve with themselves, whether the faith which they shall see confirmed by the words of Christ, by the writings of the apostles, by the testimonies of the catholic fathers, and by the examples of many ages, be but a certain rage of furious and mad men, and a conspiracy of heretics'.

And there follows one of the most ample statements of doctrine ever given by the Elizabethan Church. Similarly, the claim to the support of Christian antiquity occurs chiefly in the section of the work which looks to the charge that the English teaching is 'new-fangled and of late devised'. This naturally gives its assertions a highly polemical colouring.

It would be a mistake to underestimate the constructive elements in Jewel's attempts to vindicate the antiquity of the English arrangements. He is interested in something more than their respectability. 'Why return we not to the pattern of the old churches?', he asks. The enthusiasm of the reformer for the purity of the ancient ways is there; and outraged by the Papists' refusal to concede anything to the advocates of change, his concern to have religion 'called

1. Apologia, Sig. A viii V (Works, III, p.58)
2. Apologia, Sig. E iii R ff (Works, III, pp.84ff.).
home again to the original and first foundation' is all the more real. Moreover, on doctrinaire grounds, he subscribes to the immutability of essential religious tenets:

'Questionless, there can nothing be more spitefully spoken against the religion of God than to accuse it of novelty, as a new come up matter: for, as there can be no change in God himself, no more ought there to be in his religion'.

Yet the force of the Apologia's insistence on the English Church's antiquity always seems to derive principally from polemics. Its arguments beg to be read as a counter-move: 'catholic' is the title Papists claim for their religion, partly on the basis of its supposed antiquity and continuity; yet ours is the only truly 'catholic' faith, says the Apologia. At this point in


3. In practice, the elements of the notion of 'catholicity' were being redefined by Catholic theologians around this time. The matter is discussed by G. Thils, Les Notes de l'Eglise dans l'Apologétique Catholique depuis la Réforme (Gembloux, 1937), pp.212ff. The emphasis was passing from spatial and numerical universality to the temporal aspects of catholicity: antiquity and continuity (op.cit., pp.217-8).

4. The Apologia associates 'antiquity' with 'catholic(ity)'. 'Surely we have ever judged the primitive church of Christ's time, of the apostles, and of the holy fathers, to be the catholic church ...' /Sig. Div v (Works, III, p.77) Cf. Sigs. A vii v, E vii (Works, III, pp.56, 89). It speaks of 'the primitive and catholic church', and the 'catholic fathers' /Sigs. A vii v, G iv v (Works, III, pp.58, 100).
the debate between England and Rome there seems to be no alternative but to try to decide which of the two institutions deserves to be known as the exponent of the true religion. Happily, according to Jewel, the time has arrived when ordinary men are in a position to judge their respective credentials.¹

Polemics, the special circumstances behind the Apologia's appearance, and Jewel's own strengths and weaknesses as a controversialist, all contributed to a new emphasis in the book's appeal to Christian antiquity. Clearly there are general precedents for its respectful advertence to the testimony of the first centuries in the earlier statements of the reformed English Church and the arguments of some of its apologists. There are also precedents for its claim that the religious measures revived by Elizabeth were in conformity with primitive Christian practice - as earlier chapters in this study show. But the weight that is now being set on the national church's over-all adherence to the standards of antiquity makes the theological case of the Elizabethan treatise distinctive. Its readiness to press the antiquity-criterion as an authenticator of the true religion even sets the Apologia apart - formally speaking, at any rate - from the Challenge Sermon itself. The work provides us with the most explicit evidence of the trend towards 'verification'

¹. Apologia, Sigs. A vii²-v (Works, III, p.57).
that I have been mentioning.

In part, the new form of argument is a reflection of political changes. By explicitly rejecting the Martinengo mission, along with the Pope's General Council, Elizabeth had made the realm's estrangement from Rome all but definitive. Sensitive to 'policy' without necessarily being enslaved by it, the Apologia translates the decision into theological terms, openly admitting separation and, in fact, presenting the Roman and English 'religions' as antithetical. The contrast naturally strengthens the tendency to compare the two systems of churchmanship theologically. Their extrinsic credibility is evaluated through those 'marks' which the authentic Christian Church is assumed to have, 'antiquity' (a kind of accompaniment to 'catholicity') being accepted by Jewel as one of them. Showing the same confidence in the support of the ancient church which Archbishop Cranmer had had, Jewel - with polemical flair, but perhaps a certain indiscretion - forces the historical question into the foreground, giving it a prominence that it had never quite had before. As a result, the Apologia seems to be setting unusual store by the testimony of the early Fathers, although it is noticeable that they are now being appealed to as historical witnesses rather than in their time-hallowed capacity as the privileged interpreters of Holy Writ.

Some reference to the orientation of the Apologia's
appeal to antiquity is necessary, I suggest, when it comes to the delicate task of assessing Jewel's uses of the patristic argument - a matter broached recently by two scholars, W. M. Southgate and J. E. Booty, who appear to reach conflicting conclusions.¹ Southgate's is the fuller treatment of the subject; and in one important respect I believe his views corroborate my own.

Conceding that Jewel's opinions with regard to doctrinal authority are not novel, Southgate goes on to argue that the bishop's position is nevertheless unique, because of what Southgate terms 'the completeness of his authoritative method'. The meaning of that remark is clarified by the following statement:

'His writings constitute the first thorough-going attempt to prove the Catholicity of English Doctrine, to demonstrate that the teachings of the English Church at no point departed from the Church of the apostles and the fathers ... Although most reformers, it is true, denied that their teachings were new, that they were in any way in conflict with the apostolic Church, it is quite another matter to emphasize the objective precedent of the early Church and to stress the primary importance of demonstrating the identity of a particular modern Church with the early Church'. ²

2. Southgate, op.cit., p.120.
And presumably this is what Southgate has in mind when he says later that:

'Unlike his predecessors, Jewel did not cite individual fathers merely because it suited his purpose to buttress his primary argument with supplementary evidence. He chose to rest his case squarely on patristic support'. 1

I think it is correct to emphasise, as Southgate does, Jewel's concern for demonstrating the English Church's conformity with the ancient discipline: and also to describe this concern of his as distinctive. The dividing-line may not always be a very clear one, but there is a difference between the claims of earlier reformers and Jewel's use of the antiquity-argument - or, as I would prefer to say, his use of it in the Apologia. Even the view that the bishop attributed 'primary importance' to proving the national church's catholicity by appealing to the testimony of the Fathers is, in one respect, valid. In terms of Jewel's actual polemics this was a matter of primary concern: that is, he made the claim to de facto identity a prime element in his justification of the English Church, finding there the perfect counter to papist accusations of heresy and innovation. If pressed, however, he may well have shifted ground. It is likely that Jewel could have said, with Philip Melanchthon, that, de jure,

the corroboration of the patristic age was not essential to the reformers; but that it simply was a fact that antiquity was on the side of the gospellers, not their opponents. In the polemics of the time so many positions were assumed merely, as the saying goes, 'for the sake of argument' that it is often difficult to be sure which were seriously held. This is true of Jewel: winning the polemical point was always the major aim, and there is ample evidence of his having silenced theological considerations in order to do so. What is clear, however, is, first, that the claim to factual correspondence was one of Jewel's primary contentions; and second, that he did consider some kind of fellowship of faith with the ancients to be a distinguishing feature - though not necessarily the primary distinguishing feature - of the true Christian Church.¹

To this extent, I, along with Haugaard, agree that 'Southgate's case for Jewel's distinctive use of patristic authority is convincing'.² But I would want to underscore the word, 'use', and attribute more importance to it, probably, than either Southgate or Haugaard do. In the final analysis, what Southgate really maintains is that Jewel's view of the Fathers' role was also distinctive. He speaks of Jewel

¹ For an explanation of this point, see Booty, op.cit., pp.147-8.
² Haugaard, op.cit., p.244.
attributing to the Fathers an 'interpretative authority' - meaning, of course, something less than a 'declarative' one, where the Fathers would be seen as linked to an authoritative church, and understood to share in its power of first perceiving, and then imposing, truths that were, in some respect, beyond the express words of Scripture. There can be no complaint with this contention as it stands. Jewel's recourse to the Fathers is in no way an admission of an authoritative church; or still less, an admission of an independent 'tradition' in the Christian community. If the Fathers are to be heeded, it is only because - and in so far as - they witness to the true meaning of Holy Writ.

Yet Southgate's term, 'interpretative authority', is intended to convey something more than this. It carries the implication that Jewel's view of the Fathers was a unique one - owing a deal to Cranmer, but still forged by Jewel personally. As Southgate says, although Jewel, along with the other reformers, accepted the absolute finality of scriptural authority, he parted company with them by not sharing their unquestioning faith in the clarity of Scripture.

2. Cf. Tavard's sympathetic comments on Jewel's position, Holy Writ or Holy Church, pp.236, 242-3.
For this reason, presumably, he recognised the need for a body of interpreters, thus attributing to the Fathers a real authority, although one that was merely complementary to that of the Scriptures.

This attempt to make Jewel responsible for a distinctive doctrine of the Fathers' role is not entirely persuasive. Looking at the Apologia, for instance, one gets no inkling of hesitations as to the clarity of the Scriptures. On the contrary, the bishop's thinking seems to be entirely consonant with the conventional statements of the reformers. The passages that stress the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures leave no opening for the type of pessimism that Southgate refers to. The word preached by Christ and the apostles is

'sufficient, both our salvation and all truth to uphold and maintain, and also to confound all manner of heresy. By that word only do we condemn all sorts of the old heretics ...'.

By the Scriptures, says Jewel, 'all truth and catholic doctrine may be proved, and all heresy may be disproved and confuted'.

God's 'clear light' shines forth in his words, and they have no need of human embellishment:

1. Apologia, Sig. C i\(^V\) (Works, III, p.67).

'(we) refer all our controversies unto the holy scriptures, and report us to the self-same words which we know were sealed by God himself, and in comparison of them set little by all other things, whatsoever may be devised by men'. 1

In point of fact, the Apologia even expressly repudiates the view that the Scriptures lack clarity and require some authoritative body to interpret them. Referring to the contention of Papists that the Scriptures are 'like to a nose of wax, or a shipman's hose' - and hence, able to be 'fashioned and plied all manner of ways, and serve all men's turns' - the tract takes the stand that this is to negate the very idea of a divinely-inspired text:

'Therefore the holy scriptures, which our Saviour Jesu Christ did not only use for authority in all his speech, but did also at last seal up the same with his own blood, these men, to the intent they might with less business drive the people from the same, as from a thing dangerous and deadly, have used to call them a bare letter, uncertain, unprofitable, dumb, killing, and dead: which seemeth to us all one as if they should say, "The scriptures are to no purpose, or as good as none". 2

This is not to deny, of course, that Jewel looked on the Fathers as learned and saintly expositors of the Scriptures - and indeed, as privileged interpreters, because of their

1. Apologia, Sigs. A viii^r, C ii^r-v (Works, III, pp.58, 68):  
2. Apologia, Sigs. E i^r-v (Works, III, p.82).
proximity to Christ and the apostles. But there is good reason to doubt whether the bishop's stated views on the Fathers' role was distinctive in the way Southgate claims. To my knowledge we have no indication that Jewel felt he was departing from the standard teaching of the reformers on the all-sufficiency and clarity of the Scriptures, or on the need to subordinate rigorously all human authorities to the scriptural norm. The essence of his views, as I have encountered them, is summed-up in these words of his contemporary, Thomas Becon:

'Neither do I recite the testimonies of the old Fathers to confirm and make our matter more strong, which which already is sufficiently established by the holy Scriptures; neither need they the confirmation of any man's doctrine ...; but I have called the holy catholic doctors to witness, because they teach the same thing that the Scripture does'.

My suggestion, therefore, is that although the Apologia's emphasis on the Fathers is distinctive, it expounds no distinctive views on the Fathers' role. Nor is any revision of the Fathers' status implied in the tract's consistent use of patristic testimony. Some commentators have

1. Cited Tavard, op.cit., p.222. I believe there is a difference between the opinions of Southgate and Booty on this point, as Haugaard says - although Haugaard, in my opinion, shows some uncertainty about isolating it precisely. The key to it lies in Southgate's claim that Jewel had some doubts as to the clarity of the Scriptures. In this instance my sympathies are with Booty (op.cit., pp.136ff.). Perhaps 'illustrative authority' would be a suitable substitute for Southgate's 'interpretative authority'.

felt that Jewel's apparent preoccupation with the witness of the ancient church must mean a greater reverence on his part for its authority. However, this cannot simply be assumed; and, in my opinion, the proposition would be difficult to substantiate.

What scholars have not sufficiently adverted to is the setting, and the aim, of Jewel's whole argument from antiquity. Its prime purpose is to establish the historical conformity of the English Church with the primitive model. Accordingly, the Fathers are used, not so much in their traditional capacity as exponents of the true doctrine, but as historical witnesses - and in this context, their statements regarding the practice and belief of their time can be taken as a conclusive illustration of an existing state of affairs. The effects of this can be deceptive, and here I am in total agreement with Booty when he says:

'We must not be misled by the use Jewel made of the authority of the Fathers while proving the accusations which were the basis of the challenge. With regard to proving that there had been private Masses in the early Church, their witness was final and authoritative. But this is not to say that he viewed them in the same way with regard to matters of doctrine, or with regard to those things about which Scripture had something definite and important to say'. 1

1. Booty, op.cit., p.137. One of my regrets about Booty's fine work (to which, of course, this study owes a great deal) is that he did not make more of this distinction.
Of course, there is nothing resembling a rigorous historical demonstration in the *Apologia*. The significant point is merely that the Fathers' statements are habitually treated as so much historical evidence. Often Jewel's excursions into the past are no more than rhetorical echoes of the challenge - as when he professes to speak to the Pope directly, with the words:

'Tell us, I pray you, good holy father, seeing you do crack so much of all antiquity, and boast yourself that all men are bound to you alone, which of all the fathers have at any time called you by the name of the highest prelate, the universal bishop, or head of the church? Which of them ever said that both the swords were committed to you? Which of them ever said that you have authority and a right to call councils? Which of them ever said that the whole world is but your diocese? ...'.

The taunt goes on at some length. Other contentions are substantiated more directly however, and provide a better sample of the tract's methods. In another declamatory listing of misdemeanours, Jewel shows how Papists have repudiated the ancient authorities: Origen and Chrysostom encouraged the people to read the Scriptures, the Papists disapprove; Augustine complained of vain ceremonies, the Papists multiply them; Justinian decreed the liturgical services should be intelligible, the Papists retain a strange and barbarous tongue in their Mass, and so on. The point at issue is the departure of Rome from the ancient standards; and

the individual patristic texts that are cited, although obviously retaining the aura of doctrinal authority about them, are used primarily as concrete illustrations of defection.¹

The appeal to historical precedent goes on constantly in the Apologia. Isolated sayings of the Fathers embellish almost every significant statement that is made: one comes to wait for the addition, 'as St. Hierome saith ...'. The technique is something more than a theologian's mannerism, but less than an effort to prove the truth of what is being advanced. The Father's word adds the note of fealty to the wise counsel of the past, of respect for holy precedent and concern for the ancient ways. Not only the measures associated with the Settlement, but even the attitudes and tribulations of the reformers are shown to have historical antecedents. If the godly are accused of being trouble-makers, then so were the prophets; and Tertullian recognised that the true Christian was always likely to be dubbed a traitor and a rebel.² This sampling of the examples of the past, and the working-out of patterns of consistency, is a notable feature of the tract. And it is really into this type of background that its frequent references to the Fathers must be seen to fit. They are there to show a coherence of outlook, of

². *Apologia*, Sig. C vii² (Works, III, p.73).
fortunes, and of practice with the great believers of the past — which, in effect, was what Jewel understood 'catholicity' of faith to mean.

Commenting on Martin Luther's view of the Church Fathers, a perceptive exponent of his doctrine, J. M. Headley, has noted how in Luther's work 'the theological argument claims precedence over the strictly historical argument'. Though not a very prominent feature of his theology, the latter was often enough pursued — to corroborate, for instance, Luther's teachings on the ministry and church-order. If Headley's explanations are correct, it was a kind of realism on Luther's part which ensured that the subordinate function of the historical argument was remembered. By adverting frequently to the limitations of the Fathers, and the difficulties in reconciling their teachings, Luther made it obvious in practice that the divine Scripture was the only true norm. 'Luther seemed to delight in noting the lack of agreement and the conflicting opinions between individual fathers', says Headley. One is always aware that his attitude towards them was one of 'controlled respect'.

Headley's remarks are worth recording because it

is obvious from them that Jewel's handling of the Fathers was the very reverse of Luther's. Theoretically, Jewel's priorities were no different from those of the German reformer: that is, in the final analysis both took their stand on the Scriptures only; and probably Jewel was no less distrustful than Luther of having human additions corrupt the pure gospel. Yet when it came to the framing of arguments, it was the historical question which seemed to take precedence in Jewel's case. And whereas Luther's discussions took the deficiencies of the patristic witness as a fundamental premise, Jewel's, by contrast, tended to obscure such facts. If pressed of course, the bishop was quick to admit the fallibility of the Fathers. This was one of a number of reservations that he made in his own mind about appeals to the primitive church. But the difference between the polemicist, or apologete, and the theologian is that the one silences facts which the other knows he must reckon with. The Jewel of the Apologia belongs in the former category.

It is interesting to contrast the silences of the officially-sponsored treatise with the franker treatment of the antiquity-criterion in the work which Thomas Cooper produced in 1562, supporting Jewel. Cooper was answering an anonymously-written tract called An Apologie of private Masse, and his sympathies were fully with the bishop, who, he told his papist

opponents would certainly show 'more true divinity, than a many of your hoary heads and great reading clerks'.

Although apparently a cleric, the author of the *Apologie* had disclaimed any special competence in divinity ('being a man of no great learning, but in stories'); and his treatise was a clear-minded, but unassuming production. It contained no critique of Jewel's assumptions, apart from reproducing Henry Cole's point that it was simply not feasible to order the present-day church strictly according to the model of the primitive one:

'To call such things to the state of the Apostles' time, and of the primitive church again, is nothing else, but to enforce a tall man to come to his swaddling clothes, and to cry alarm in his cradle again.'

Cooper, however, showed himself to be sensitive about such matters.

Rather like Luther it would seem, his position manifestly was that the Fathers 'are to be read with judgment'.

He always seems sure of how they were to be used: 'chiefly' religion must be judged by the word of God; and 'partly' by 'the state of that time, which, in all reason, may seem to be farthest from corruption' - but the latter is merely to 'confirm' 

---

3. An Apologie, fols. 8r-v.
5. Cooper, op.cit., fols. 9v-10r.
the right view of things. It is clear, he says, that the Fathers were often in error; and also that their statements would sometimes have been different if the controversies of the later church had been projected into their own times. As for their authority, says Cooper, 'I do not therefore count it a teaching true, because they were of that opinion'. But still, the Fathers are to be esteemed,

'not only as holy men indued with singular grace of God: but also as right good witnesses and strong defenders of the chief articles of our faith, at that time when Satan endeavoured, partly by cruelty of persecution, partly by infinite numbers of Heresies to deface and extinguish the same'.

Cooper could be equally explicit about what a return to the primitive church entailed. Nobody wants 'all things without exception reduced to that very form of the world, that was in the primitive church'. The important thing is simply to retain what is essential:

'In doctrine there is but one verity, and but one right use of the sacraments. Therefore they should be always one at all times, and then are most likely to be least corrupted, when they are nearest the time they were first ordained'.

Customs, of necessity, must change; and so 'things mean and indifferent' may be altered at discretion as circumstances change.

2. Cooper, op.cit., fols. 53r, 68ff.
3. Cooper, op.cit., fol. 70v.
5. Cooper, op.cit., fols. 9r, 10r-11r, 55r-v.
Other instances could be cited to show Cooper's advertence to the qualifications that he felt needed to be made when there was talk of appeals to the ancient church. Jewel's own ideas, it should be noted, were similar to Cooper's. When taxed by his opponents, he could make the same distinction between essentials and things indifferent and admit the restricted sense in which he was envisaging a return to the primitive. He was equally sensible, too, with regard to the limitations of the Fathers. But these cautionary notes are rarely struck in the Apologia: the recapturing of the ancient ways is made to seem total; the Fathers are assumed to have spoken with one voice; and antiquity - quite misleadingly - even appears to be taken as an absolute standard. It is as if the theologian in Jewel was silenced when the polemicist took over. Whereas Luther, and even Cooper, could raise the historical questions and keep the correct theoretical priorities explicit, Jewel's handling of them obscured, and even appeared to negate, those priorities. This, it seems to me, was one of the inherent dangers in the trend towards 'verification'.

It had other inhibiting effects also. The claim to identity of practice with the ancient church entailed a bold reading of the history of the first Christian centuries. And of course, the polemics made it difficult to retreat from positions once they had been espoused. Two works of continental divines were dedicated to Elizabeth around 1559: one was a volume of the Magdeburg Centuries, and the other a tract of Peter Martyr's.
One could hardly expect to find the same concern for detail in the Apologia that one encounters in these scholarly productions. Yet they were no less polemical than the English treatise, and they remind us of two major historical deficiencies in the latter. One was the absence of any advertence to development within the so-called 'primitive church': the Historia ecclesiastica recognises it; the Apologia does not. The second was the apparent lack of concern for context: the distance between Martyr's Defensio Doctrinae veteris and the Apologia on this score is enormous. To turn from these Continental works to the English one is to see that Jewel's sweeping claims on behalf of the national church begged historical questions which even his contemporaries were finding it necessary to confront.

1. Quarta Centuria Ecclesiasticae Historiae ...(Basle, 1560) (the volume dedicated to Elizabeth, see pp.3-11/7. On rites and ceremonies, for instance, the degeneration in the fourth century from the simplicity of earlier times is noted (p.406). In regard to the Eucharist it is said: 'Ceremoniam coenae Domini ab Ecclesia Romana (si vera sunt, quae de Paparum constitutionibus tradita sunt) transformari paulatim coepisse, in superiori Centuria monuimus. Hoc vero etiam seculo pluribus humanis traditionibus deformata est' (p.480). The steps in the usurpation of primacy by Rome are also traced (pp.549f.). In all cases, the emphasis is on gradual change.

2. Peter Martyr, Defensio Doctrinae veteris et Apostolicae de sacrosancto Eucharistiae Sacramento (no place or date, but the date of the dedication is 1559). The whole work is characterised by close advertence to the context of the sayings of the Fathers. Good instances, pp.742-3 (re. Hilary), pp. 749-53 (re. Cyril).
Chapter Five

'SCHOLASTICAL' CONSERVATISM: THE LOUVAINISTS

'... notable, evident, and most plain places ... an hundred places of the fathers'

(Thomas Harding)

'... I collected many things from him (Tertullian) by which I shall be able to stop the mouths of many of my countrymen'.

(Richard Hilles)
It was some years before Bishop Jewel's works provoked any significant public response from papist apologists. But when it came, the rejoinder was nothing less than an onslaught.

In 1564-5, says Frere, 'there began the booming of artillery from Louvain'.

The attack was the work of a dozen or so English theologians living in exile, and must surely have been organised. During the years mentioned they had a variety of treatises printed in Flanders for circulation in their homeland, practically all of which made Jewel their express target. Some twenty tracts appeared in 1564-5 alone. Along with the bishop's own initial pieces they belong to the opening phase of what was to prove a protracted and tiresome debate. Contributions were still being made to it well into the seventies. But only the number and size of the volumes it elicited from both sides entitle it to be remembered as 'the Great Controversy'.

1. Frere, English Church, p.88. Some five or six works of Dr. Richard Smith were published in Louvain and Douay in 1562-3. They were in Latin however, and attacked the Continental reformers principally - Calvin and Melanchthon in particular. Though they are sometimes said to have marked the opening of the exiles' attack on Jewel, I have decided they fall into a different category. I suspect their appearance may have some connection with Smith's appointment to the Chair of Divinity in the new University of Douay at this time.

My concern is not to trace the course of this controversy, but to examine the form the argument from antiquity took in the 'doctrinal' reaction of English Papists to the Settlement. For this the initial works of the Elizabethan exiles provide an ideal source. My criterion has been to set aside all writings that would fall into the category of 'replies to replies', and it means that most of the treatises commented on were published in 1564-5, only a few appearing later than this, and they in 1566.

Perhaps the simplest means of classifying these books is to say that they attacked the Bishop of Salisbury on two fronts. Most were a belated acceptance of Jewel's challenge, Thomas Harding leading the way with his Answers, printed early in 1564,\(^1\) to be followed by Thomas Dorman,\(^2\) John Martiall,\(^3\) and John Rastell\(^4\) in the same year; William Allen in 1565;\(^5\) and somewhat

1. T. Harding, *An answere to maister Iuelles chalenge* (Louvain, 1564) (= *Answere/.*


4. J. Rastell, *A confutation of a sermon pronounced by M. Iuell, at Paules Crosse, the second Sondaie before Easter ... Anno Domini M.D.L.X.* (Antwerp, 1564) (= *Confutation/.*

Simultaneously Harding was opening up a second front by mounting an onslaught on the *Apology*, which, incidentally, the exile divines believed was a composite work having Jewel as its principal author only. Harding's *Confutation of a Booke* appeared in April 1565, and minor pieces on the same theme followed within a matter of months. His efforts were seconded by Nicholas Sanders whose work, *The Supper of our Lord*, also attacking the *Apology*, was first printed in December 1565.

Apart from these original tracts several translations were made by the English apologists as contributions to the debate with Jewel. Some four are known to have appeared in 1565.

Two were versions of Latin treatises by the prominent Ingolstadt

1. R. Poyntz, *Testimonies for the real presence of Christes body and blood in the blessed Sacrament of the aultar ... out of the auncient fathers which lyved far within the first six hundred yeres* (Louvain, 1566)

2. T. Heskyn, *The parliament of Chryste avouching and declaring the enacted and receauved trueth of the presence of his bodie and Bloode in the blessed Sacrament* (Antwerp, 1566)


4. N. Sanders, *The supper of our Lord set foorth in six Bookes, according to the truth of the gospell, and the faith of the Catholike Churche* (Louvain, 1565)
controversialists, Staphylus and Hosius.\textsuperscript{1} The third was a translation of a work by William Lindanus of Dordrecht, a divine whom posterity has largely overlooked, but a force in his own day and a person who may well have exercised a considerable influence over the refugee scholars.\textsuperscript{2} Finally, Thomas Stapleton produced in this year his famous English rendering of Bede's *History*, drawing out its polemical significance in an accompanying treatise (less well-known, but still notable), *A Fortresse of the Faith*.\textsuperscript{3}

The authors of these works were all from the ranks of the university men who fled to the Low Countries in some numbers after the government's determination to break with the Marian religious policies became manifest. As early as the twelfth century, and even before, Flanders had been a haven for

\textsuperscript{1} S. Hosius, *A most excellent treatise of the begynnyng of heresyes in our tyme*, tr. R. Shacklock, who entitled it *The hatchet of heresies* (Antwerp, 1565); F. Staphylus, *The apologie ... intreating of the true and right understanding of holy Scripture*, tr. T. Stapleton (Antwerp, 1565). Unfortunately, this last work was not available to me.

\textsuperscript{2} W. Lindanus, *Certaine Tables ... wherein is detected and manifeste the doting dangerous doctrine, and haynous heresyes, of the rashe rablement of heretikes*, tr. L. Evans, who entitled it *The betraing of the beastlines of heretykes* (Antwerp, 1565).

\textsuperscript{3} Bede, *The history of the church of Englande*, tr. T. Stapleton (Antwerp, 1565); *A fortresse of the faith first planted among us englishmen, and continued hitherto in the universal Church of Christ* (Antwerp, 1565)
English refugees caught in the cross-fire between Popes and Kings: Thomas Becket had fled there. In Tudor times, with the Low Countries under the control of Spain, Antwerp and Louvain were obvious places for Papists to look for asylum. The latter was particularly favoured. In the words of Sanders, it was 'the nearest harbour of the faith to which Englishmen driven out for the faith might run for refuge'.¹ Its advantages were obvious. Louvain was almost as well-situated as Antwerp for easy communication with England; it was rather more securely under imperial domination; and it had the added attraction of being a quiet, but renowned, university town (still, in 1560, the only one in Flanders), and a centre often frequented by English scholars even before Erasmus and reformation debates added to its international prestige.²

A tiny community of staunch Romanists - the most notable of them intimates of Sir Thomas More - had formed in Louvain during the reign of Edward VI.³ And already at that time a few works of controversy - 'venomous' ones, in the

judgment of Peter Martyr—had issued from the exiles to harass the reform divines. With the Marian religious settlement so rapidly annulled, it was to Louvain once again that the eyes of the Catholic party turned in 1559—the more so as Philip II's recent association with England seemed to guarantee them his patronage. By September of that year there was a colony of 'evil-tongued Catholics of England remaining in the Low Countries', in active communication with their co-religionists at home. The controversialists among them were to be known by their contemporaries as 'our Louvainists', or the 'English Louvainists'.

It is with the group represented by these writers, the secular clerics, most of them young men from the universities, that the initiative mainly lay in the years of exile before 1569. This explains the character of the overseas opposition to Elizabeth that occurred in these early years. It was theologically-motivated rather than politically-inspired; doctrinaire, idealistic, but activated by a genuine pastoral concern, and by a donnish belief in the power of argument, even if it had the rather juvenile air of a common-room campaign about it. It was an opposition somewhat insensitive to political realities, obviously


clerical. And it reflects, for all its apparent dogmatism, the indecision of English Papists (even those abroad) at this time. William (later Cardinal) Allen summed-up, all unconsciously, the strengths and weaknesses of this initial phase of English missionary activity abroad when he wrote of the 'scholastical attempts, for the conversion of our Country and reconcilement of our brethren to the Catholic Church' that characterised it.¹

Until the Northern Rebellion in 1569, there was no widespread movement of the Catholic nobility abroad. The laity who made their way to the Low Countries in these early years were a heterogeneous group. They included one or two prominent people who had served the late Queen in some administrative capacity and whose careers were now obviously in jeopardy, like Sir Francis Englefield, Mary's councillor, who departed the country, ostensibly for health reasons, early in 1559² and who, after a visit to Rome, settled in Louvain where he became a kind of figurehead for the community.³ Others were second-time

¹ W. Allen, An apologie and true declaration of the institution and endeavours of the two English colleges (said to be Henault, but really Rheims, 1581), fol. 15².
² Thus, Bayne, Anglo-Roman Relations, pp.41-2, who gives the date of Englefield's departure as April. See however, Feria to Philip II, 10 May 1559, in which it is stated that Englefield is having much difficulty in leaving, Kervyn de Lettenhove, op.cit., vol.1, p.519. Cf. Guilday, op.cit., p.7; Meyer, England and the Catholic Church, pp.31, n.1; pp.465-7.
exiles like Dr. William Rastell, who survived for some years as one of the justices on the Queen's Bench and departed sensationaly for Flanders in 1562 (for doubtfully religious motives, according to Quadra); and Dr. John Clement and his family. The rest were often parents or relatives of exiled ecclesiastics. But the English laity in Flanders were not particularly numerous: in marked contrast to the Marian exiles, they constituted only a small proportion of the English abroad. At this point there is little evidence of their engaging in overt political activities; and the small impact they made on the society that accepted them has often been commented on.  


2. For instance, the mother and two sisters (both religious) of Nicholas Sanders went into exile, T. M. Veech, Dr. Nicholas Sanders and the English Reformation, 1530-81 (Louvain, 1935), pp.3, 53, 58. So too did the father of Thomas Stapleton, for which see E. J. McDermott, "The Life of Thomas Stapleton, 1535-1598", unpublished M.A. dissertation, University of London, 1950.  

3. Numbers of the exiles are given in a petition to Rome dated 8 March 1566. There were 7 families totalling 30 persons, plus 13 others, giving a total of 43 laity out of the 213 exiles mentioned. Pollen cites the figures from a manuscript in the Vatican Archives, English Catholics, p.99, cf. p.248. Neale notes that, of the 800 odd Marian exiles, the largest proportion were gentry, with clerics constituting probably one-third of the total, Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, vol.1, p.55.  

4. Cf. R. Lechat, Les Réfugiés Anglais dans les Pays-Bas Espagnols durant le Règne d'Elisabeth, 1558-1603 (Louvain, 1914), pp.48, 198. In the same despatch in which he mentions the departure of Catholic religious from England, Quadra mentions the arrival of several Flemish families, Quadra to Philip II, 19 June 1559, Kervyn de Lettenhove, op.cit., I, p.541.
The same was true of the exiled religious. With the structures of monastic and religious life so successfully dismantled in the reigns of Henry and Edward, the short-lived resurgence under Mary amounted to very little. Of the communities that survived in 1558, the religious of three were given permission to leave the kingdom in the following year because of a request made by Feria, the departing Spanish ambassador, to the Queen.¹ These settled in the Low Countries, benefiting, if somewhat fitfully, from Spanish patronage.² Many of these religious were old, and while they doubtless remained close to the other exiles, they did not contribute in any direct way to the polemical campaign which the non-cloistered clergy mounted in the sixties. A marginal collaborator in the debate with Jewel was Dr. Thomas Heskyn, chancellor of the diocese of Salisbury on Elizabeth's accession and a noted divine, who joined the Dominican order on his arrival in Flanders. At a later date, also, several of the young Louvain controversialists would be

---

¹ Il Schifanoya to the Castellan of Mantua, 30 May 1559, mentions Feria's request, Ven.Cal., VII, p.93. The despatch of 6 June notes that the permission had been obtained but was limited to 'those communities who were in being at the time of other schism, and who are very few in number', Ven.Cal., VII, p.95. For details of the communities, see Sanders to Moroni, op.cit., pp.42-3; Guilday, op.cit., pp.4ff., 247ff.

² On the financial assistance given to the religious in Flanders, see Lechat, op.cit., pp.25ff. For the condition of the communities in 1561, see esp. pp.224ff.
attracted to the Society of Jesus. But in the first years of exile, the remnants of the old English religious communities abroad were not active in the public arena. The newly-founded Jesuits had yet to make their impact on the English mission. The centre of the stage was held by the secular priests and students from the two universities - 'the very flower of Oxford and Cambridge', as one prejudiced contemporary put it, carried away, as it were, by a storm and scattered in foreign lands - who together formed the largest single group among the refugees.

In spite of Dodd's claim that 'great numbers of the most eminent clergymen' went abroad in the first exodus of clergy

---

1. Heskyn was an exceedingly able theologian (certainly among the best of the Louvainists), but his work has attracted little attention. It is interesting to note that the government marked him down as 'a subtle adversary', which is probably the most laudatory comment to be found in the document from the State Papers (to be referred to later) published by Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p.184. John Rastell joined the Society of Jesus in Rome in 1568. Thomas Stapleton did the same in 1585, in Douay, proceeding later to Louvain (not Rome, as is sometimes said. See Henry Holland, Vita Stapletoni, in Opera, vol.1 (Paris, 1620), Sig. E i). Stapleton left the Society after two years, but for his continued friendship and association with the Jesuits (an important factor in his theological career), see M. R. O'Connell, Thomas Stapleton and the Counter Reformation (New Haven, 1964), pp.38ff.

2. Sanders, Rise and Growth, p.261. Mullinger comments: 'one of his /Sanders!/ more than usually impudent falsehoods', J. B. Mullinger, The University of Cambridge, vol.2 (Cambridge, 1884), p.179, n.2. In fact, I think the remark was made by E. Rishton, who completed Sanders' history, not Sanders himself.

3. The petition mentioned above (1566) counts 68 priests and 37 students among the exiles; while the total number of religious, men and women, was 65, Pollen, op.cit., p.99.
and scholars, these were mainly young men, and they had few of
the leaders of the Marian clergy to guide them in exile.
Scarcey any of the distinguished churchmen against whom
Elizabeth first moved in 1559 were able subsequently to make
their way to the Low Countries. Some were actually captured
while attempting to flee. A couple of the less-prominent Marian
bishops did eventually escape, Richard Pate and Cuthbert Scott,
bishops of Worcester and Chester respectively, settling in Louvain,
the other, Thomas Goldwell, bishop of St. Asaph, returning to Rome
where he had resided for a long time as an associate of Reginald
Pole's. Both Pate and Scott died very soon after winning their
freedom. Goldwell survived until 1585, attending the closing
session of the Council of Trent as the sole English participant
and later taking various posts in the Curia. But he was too ill
to assume any real leadership of the English abroad. The most
effective leaders in Louvain were the senior academics who escaped,

2. For instance, Nicholas Harpsfield, Archdeacon of Canterbury,
and Seth Holland, Dean of Worcester, see Sanders to Moroni,
op.cit., pp.37, 41. Guilday takes the view that the government was 'in stern
opposition' to an exodus of Papists (op.cit., p.3, n.2). Meyer, on the other hand, believes that the government was
at first content merely to get rid of Catholics (op.cit.,
p.31). Birt's view is, I think, the best one: that Elizabeth
did not favour these departures; that efforts were made to stop
them, but these were 'spasmodic rather than sustained' N. Birt,
"English Refugees in the Low Countries. I", The Downside
Review, XXXIV (1915), p.112
and who were given some kind of official recognition - and possibly teaching posts - by the university: men like Thomas Harding and Nicholas Sanders. It was around them - and probably Harding particularly\(^1\) - that the first organised opposition to the Settlement formed.

Harding was already, in a sense, a natural rival of Jewel. The two controversialists were natives of Devon, an area (as Sanders remarked, in his report to Cardinal Moroni) 'still very averse from heresy'.\(^2\) They had attended the same school in Barnstaple, which, incidentally, was the birth-place of Cuthbert Mayne, the first seminary priest to be executed under Elizabeth (part of his quartered body being returned there in 1577).\(^3\)

---

1. A. C. Southern believes that Sanders was 'the principal promoter of these apologetical works' /"'The Best Wits out of England'. University Men in Exile under Elizabeth", The Month, new series, VII (1952), p.157. A. C. F. Beales agrees that he was both 'leader' and 'founder' of the Louvain school of apologetics /Education under Penalty (London, 1963), p.32/. I agree, however, with Pollen (op.cit., p.107) and Veech (op.cit., p.88): Harding seems to me to have taken the lead in the campaign against Jewel.

2. Sanders to Moroni, op.cit., p.45. On the connection between Harding and Jewel, see Booty, Jewel as Apologist, p.67.

3. J. Morris, The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers related by themselves, vol.1 (London, 1872), p.100. There was a Robert Turner of Barnstaple, an exile, who became rector of the famous university of Ingolstadt and published a work on behalf of Mary Queen of Scots later in the reign, Ascoli, La Grande-Bretagne, p.149, n.5.
Harding and Jewel had been in Oxford together. Both were fervent young reformers in the reign of Edward VI, and disciples of Peter Martyr.¹ Both recanted under Mary, but only Harding persisted in his Romanist beliefs and his apostasy was bitterly resented by his former colleagues.² He had become an associate of Gardiner's and was, as Elizabeth's commissioners noted in the early sixties, 'stiff in papistry'.³ To add to the personal animus between himself and Jewel, Harding, as a prominent ecclesiastic in the diocese of Salisbury, deposed under the new administration, now saw his one-time associate and rival leading the diocese he himself had served.⁴ Jewel's ironic comment on Harding's deposition from office gives some indication of the feeling between them: 'Harding, that consistant man, has preferred to change his condition rather than his opinions'.⁵

¹ The connection was referred to later in the reign (1584) by Thomas Drant, the preacher: 'Thomas Harding sucked up his learning at Peter Martyr's feet', cited Brench, Preaching in England, p.297.

² To highlight Harding's defection, Lady Jane Grey's letter to him after he apostatized is said to have been published by John Aylmer from Strassburg during Mary's reign, Garrett, Marian Exiles, p.76. See also the report of Harding's conversation with the departing exile, Whittingham, reproduced in Arber (ed.), Troubles, p.2.

³ The comment is from an undated document in the State Papers, reproduced by Gee, who thinks it must have been written around August 1562 (Elizabethan Clergy, p.176, cf. 180). Hughes agrees with Strype and dates it 1561 (Reformation in England, III, p.422). The document is a detailed list of the principal recusants, and the marginal comment opposite Harding's name in the original reads: 'Learned. In King Edward's time preached the truth honestly and now stiff in papistry and thinketh very much good of himself'. On Harding's connection with Gardiner, see De Vocht, art.cit., pp.234, 240; Hughes, op.cit., II, p.183, n.1.

⁴ De Vocht, art.cit., p.234; Booty, op.cit., p.81.

⁵ Jewel to Peter Martyr, 2 November 1559, Zurich Letters, I, p.45.
Harding's background was an academic one, and after his arrival in Flanders, some time in 1562-3, he seems to have become a member of theology faculty in the University of Louvain.  

Sanders was a somewhat less distinguished figure, but of staunchly papist origins. He was fairly prominent in Marian Oxford, his academic competence being in canon law. After leaving England in 1559, however, his ecclesiastical career had progressed rapidly. Apparently helped by influential patrons, he had been ordained a priest and made Doctor of Divinity in Rome, and served on missions under Cardinals Hosius and Commendone before joining the exiles in 1564 or 1565. Having been one of Hosius' theological advisers at Trent, his qualifications were soon recognised by the faculty at Louvain. We know that a few months after he was accepted as a matriculant by the university, Sanders publicly defended three theological propositions before the divinity school - a formality which usually preceded an appointment to a professorship. So it is reasonable to assume that he took office in the university, at least for a time.

1. For the date of Harding's arrival in Flanders, see Pollen, op.cit., p.107. Matriculation was granted to Harding by Louvain University on 7 May 1563. De Vocht believes that if Harding was not an actual professor either of Hebrew - his post in Oxford - or theology, he was honoured as such by the university, and was at least a member of the theology faculty. The uncertainty arises from the fact that the records of the theology faculty in this period have been lost (art.cit., pp.235-7).

2. Veech, op.cit., p.10.

Practically all the other participants in the debate with Jewel in these early years were young scholars. Most of them were still in their twenties on Elizabeth's accession, and they came to the Continent fresh from one or other of the English universities without yet having embarked fully on an ecclesiastical career. Only one, John Rastell, seems to have been a priest at the time of his escape. William Allen, although he had been named Principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, in 1556 at the age of twenty-four, was almost certainly not in major orders on his arrival in Flanders. Thomas Stapleton and John Martiall had taken the first steps on the path to preferment in England. The rest were young fellows of various colleges.¹

It is scarcely surprising that this group of refugees

1. From J. Foster (ed.), (Alumni Oxonienses: 1500-1714, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1891-2), supplemented by D.N.B., the academic careers of the principal Louvainists can be reconstructed as follows:

(a) Oxford men, in chronological order,
- Nicholas Sanders, New College, perpetual fellow 1548, Ll.B. (1551).
- William Allen, Oriel, fellow 1550, B.A. (1550).
- Thomas Dorman, for some time at New College, then All Souls, fellow 1554, B.C.L. (1558).

(b) Cambridge men.
- Thomas Heskyn, had spent some 12 years at Oxford, then fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, M.A. (1540), B.D. (1548), D.D. (1557).
should have been drawn to support Harding in his campaign against Jewel. Like Harding himself, the vast majority of those who composed or translated treatises for publication in the years 1564-5 were Wykehamists - former students of Winchester, and New College, Oxford (the former endowed, and the latter founded, by William of Wykeham, the fourteenth-century bishop of Winchester and chancellor of England). No less than eight of these twelve divines were graduates of the Wykehamical institutions, and they included the major contributors to the debate: Harding, Sanders, Dorman, Martiall, Rastell, Stapleton, Pointz, and Fowler (the last-mentioned contributing a translation in these early years, but being better known as the printer of many of the Louvainists' tracts). As I have said, with the exception of Harding, all of these men were still in their twenties at the time of Elizabeth's accession. Some of them could probably be considered Harding's protégés.1 It is likely, however, that the institutional connection was more important than the personal one. For long periods in the forties and early fifties John White and Henry Cole had served as wardens of Winchester and New College respectively, and they were strong advocates for the old ways.2

Both have already been mentioned in this study as outspoken and

1. Dorman, Proufe, Sig. A ii R-v. Also, Harding was one of the masters who signed the protocol register when Stapleton was admitted into New College in 1553, McDermott, op.cit., pp.49f.

2. White was warden of Winchester, 1541-54 (retaining the wardenship, apparently, when he became Bishop of Lincoln); and Cole warden of New College, 1542-51.
courageous defenders of the papist cause. All seven of the younger Wykehamists would have been students under one or other - and, in some cases, both - of them in their formative years. Wykehamical conservatism was obviously an element in the outlook of the principal Louvain apologists.

The roots of this conservatism went deep. In establishing New College (or 'Seinte Marie College of Wynchestre in Oxenforde' as it was formally known), it was William of Wykeham's intention to form conservative churchmen. Its products from the beginning were, according to the college's historians,

'precisely the class of men to whom, he William of Wykeham looked to defend the old régime in Church and State, to keep power in the hands of the Bishops, and to suppress the ominous alliance between heretical theologians and revolutionary laymen which had produced the alarming phenomenon of Lollardy'.

The tradition of turning learning to the service of social moderation persisted in later times. New College was one of the first Oxford institutions to patronise the revival of good letters in the fifteenth century. And yet one has but to mention the names of its most distinguished alumni in this period - William Grocyn and William Warham - to realise that the

new learning was not necessarily accompanied by a taste for the new religious ideas. 'With all his new and unheard-of classical accomplishments', says Rashdall and Rait, Grocyn 'still reverently studied the schoolmen against whom Erasmus was stirring up the scorn of cultivated Europe, and preferred Aristotle to Plato'.

Warham, of course, as archbishop of Canterbury, reluctantly collaborated with Henry VIII at first in the matter of the divorce, but spoke out against the rejection of papal authority finally, in 1532, the year of his death. Later again, at the time of the reformation struggles, the 'most typical' Wykehamists were 'the ablest and best among the reactionaries' - men like the Harpsfield brothers, John and Nicholas, who 'combined the new learning with the old' and who

'fled to the Continent under Edward VI, returned, rose to high preferment under Mary, and became exiles again, or suffered at home, under Elizabeth'.

Not only did this conservative tradition survive into the period when the Louvainists would have been students, but it had probably grown stronger as a result of vicissitudes. These were sometimes severe. One recalls the oft-quoted words of Dr. Layton, the King's visitor to the university in 1535: how he had

---

2. Rashdall and Rait, op.cit., p.111.
'set Dunce [i.e. Duns Scotus] in Bocardo', and how
'the second time we came to New College
after we had declared your injunctions,
we found all the great quadrant full of
the leaves of Dunce and the wind blowing
them in every corner'. 1

The religious pressures of course mounted as time went on.
Under Edward VI, images and the high altar in the chapel at New
College were destroyed beyond repair; 2 and there was some
repression of the more outspoken Papists, especially in the
latter part of the reign.

At Winchester, the warden, John White, was committed
to the Tower by the Privy Council in 1551, and afterwards entrusted
to Cranmer in the hope that the archbishop might 'reclayme' him.
It even seems that White was declared excommunicate by John
Philpot, then archdeacon of Winchester, for his evil doctrine. 3
Nicholas Sanders, a pupil at the college during White's wardenship
(and who refers to him as 'that most saintly man'), 4 gives us
some kind of insight into the passions that religion was raising
at the time, even in schoolboys. After the head boy and several
others had been converted by one of the masters to 'Calvinism',

1. Dr. Layton to Cromwell, in Three Chapters of Letters relating
to the Suppression of the Monasteries, ed. T. Wright (London,
2. A. H. Smith, New College Oxford and its Buildings (London,
1952), p.79. It is interesting to note that in 1559, after
the university visitation, there is a record of sums paid to
two labourers who worked for four days destroying altars,
pictures and images (op.cit., p.80).
3. D.N.B., s.v. 'White'. Philpot was himself a Wykehamist.
4. Sanders, Rise and Growth, p.207.
the sweating sickness (then raging in England) caused the death of some of these neophytes. This, and White's preaching, turned the tables in favour of the old faith according to Sanders. Pupils were either converted to the Catholic faith, or so strengthened therein, that in after-life, by telling the story of this divine visitation, they brought many others back from the heresy of Calvin to the unity of the Catholic Church!\(^1\)

It is less certain that Henry Cole was as explicit a defender of Papistry during his term as warden of New College. He outwardly conformed to the official religious changes, yet the chances are that he never fully supported them. Rashdall and Rait's assessment is that he belonged decidedly to the party of the new learning, but not (in heart) to the new religion.\(^2\) Probably Cole should be classified with earlier wardens like John London, and later ones such as Thomas White: men who managed to retain their position while remaining 'crypto-papists'.\(^3\) Certainly there is evidence that the traditional religious beliefs were not entirely obliterated at New College during Edward's reign.

---

3. John London was warden in 1526, and is remembered for having assisted Cromwell in the dissolution of the monasteries (cf. Mallet, *op.cit.*, I, p.298; 2, pp.68f, 89). Estimates of his character vary considerably, but Janelle's opinion of him is favourable: he believes he was in the same mould as Gardiner, and that he exercised a conservative influence at New College, *L'Angleterre catholique*, pp.223, 339-40. Thomas White was warden, 1553-73.
Those Louvainists who were in Oxford from 1553 onwards were, of course, at the very centre of the Marian reaction. If the papist revival anywhere became a missionary movement, it was there. Learning from their predecessors' techniques, and applying them with unprecedented rigour, Gardiner and his associates imported Catholic divines from Spain to teach, imposed uniformity through searching visitations, and used the university as a stage for some of their more brutal demonstrations of repression. The measures were, perhaps, predominantly negative. Ascham deplored the harrowing of the fair groves of learning in those times, noting how judgment in doctrine was wholly altered and the ways of right study perverted; and he was not alone in his laments. Yet the reaction had its own idealism. And the young Oxford academics who later fled abroad were probably the ones who imbibed it most thoroughly. Whereas the higher Marian ecclesiastics might be termed 'pastoral' conservatives, these were rather the ideologues of the ancient religious ways. They were not quite at the stage of being typical exponents of Counter-Reformation Catholicity, yet, shaped by the Marian revival, they were its forerunners.


2. The Device testified to the 'hurt' done to true religion by 'the late visitation in Queen Mary's time' (Gee, Elizabethan Prayer-Book, p.200). The bishop of Salisbury's laments over the sorry plight of the universities in 1559 are well-known, Jewel to Bullinger, 22 May 1559; Jewel to Peter Martyr, 1 August, 2 November, 5 November 1559 (Zurich Letters, I, pp.33, 40, 46, 52, 54-5). However, such complaints were common, both before and afterwards, especially among preachers, for examples, see Blench, op.cit., pp.245, 270f., 309, n.418.
The temper of their conviction is already reflected in the fact that most of the Louvain writers chose to go into exile voluntarily. Records of the visitation that certainly took place in Oxford around August 1559 are far from complete. Yet they apparently support the judgment that the measures taken were 'mild and gentle': not many were deprived of office; and the list, compiled a few years later, of those who were excluded from the precincts of the university mentions only a few of the Louvainists - Harding, Heskyn, Rastell, and probably Dorman. Harding, seemingly, was the only one placed under any more specific form of restraint. That is to say, there is no question of these scholars having been actively persecuted, or even of their having lived under the threat of imprisonment. As we know from the records of the visitations subsequently carried out by Bishop Horne, many of their co-religionists at New College remained in

1. This subject has been well covered by C.M.J.F. Swan, "The Introduction of the Elizabethan Settlement into the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge with particular reference to the Roman Catholics, 1558-1603", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1955. Beales, however, considers the ejection of heads and senior fellows in 1559 to have been 'on a heavy scale', op.cit., p.30. Mallet doubts this, op.cit., 2, p.106.

2. Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, pp.180, 183, 184. Dorman is probably the one referred to in the entry: 'Thomas Dormer, late scholar from Oxford, restrained from the universities'.

3. Harding was obliged 'to remain in the town of Monkton Farleigh, in the county of Wiltshire, or sixteen miles' compass about the same, or within the town of Toller Whelme in the county of Dorset, or twenty miles' compass about the same', Gee, op.cit., p.180.
office and temporized as best they could. The Louvainists, however, chose exile rather than outward conformity, departing for the Continent without an official licence, sometimes after having resigned their fellowships of their own volition.

Abroad they appear to have maintained the semblance of a community life. But the full picture of their day-to-day existence in the Low Countries has yet to be reconstructed by historians; and most of the fragments of information that are available need not concern us here, for our interest is chiefly in the outlook they displayed. This is well illustrated, I think, in one or two incidents that are adequately documented. These support the contention that the Louvainists stood for a doctrinal intransigence that associates them - closely, but not totally - with counter-reformation thinking.

1. The visitations of 1561, 1562, 1566-7 are discussed by Swan. There is also an extended account of the 1566 visitation in Rashdall and Rait, op.cit., pp.115-33. All the visitations show the strong papist feeling that remained in the college.

2. To take Thomas Stapleton as an example: it is known that he resigned his fellowship some time between 5 June and 12 July 1559. Seemingly he left England in the entourage of the Countess Feria. On 22 March 1560 there is an entry in the Patent Roll saying he had been pardoned for leaving the country without permission, and was given leave to stay abroad for 3 years, on condition that he not consort with the Queen's enemies, and realised he could be recalled on account of affairs of state by letters of the Queen. He was not deprived of the benefices he held in Chichester until, at the end of this time, he returned to England, refused the Oath before Bishop Barlow and was stripped of his offices, some time around August 1563 (McDermott, op.cit., pp.52, 69f.).

One of these concerns the appeal to have Elizabeth declared a heretic and a schismatic by the Council of Trent. The facts of the incident are fairly well established. After the failure of the missions of Parpaglia and Martinengo and the Queen's refusal to support the summoning of a General Council, the Englishmen abroad, in the opinion of certain historians, began to think it was time for more drastic measures to be taken. The situation at home seemed to be growing worse: not only had the Holy See's diplomatic initiatives been rebuffed, but preachers in England were now calling for the blood of the imprisoned bishops even in the Queen's presence. Elizabeth's excommunication by the Church - perhaps backed up by some kind of direct action on the part of the Catholic powers - now looked to some, if not all, of the exiles highly desirable.1 Probably they were encouraged by the Papacy's excommunication of certain prominent French heretics early in 1563. For it was just a few months later, in June, that the possibility of having the English Queen declared excommunicate was raised at the Council.2

Seemingly several avenues of approach were taken. The proposal is known to have been put to Cardinal Moroni around

1. Pollen claims 'a reaction had set in' among the exiles, op. cit., p.76; see also "The Politics of English Catholics during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. I: The First Period, 1558-1568", The Month, XCIX (1902), pp.53f.

this time. But the chief move came from a delegation comprised of the bishops of Arras, Namur and Ypres and three prominent theologians (including Michael Baius) from the University of Louvain. They claimed to have received written instructions from the Catholic bishops of England to press for the Queen's excommunication; and Bayne considers it certain that the Flemish group had engaged in secret consultations with the leading exiles in Louvain. Their proposal was that Elizabeth should be declared a heretic and a schismatic by the Council, but that any execution of the sentence of excommunication should be left to the discretion of the Pope.

Although Pius IV himself was surprisingly sympathetic to the suggestion, the move eventually failed, largely because of the stern opposition of the Emperor Ferdinand. But the incident is of interest here mainly for what it tells us of the exiles. The names of those supporting the proposal are not known. From other indications we can be sure that the project

3. Envoys at Trent to the Emperor Ferdinand, 12 June 1563, in F. B. von Bucholtz (ed.), Geschichte der Regierung Ferdinand des Ersten, vol. 9 (Vienna, 1838), p. 700. Included in this despatch is the text of the submission to Trent; and on internal evidence one would have to conclude that it came from an English source.
would have had the support of Nicholas Sanders. But of course, he was himself attending the Council and had not yet joined the Louvainists at this point. It seems safe to assume, however, that the move reflects the sentiments of those who were to be the principal controversialists. It could suggest, as Pollen thinks, a political naivety, and an adherence to a conception of Christendom that events were fast rendering outdated (if they had not already done so).

In one respect the proposal was unmindful of political consequences. Yet this was hardly because those who framed it were simply insensitive to them. It merely meant that they were not prepared to put political considerations first. The terms of the recommendation to the Council make this abundantly clear. The submission argues strongly (and, in a sense, politically) that Trent should set an example for English Papists, and confessors of the faith everywhere, by taking a non-political stand. It even dares to strike a kind of prophetic note for the benefit of the Council fathers:


2. 'The exiles return boldly to the medieval idea, while the politicians in touch with a broader world, reject its proposals /i.e. for the excommunication/ with anger, or treat it as quite inferior to their own plans', Pollen, op.cit., p.78.
'The expectation of Catholics is that something of this kind [the excommunication] will come from the Council; and if it is not forthcoming, then their good opinion of the assembly will be undermined, and the hopes of those who suffer persecution for the Catholic faith will be frustrated. Moreover, failure to pass this sentence will give Catholics cause for thinking that the Council does not act sincerely, and that its measures are based only on private policies and particular interests. What timidity, despair, and inconstancy this is likely to generate in the hearts and consciences of Catholics, when they see that not all have the same fortitude and constancy, only God knows ... [For they will have to think] either that this Council is afraid to take action against the authors of heresy, or that this sacred assembly puts political considerations and private interests before the necessary suppression of heresy, trusting more in the vain undertakings and power of men than in the omnipotence of God himself ..."\(^1\)

There was a reckless kind of heroism about those supporting this proposal and above all, they wanted to press home the ideological case. Heresy was heresy, so to speak; and it must be called by its proper name. For compromise was the enemy the Louvain divines were battling to subdue.

This is borne out by the exiles' attitude to the difficulties of their co-religionists at home. As is well known, the English Papists struck different stances on the matter of attending the reformed religious services: some stayed away; others complied outwardly with the terms of the Act of Uniformity; and there was a third group who stood for compromise, viz. attendance at the services, but without the reception of Holy

\(^1\) Bucholtz, op.cit., p.700. My translation.
In an effort to gain official approval for this last course of action, petitions had been forwarded to the Council of Trent and the Holy See around the middle of 1562 via the Portugese and Spanish ambassadors in London respectively. The requests went to different bodies: a committee at the Council considered the matter; so too did the Congregation of the Inquisition, an arm of the Roman Curia. But the decisions were much the same in each case: any attendance at the Anglican services was strictly forbidden.¹

Many in England (including some of the clergy) found these judgments difficult to accept. But it comes as no surprise to find that, in the dissensions which followed, the Louvain divines were always partisans for the strict view. They disapproved of compromise from the beginning, it would seem.² And later, when Harding, Sanders and some others were given faculties by the Holy See to reconcile those in heresy, they would ultimately become more and more intransigent, until it reached the point where absolution was refused to those who had attended the reformed services.³ This is not to say that the exiles were unsympathetic to the plight of their fellow-countrymen; up to a point, they tried to be spokesmen for them in Rome. Yet,

³. This was largely due, admittedly, to the hardening attitude of the Holy See, especially from 1566 onwards, see Pollen, op.cit., pp.104-5.
naturally enough, they would countenance no compromise with the Settlement; and it would be true to say, I think, that their polemical works were conceived partly as an attempt to maintain the intransigent view of things among Englishmen.

The remark has often been made that the controversies involving both Puritans and Catholics which developed after 1559 were an effort on the part of the doctrinaire to modify political measures by theological considerations. This is true of the Louvain divines in a way that it is not true of Jewel. In spite of official discouragement of 'all vain and contentious disputations in matters of religion', Elizabeth's government naturally recognised the need for theological justifications of its enactments. Jewel managed both to serve this need and to help put a 'godly' complexion on measures that were, at root, politically-motivated. Up to a point, he and his opponents alike were all committed to keeping the theological issues at stake in the Settlement explicit. But there was a difference in degree here: the Louvainists were more doctrinaire, partly because of the position they were in, and also (probably) because their age made them so. There is no evidence of their polemical campaign having been sponsored either by Spain or Rome, although Philip is known to have expressed gratification at the work they

1. Royal Injunctions (1559), no.50, Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p.60.
were doing; and indirectly of course, by helping them financially, both the Pope and the King of Spain did have a hand in the enterprise. However, the Louvainists were not speaking for others but for themselves; and they stood for the proposition that the correct theological judgments could, and should, prevail in the nation's religious affairs, 'human' or 'worldly' considerations notwithstanding.

The works the exiles wrote fall somewhere between attempts at individual persuasion and pamphlets aimed at a total conversion of society. Their authors have no wish to appear agents of social disruption. There is a reverential tone in practically all of the tracts towards the Queen - in fact they are sometimes dedicated to her (in almost complete sincerity, it would seem). And of course, the polemicists disclaim any idea of being seditious, or of causing disquiet to the realm. Part of the irony of their position, indeed, is that the Louvainists are genuinely desirous of upholding authority: as Dorman puts it, they pine for England's 'Golden Age', before the days of Luther, when subjects were obedient, and not disrespectful and curious about too many things. The only real means of attack open to them therefore, is to assault the reform divines. If their

1. Guzman de Silva to Philip II, 14 April 1565, Span.Cal. 1558-67, p.418: books sent from Louvain in English have done much good. Philip II to De Silva, 6 June 1565, Span.Cal. 1558-67, p.432; the King is gratified with the Louvain writers' work, and the ambassador is to encourage it, but without scandalising the Queen.
2. Dorman, Proufe, fol.138v.
errors can be exposed, the exiles seem to be thinking, then the	nation may well be saved.

This in itself suggests that these early polemicists
were merely feeling for a position. That is to say, while they
were quite dogmatic about the religious options, they were less
secure as to the precise aims of their propaganda. On the one
hand, their use of the vernacular in the treatises seems to argue
to a specific purpose. It certainly shows that they had no
intention of trying to win international reputations for
themselves or to influence continental debates.1 The stage at
which this happened is clearly marked, for when, around 1568,
some of the exiles began to publish in Latin, the scope of their
work also broadened: they then started to advert to the errors of
Calvinism as such, and not simply of its English forms.2 Papists
may have still been at the stage of taking to theologizing in the
vernacular with something of a bad grace, regarding it simply as
a polemical expedient.3 And in fact, the use of the native
tongue in their tracts set the Louvainists rather at odds with the

---

1. On the 'quasi totale ignorance' of the English language in
   France at this time, see Ascoli, op. cit., pp.176ff. In 1572
   Parker commented to Burghley: 'loth he /Day/ is and other
   printers be to print any Latin book, because they will not
   here be uttered, and for that books printed in England be in
   suspicion abroad', D.N.B., s.v. 'Day'.

2. It was in this year that Stapleton began to publish his Latin
treatises. Sanders had published only a few Latin works
prior to this time, and later his works were habitually in
Latin. Some of Harding's and Jewel's English tracts were
later translated into Latin by their respective admirers.

official church-position. But they were obviously convinced that the vernacular was necessary to their purposes, for they used it unremittingly in these early years.

What these purposes were, however, it is difficult to state precisely. The treatises are varied, and seem to be aimed at no very specific audience. Sometimes their concern seems to be for the simple and the ignorant who, they believe, are likely to be deluded by the reformers. Mostly, however, the appeal is not simply to the literate but to the learned - or so one would assume. No doubt, like John Fisher (even in the days when the reform movement was merely beginning), they had little hope of converting their adversaries. Probably their main ambition was to strengthen the waverers - chiefly, it would seem, by showing that there was a Catholic voice to be heard. Perhaps the gesture of opposition came to be as important to them as any particularised missionary intent.

The success of this gesture has been variously assessed. As might be expected, near-contemporary Catholic accounts of the Louvainists' literary campaign stress the almost-miraculous changes of heart, the confusion of their opponents, the stiffening

of papist resistance at home and so on. Allowing for the fact that the conditions of the time necessitated close government supervision of the publishing and importing of printed works (and that such protective measures were by no means always directed against Catholic productions solely), the steps taken in England do seem to reflect an official concern over the Louvainists' efforts. Following the royal injunction of 1559 concerning the licensing of books, the Star Chamber are known to have turned their attention to the matter, issuing in 1566 an ordinance prohibiting, under heavy penalties, the printing or importing of 'any book against the form and meaning of any statute, or law, or injunction etc., passed by the Queen's authority'. Later in this same year there was talk of a parliamentary statute concerning hurtful English books; and there was, of course, a series of royal proclamations on the subject, the first of which seems to have dated from 1564.

1. A number of these are cited in H.E.G. Rope, "Jewel: An Early Exponent of Anglicanism", The Month, CXLV (1925), p.32f. It is interesting that often the conversion to Catholicism comes, not from reading the works of the Louvainists, but from the study of Jewel's replies. See the story of William Reynolds, who is said to have started to translate part of Jewel's works into Latin, and found 'such stuff as made him greatly mislike of the whole religion', repented his heresy, and presented himself (and Jewel's book) before the tribunal of the Inquisition in Rome in 1575, A. A. Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, second ed., vol.1 (London, 1721), col.267, cf. col.170.


3. Thurston lists the royal proclamations, adding some that Arber does not mention, art.cit., p.458, n.1. For the proposed legislation, and the proclamation of 1564 (of which no copy survives), see Pollen, op.cit., p.108, n.3.
Well before 1570 (when opposition to papist tracts might be expected as a matter of course), some ecclesiastics were expressing their apprehensions over the Louvain books; and the search for, and proscription of them was a feature of Bishop Horne's visitations of New College in the middle and late sixties. Not only the books but the authors themselves were outlawed. When one adds to this such snippets of information as Cecil's known concern over the length and promptness of Jewel's replies to the Louvainists, it is clear that the government at least took these works seriously.

Later in Elizabeth's reign a Paul's Cross preacher would refer to 'the Pope's Soldiers' as 'lookers for a golden day'. In spite of their dogmatism (and because of it?), there is the forlorn suggestion of men hoping against hope in the exile treatises, and of not quite knowing what to do for the best as they waited. The tracts merely reflect an incipient stage in

1. Details are given in Swan's thesis, referred to earlier. See esp. his correction of the 1566-7 prohibitions as printed by Frere and Kennedy, Visitation Articles, III, pp.182f., 189 (p.106, nn.4, 5). The Bishop of Durham was expressing his concern as early as the November 1564, Lechat, op.cit., p.33.


the English missionary activity abroad. Yet while they may not reveal to us the final conclusions which these first exiles and their successors were to reach, they do begin to convey the character of the Catholic reaction that was already in the process of mounting.
II

There would be considerable justification for treating the works written by the Louvainists in 1564-5 as a team-effort. Later, as the controversy wore on, there was a tendency for it to fragment into a number of individual duels, the rapid exchanges between Harding and the bishop of Salisbury being paralleled by similar, if far less voluminous, skirmishes between Dorman and Nowell, Martiall and Calfhill and so on. But in the main, the tracts of the first wave were trained on the one target; they issued more or less from the one source - one might as well say from the one common-room; and their almost simultaneous appearance certainly suggests collusion, as does the fact that the topics raised in the individual volumes dovetail quite neatly. While Harding manhandles the challenge and the Apology in their totality, Dorman and Rastell concentrate on selected issues, Allen writes on purgatory, Martiall on images, Sanders and Pointz on the Eucharist, and a whole series of translations is made to complement the original works. Remembering the Wykehamist background of virtually all the contributors, one scents planning and deliberate collaboration. To clinch one's suspicions, the exiles write in the knowledge that they have the backing of a team. The less erudite excuse their efforts by appealing to the weightier contributions of their colleagues; and there are other, similar, tokens of a joint enterprise in the tracts themselves.
Such collaboration is not necessarily synonymous, of course, with a rigid uniformity of approach; and still less, with a regimentation of argument. Needless to say, one does feel the weight of the shared assumptions in the exile-writers. Yet any reader would be equally sensitive to the differences between them, not simply in their style of expression, learning, and taste, but also in what might loosely be called their theological preferences. Close reading is perhaps required to detect the variations in theological opinion among the Louvainists. They do exist, but are not very notable in the works under review. What are obvious however, are the differing theological preoccupations, which lead individual writers to tackle the refutation of Jewel in quite distinctive ways.

Without reflecting at all on the theological options that might or might not lie behind them, John Rastell in his *Confutation* lists four ways of 'fighting' those he calls 'our common adversaries' - meaning, quite certainly, in the context, Jewel; and probably also the writers (as the Louvainists thought) of the *Apology*. First, he says,

'Some writers of these our days, men of great continuance and study, do lay full load out of Scripture and councils, just upon the pates and backs of our common adversaries'.

Then there are

'Other some [who] be more sparer in alleging of old authorities and rather follow a sensible fashion of reasoning, without book, against them'.
Again,

'some will persecute the enemy so narrowly that sentence by sentence they examine his truth and fidelity'.

And finally, there are

'some again, /who/ do so think upon the chief point of the question that, for haste's sake, they let much escape which perchance was well worth the noting'. 1

Rastell's distinctions do not bite very deeply into the differences in approach to be found among the Louvain apologists. But they at least advert to the fact of difference. And any summary of the arguments of these early treatises needs to take that fact into account. In an attempt to do so, I mean to isolate three strands from what is really a tangled skein of reasoning, identifying them with the particular work in which I believe they are most apparent - always having in mind, of course, the Louvainists' response to Jewel's argument from antiquity. The works are: Harding's Answere; Rastell's Confutation; and Martiall's Treatyse of the Cross.

1. Thomas Harding: "Trying M. Jewel's places".

The first, and most characteristic, style of argument from antiquity can be illustrated from the works of Jewel's arch-assailant, Thomas Harding. The aggressive note struck in these dour, yet not uninteresting, productions echoes, of course,

1. Rastell, Confutation, Sigs. A iii^f-v.
throughout the whole of 'the Great Controversy', Jewel and Harding together, the main protagonists, setting the tone for the debate.

Any of Thomas Harding's lengthy tracts might be used to sample this style. They are very much of a piece in their approach: encyclopedic point-by-point rebuttals of virtually everything Jewel had advanced; works that remain close to the surface of the controversy and carry it relentlessly forward, steadily compounding problems rather than clarifying them by their adherence to debating techniques. Harding in fact claimed of the book I mean to comment on, *An answere to maister Iuelles chalenge*, that the 'demeanour of writing' had deliberately been kept impersonal - 'cold, low, flat and dull' - when the work was first drafted in an effort to preserve anonymity (fol. 5r, 6r). But the pains seem to have been wasted. There is little to distinguish this from his other contributions to the debate, and being his first intervention, it allows the reader to observe, with relative clarity, the main lines of his attack.

According to Harding the work was originally written in England for a friend, anonymously and with a view to private circulation, because he was officially 'imbarred' from preaching; but he was importuned by his colleagues to publish it over his own name after his arrival abroad (fol. ii r. Cf. fol. 4v). Perhaps this was the truth of the matter. Yet, to judge from internal evidence, there is no reason for suspecting that its author ever envisaged a restricted readership for it. On the contrary, the
expectation (not to say the hope) is that it will 'come to the hands of many' (fol. 5\(^\text{v}\)). Harding admits he writes to influence his brethren at home: to call back those who have 'overrun' themselves; or if these are beyond saving, then at least to preserve the faith of his countrymen who are 'yet whole' (fol. ii\(^r\)).

The manner of argument corroborates this entirely, showing Harding to have been as dedicated a publicist as Jewel. For there can be little doubt as to the principal motivation for the Answere: Harding is plainly dismayed that Catholics have been made to seem bereft of any defence or rejoinder before Jewel's bragging challenge (fol. iii\(^v\)). The loss of face is what worries him; and he writes, so to speak, for English society at large, wanting quite desperately to invade the public arena and retrieve the situation with a monumental array of arguments. In today's terms, Harding's concern is for the 'image' of the Catholic party. He is stung by the challenge - perhaps partly for personal reasons; it is difficult to be sure.

Harding declares his affection for his one-time associate:

'my heart served me not to deal with M. Jewel, my old acquainted fellow and countryman otherwise than sweetly, gently and courteously. And indeed here I protest that I love M. Jewel and detest his heresies' (fol. 6\(^r\)).

But of course, much sizzling abuse has often sheltered behind this conventional distinction between the person and his views; and
Harding's protestations that he means to proceed 'without choler, without gall, without spite' (fol. 5^F) are possibly negated by the sharpness and persistence of his attacks. One suspects that rivalry, if not enmity, between the two dons might have aggravated Harding's reaction to the challenge. Perhaps, knowing the pedigree, he was prone to distrust the would-be prophet - a failing not without its precedents.

Certainly, Harding is sensitive to the effects of Jewel's popular arguments. He commonly writes of 'the horrible seducing of the unlearned' (fol. 165^V. Cf. 3^V, 130^V-131^F etc.) through the challenge - a frequent complaint on both sides in this controversy, which, roughly interpreted, amounts to an expression of fear that the opposition's arguments were beginning to find their mark. As a counter, Harding piles his authorities high to topple Jewel's show of learning. Or, to use his own image, he loads the table with delicacies from antiquity until it creaks - a vulgar and rather ostentatious display, he admits, but, under the circumstances, necessary:

'I have overcharged the board with dishes
... I should mislike the same in another myself. I grant therein I have not always kept due comeliness' (fol. iii^F).

What justifies the abundance is that in 'this time of spiritual famine' Catholics have been reproached for lacking the means of proof (fol. iii^V).

In practice, therefore, Harding makes Jewel his
exclusive target,\textsuperscript{1} reprinting the whole of the challenge, numbering its items and pursuing his quarry through all twenty-seven of the propositions in turn, with the utmost literalness. No effort is made to order the topics or link them under suitable headings for convenient discussion. Each is simply taken as it stands and refuted at length, always within the terms Jewel has set, viz. the testimony of the first six centuries. So essentially the battle is over 'places', and almost becomes a matter of seeing which side has the 'most plain', 'notable', or even the bigger number of 'sayings' to cite. Harding is utterly relentless at accumulating patristic authorities to outstrip those of Jewel. Display, one is made to feel, is important in this encounter. The Answere is far less a reasoned refutation of Jewel's position than a somewhat juvenile response to a dare. Harding takes up the gauntlet Jewel has thrown down; a trial of strength ensues; and because the rules of the game demand it, Jewel is allowed his choice of weapons. Harding is loath to admit that he is looking for a 'victory' over his adversary (fol. l\textsuperscript{v}). But this of course is his aim. The important consequence is that the debate then turns, not around the matter of theological truth or falsehood, but around the verification of an historical claim.

Harding of course is the all-round controversialist: he follows his quarry point by point, sentence by sentence, as I

\textsuperscript{1} Cf. Answere, fol. 32\textsuperscript{r}.  }
have said; and misses no opportunity to draw attention to Jewel's errors, whatever the context might be. In this respect the *Answere*'s range of concerns is very wide indeed, and it may be slightly misleading to speak of one controlling viewpoint in the work. However, it is to the terms of the challenge that Harding consistently returns, and the direction of his argument is apologetical — and therefore, in this context, historical. The dominant concern is to meet the challenge, by showing, of course, the antiquity of the papist positions. He accepts Jewel's dare to elaborate the patristic support for all the measures the bishop had mentioned, so that the historical issue does become paramount in the treatise.

If he is not utterly single-minded about proving antiquity, Harding is almost so. One can observe him in the *Answere* deliberately waiving the opportunity to contest Jewel's assumptions, even though he obviously disagrees with them. It is clear, for instance, that Harding does not accept 'Jewel's first six hundred years' (fol. 50v) as an adequate, or self-sufficient, criterion of theological verification.

'The places of proofs, which we have here used, are such, as yourself allow for good and lawful. The Scriptures, examples of the Primitive church, ancient Councils, and the fathers of six hundred years after Christ. You might and ought likewise to have allowed, Reason, Tradition, Custom, and authority of the Church, without limitation of time' (fol. 188f).

1. To the 'authorities, which you deny us to have for proof of your great number of articles' — that is, 'doctors, general councils the most ancient, the example of the primitive church, the Scriptures' — Harding says, 'I add further reason, consent, universal and uncontrolled, and tradition' (*Answere*, fol. 22v).
But the point is not pressed. Harding does not insist on applying his own wider criteria when assessing the points of the challenge. Nor does he elaborate his own principles or bother to defend them. One can deduce from isolated remarks what his thinking might have been - that, along with the other Papists, he placed great store, for example, on universality of witness as a criterion of the authentic traditions - but the matter of criteria is not directly broached. The refutation of Jewel's over-all position is not Harding's concern.

From the theological point of view, Harding conceded only a limited usefulness, I think, to the statements of the early Church Fathers. Certainly, he appears to conform to the conventional ideas regarding the Fathers' testimony. To judge from random comments, Harding esteemed their views highly when it came to interpreting the words of Scripture (fol. 165\textsuperscript{v}). Moreover, he clearly accepted the Fathers as privileged witnesses to the apostolic teaching. 'Let us see', he says on one occasion, 'by the testimonies of the fathers, what doctrine the Apostles have left to the church' (fol. 166\textsuperscript{r}). Their teaching was especially relevant when it provided evidence of a universally-held position, for then, on Harding's principles, it points to 'the infallible faith of the church' (fol. 127\textsuperscript{r}).

1. Cf. Answere, fol. 192\textsuperscript{r}. 
On the other hand, however, Harding was also of the opinion that the ecclesiastical situation which the views of the Fathers reflected no longer corresponded in all particulars with that of the present-day Church. In Christian antiquity, as he says, 'when the faith was a learning' (fol. 69\textsuperscript{r}), the conditions for living the Christian life differed from those in later times. Specifically, he argues, the common tongue in the liturgy was then needed to instruct recent converts. People then came together in the assemblies to teach each other and expound the Scriptures in common, whereas now they gather to pray and 'hear the opening of God's word' by the cleric (fol. 67\textsuperscript{v}). \(^1\) 'The state of that time ... was much unlike the state of the church we be now in' (fol. 70\textsuperscript{r}). In consequence, there was a certain futility about appealing to the witness of the past in some areas. For even to sift the true significance of the Fathers' statements, it is necessary, according to one of Harding's asides, that we 'give ear to the Holy Ghost speaking to us by the mouth of the church' (fol. 42\textsuperscript{r}). Here, of course, the Papist's real criterion of validity is asserting itself; and one can appreciate that Harding's weight was not entirely behind the trading of patristic texts. Yet trade texts is what he does.

A striking illustration of his abdication of the role of critic comes from Harding's readiness to exchange patristic citations with Jewel even on topics he considers trivial, or in

\(^1\) Cf. Answere, fol. 70\textsuperscript{r}. 
areas where he believes the views of the Fathers irrelevant. Occasionally in the Answere Harding deplores Jewel's preoccupation with marginal concerns. He offers the general comment early in the treatise that Jewel has craftily withdrawn from the larger doctrinal issues 'and cast unto us a bone to gnaw upon, this number of Articles of less weight' which are mostly concerned with 'order rather than doctrine' (fol. 3\textsuperscript{r}). And he makes it plain that he considers some of the items in the challenge entirely inconsequential. The practice of the priest holding the sacrament above his head is not one of 'the greatest keys of our religion', says Harding, and the doctrine of the Church could well stand without it (fol. 109\textsuperscript{v}). Again, he complains, the carrying of the Eucharist under a canopy is 'so small a matter' (fol. 121\textsuperscript{r}). And the last five of Jewel's articles, in fact, he labels 'school points, the discussion whereof is more curious than necessary' (fol. 182\textsuperscript{r}).

Moreover, one can see that in the case of some of the more controverted questions, like the reception of the Eucharist under both species and the use of the vernacular in the liturgy, Harding does not regard the teaching of the first centuries as highly pertinent. He argues at some length that, as far as Christ's express command is concerned, the distribution of Communion to the laity under one or both species is an indifferent matter (fol. 31\textsuperscript{v}ff.). But even if Christ had himself imposed it, the Church could still abrogate that command:
'the exact straightness of God's ordinance may without sin in cases be omitted, in such things which be not necessarily to be observed of themselves, or of the prescript of the law of nature, so that great and weighty causes (the rule of charity exactly observed) require the same ...' (fol. 37v).

'Christ hath scarcely commanded any outward thing, the moderation, qualifying and ordering whereof, he hath not left to his church, as according to the condition of the time, it hath been seen most expedient for the common preferment and edifying of the same' (fol. 37v).

So, as things stand, says Harding, the matter is open to the decision of a General Council. Communion under two kinds, he concedes,

'might be restored again by the authority of the church lawfully assembled in a general council, upon mature deliberation before had, and a wholesome remedy against the inconveniences thereof provided' (fol. 40v).

The same is true of the use of the vernacular: one might even grant that its reintroduction into the liturgical services would be an advantage (fol. 71v). 'But', Harding continues,

'all the common people to understand the priest at the service, I think wise and godly men judge it not a thing so necessary, as for the which the ancient order of the church with no little offence, public and universal authority not consulted, should be condemned, broken and quite abrogated by private advice of a few' (fol. 70v).

Yet even in cases such as these, where, on Harding's own admission, 'the credit of the catholic faith dependeth not of old proofs' (fol. 182v), he still contests the witness of the first six centuries with Jewel, unwilling to concede a single point to his adversary on the score of antiquity. Jewel's challenge is
accepted with regard to all the items mentioned, theologically relevant or not.

Unfortunate effects follow from this suspension of theological judgment in favour of polemics. And here Harding's case might serve as a paradigm for that of the counter-reformation apologists as a whole. Firstly, Harding was immortalizing trivia. His admission that a practice like elevating the Blessed Sacrament has no significance is, of course, negated when he then sets about proving that there are records of this ceremony 'even from the Apostles' time forward' (fol. 110R). The same applies when, having granted that the use of the term 'universal bishop' has no great bearing on the question of the primacy, he goes on to insist, on shaky grounds, that the term was commonly applied to the bishop of Rome in the first centuries (fol. 75R). Making the problem one of history is no way of relegating the discussion of confessedly irrelevant matters to the oblivion they deserve. Moreover, a brake is applied to fruitful historical discussion when Harding's arguments imply a total continuity in discipline, no less than in teaching, from the Church's beginnings to the present day. Once again, what Harding does effectively countermands what he says, in conceding, for instance, that there are some differences between conditions in the primitive Church and those of later times. In practice the polemicist silences the potential exponent of change. Thirdly, and finally, Harding's apologetic concerns obviously intrude on his handling of patristic texts.
It is not my intention to consider in detail the reliability of Harding's patristic arguments. My largely untested suspicion is that, in spite of the impressive number of citations and the occasional hint of antiquarianism, the texts are habitually drawn from books of common-places, and that Harding all-too-often (and without adverting to the known facts) uses texts of doubtful authenticity - in short, that he is as open as Jewel to the charge of settling for the 'flourish and varnish of learning' (fol. 189v). But more pertinent to my argument is the intrusion of polemics into Harding's evaluation and use of the patristic evidence; and indications of this are not difficult to find.

Even for so dogged a worker as Harding the task of analysing the teaching of antiquity on all twenty-seven items of the challenge is obviously too much. His polemical aims defeat him in the end, as they must, the sign of his capitulation coming in brash and undisciplined generalisations like the following:

'All the holy and learned fathers, that have preached the faith of Christ from the rising of the sun to the setting, have taught this doctrine, by word and writing left to the posterity ...' (fol. 171v).

The doctors 'have with one consent, in all ages, in all parts of the world, from the Apostles' time forward, both with their example and also testimony of writing confirmed the same faith in the Mass' (fol. 10v).

Harding's tendency, moreover, is to extend the meaning of texts by arguing from them, often quite wildly. To use his own terms,
he looks beyond 'the bare words' of patristic statements, 'inducing' further significance into them (fols. 24\textsuperscript{v} - 25\textsuperscript{r}).

This can sometimes lead to the most brazen pleading. From a decree of Pope Soter, for instance, which actually legislates on the need for several people to be present at the Eucharist in order to answer the priest, Harding can attempt to draw a testimony in favour of 'private Mass' (meaning, in this context, the practice of having only the priest communicate). Harding, in effect, simply uses the papal decree as the major of a syllogism, the minor being: if the Pope had considered communion for the laity necessary, he would have legislated about it in the decree. The sleight of hand is not unconscious, Harding excusing himself on the grounds that this 'manner of argument is commonly used of our adversaries' (fol. 25\textsuperscript{r}). There is a similar extension (or distortion) of meaning in relation to the evidence of Pope Sergius I on the practice of breaking the eucharistic bread into parts - which Harding is wanting to defend as the ancient practice. Since Sergius' testimony falls slightly outside Jewel's six hundred years - he reigned 687-701 - Harding is forced into deductions. Firstly he assumes, rather gratuitously, that Sergius himself could not have fathered the custom; and even more daringly, he takes it that the practice must be of apostolic origin, precisely because, on his own admission, there is no mention of it in the documents prior to this time. If the Church had invented the practice and not inherited it from the apostles, then, so the argument runs,
there would be some reference to it in earlier decrees (fols. 128\textsuperscript{v}-129\textsuperscript{r}).

Harding's efforts to make silence speak are quite a feature of the Answere.\(^1\) They are symptomatic of a broad tendency to extort support from unlikely (not to say unwilling and hostile) authorities, in an attempt to win a polemical point. Often it is as if Harding, with a bland - and, one is forced to suspect, conscious - disregard for historical evidence, were merely trying arguments out on his opponent and his readers. Yet, on the other hand, he can effectively appeal to historical criteria when it is a question of refuting Jewel's authorities. In relation to a key text of Gelasius, for instance, Harding pulls out all the critical stops, accusing Jewel of mistranslating the passage (fol. 47\textsuperscript{v}); of citing only a fragment when he should have 'show(n) us the whole epistle of Gelasius ... that we may weigh the circumstances and the causes why he wrote it, conferring that goeth before and that followeth' (fol. 48\textsuperscript{v}); and finally, of disregarding the historical context, which Harding proceeds to reconstruct with some sensitivity (fol. 49\textsuperscript{r}). Admittedly, when Harding adverts to context in this way, it is normally to remind us of one thing only: that a particular statement was occasioned by controversy, and must be interpreted accordingly. The appreciation of historical circumstances is limited. And in general, Harding appeals to such circumstances only when it helps him to refute his opponent's arguments.

\(^1\) For instance, Answere, fols. 23\textsuperscript{r}, 59\textsuperscript{r}, 64\textsuperscript{r}, 98\textsuperscript{r} etc.
If contesting the facts of antiquity with Jewel worked mostly against the emergence of an historical sense in the Catholic apologist, it also led, somewhat indirectly, to certain gains. These are worth mentioning, for, as with the disadvantages, they are probably symptomatic of benefits, however minor, that accrued to scholarship from debates like the Great Controversy.

Forced to face the question of whether the Church Fathers held a particular view or defended a particular practice, Harding gives at least some thought to the defects and apparent defects of patristic teaching. Although not always correct, Harding's conclusions are of interest for what they reveal of his grasp of the past. As well as a passing admission that the Fathers can be mistaken 'in one point or two' (fol. 156r) - which, in its context, is of no great significance - one finds Harding conceding that not all the theological issues were treated by the Fathers: they held only to the main truths of faith, he says (fol. 3r). Moreover, the Fathers could profess their belief in the mysteries without using the same words that a later generation would use (fol. 98r).

His position here runs parallel to the one he adopts in relation to matters of church-discipline: practices may sometimes vary 'according to the condition of the time' (fol. 37v), but without there being any departure from what Harding calls
the scope and principal intent of the practice. In a word, the essential aim will always be served even though there is variation in the forms of, say, church services. Here, it is obvious, Harding's belief in an indefectible inerrant Church is controlling his expectations about the past, closing his mind tight against certain possibilities. Yet there is at least some concession to the changes time works. The same applies to matters of teaching.

The words in which the church professes its faith may vary. The Fathers may not have used such words as 'substantially' to declare their faith in the Real Presence, but this was only because the truth of Christ's presence in the Eucharist was not challenged in the first centuries. When, with the heresy of Berengarius in the eleventh century, it was challenged, then the more explicit statements of the Church Doctors reflected this (fol. 98r). Terms such as 'transubstantiation' were merely devised 'for the apter declaration of certain necessary articles of our faith' (fol. 116r). In the same way, scholastic phraseology to describe the Eucharist - with its tags, ex concomitantia and vi sacramenti, for instance - only helps the Church to say 'in shorter and plainer wise' what the early councils had said (fol. 116r). Harding grants the superficial advance but of course insists on the substantial identity of faith. It is only the need for greater clarity that forges the new terminology: the Fathers knew fully all that
was to be grasped. They

'doubtless would no less have used them
such terms', if that matter had been
in question or doubt in their time' (fol. 98r).

One sees the limitations of Harding's sense of history. Yet there is an incipient recognition of diversity, and one finds this commonly in the Catholic apologists. Harding goes a little further than most, however, in specifying the circumstances responsible for such diversity. Consider the following passage from the Answere where, commenting on the 'school points' raised in the last five articles of the challenge, he expatiates on the differences between the scholastic and patristic terminologies:

'Whether the faithful people were then
in the first six hundred years...
taught to believe concerning this blessed
Sacrament precisely according to the purport
of all these articles or no, I know not.
Verily I think, they were taught the truth
of this matter simply and plainly, yet so as
nothing was hidden from them, that in those
quiet times (quiet I mean touching this
point of faith) was thought necessary for
them to know. If since there hath been more
taught, or rather if the truth hath in some
other form of words been declared for a more
evidence and clearness in this behalf to be
had, truth itself always remaining one; this
hath proceeded of the diligence and earnest
care of the church, to repress the pertinacity
of heretics, who have within these last 600
years impugned the truth herein, and to meet
with their perverse and froward objections:
as hath been thought necessary to find out
such wedges, as might best serve to rive
such knotty block....' (fol. 182r).

Harding here moves beyond the fact of difference and, however timidly, begins to explore causes. There is even something approaching a theory of doctrinal development in this passage -
rudimentary, doctrinaire and impervious to some of the facts of history, but still an attempt to confront the problem posed by historical change, an exercise prompted by the exchange with Jewel.

The circumstance that dominates this and other passages is the change worked in the Church's statements by heresy. Wedges are needed to rive the knotty block, so new formulae emerge. Defence changes the stance of orthodoxy. Harding has grasped the significance of at least this historical factor. He alludes to it frequently when attempting to explain away certain utterances of the Fathers that constitute a problem for him. In fact, he uses it as a basis for discriminating between two types of statement in the patristic writings - another remark that perhaps points to the dawning of an historical consciousness in the polemicist:

'And the learned men that be well seen in the fathers, know they must use a discretion and a sundry judgment between the things they write "agonistikōs", that is to say, by way of contention or disputation, and the things they utter "dogmatikōs", that is by way of setting forth a doctrine or matter of faith' (fol. 133v).

A final, if fairly obvious, historical gain from the controversy is that it prompts explanations of some of the facts of antiquity. Harding's efforts in this direction, it must be admitted, are scarcely impressive. But there are areas where

---

1. See, for instance, Answere, fols. 21v, 36v–37r, 44v.
the discussion is at least useful and points to constructive possibilities. Harding, for example, takes up the now-familiar theme of the patristic use of such terms as 'figure', 'sacrament', and 'sign' in a fairly long disquisition (fols. 135 ff.). More impressive than his own staid conclusion is the fact that Harding acknowledges this to be a matter of considerable complexity (fol. 138f). His historical ingenuity has obviously been strained by his efforts to meet the reformers' interpretations of the patristic evidence; and a field of historical enquiry is clearly being opened up through controversy.

In the last analysis, however, nobody could argue that gain outweighs loss in a book like the Answere. Harding's passion to compete issues in a sad offspring: a debilitated theology, a partisan history and indeed, an argument in which personalities already threaten to outstrip issues. The most that can be claimed is that some indirect benefits are promised from this wholesale plundering of the relics of Christian antiquity.


The difference in the ways John Rastell and Thomas Harding face up to the problem of Jewel's challenge is clearly enough suggested by the titles of their respective replies. Harding's is an 'Answere': it meets Jewel on his terms. Rastell, on the other hand, compiles a 'Confutation', a work that refutes
Jewel's arguments; and more importantly for our purposes, contests his assumptions.

It cannot be pretended this is a hard-and-fast distinction. Neither work is entirely homogeneous in its approach. Harding, as we have seen, can register his disapproval of the bases of his opponent's argument. And Rastell from time to time finds Jewel's challenge too provocative to resist. In fact he even frames a counter-challenge (or several of them) as an epilogue to his treatise ('A Challenge against the Protestants', fols. 160\textsuperscript{r}ff.). But while granting that there are many ways of doing battle with Jewel and that each is entitled to fight after his own fashion (Sig. A iii\textsuperscript{r}), Rastell is himself convinced of 'the absurdity of the challenge' (fol. 161\textsuperscript{r}) and subscribes, as he says, to the advice of Proverbs: 'Do not answer a fool according to his foolishness, lest thou be made like unto him' (fol. 160\textsuperscript{v}). His own 'counterfeited challenge' (fol. 161\textsuperscript{v}), a close copy of Jewel's, is really an attempt at ridicule; and the rejection of the terms of the original challenge is a consistent feature of Rastell's work. This is why I have chosen the Confutation to sample the type of criticisms the Louvainists levelled against the bishop's argument from antiquity.

John Rastell, it should perhaps be said, was something of a layman in theology. The proof of this is to be found, not in his own rhetorical admissions that he uses only a penknife to diminish Jewel's lusty blood' where others are armed with great
swords and pikes (Sig. A v), but in his approach, which contrasts (if only subtly) with, say, that of Harding.

Harding is scholarly, with many of the scholar's failings: a gusto for argument that can trap him into digression; over-fondness for the display of learning; a donnish tendency to meet an opposing case by putting one's rival down, and down further, until there is no doubt who is the superior. Such defects, however, are consistent with a genuine and thoroughgoing dedication to debate. Rastell, by contrast, is measured, economical with words, focussed always on the main issues, admirably lucid in his arguments. Yet his clear-headedness is really the accompaniment of an incomplete dedication to argument. He is the type of student who must keep his arguments in perspective and who is never bewitched by them. Controversy, one feels, is labour for Rastell. He has devoted his 'solitary and sorrowful time' to the exercise of answering Jewel partly, as he says, for his own benefit: to prepare what he might say when called on to profess his faith publicly (fol. 1 v. Cf. fol. 159r). Restrained by so pragmatic a purpose, and by his own temperament I think, he keeps doggedly to the main points, probably hoping to find an audience for his work mainly among those 'learned ... and expert in liberal sciences' (fol. 101r). His critique of Jewel owes more to the literate man's "so what?" before the bishop's conclusions than to the divine's sensitivity to principles and implications.
From most points of view this is all to the good. If Rastell's discussion of the challenge is somewhat lacking in theological depth, it does have the advantage of being business-like and pertinent. His method is to reproduce a passage from the printed text of the Paul's Cross sermon and then comment on it at length. This glossarial style is obviously limiting, but, because he chooses his marks wisely, Rastell manages to draw out the main points of Jewel's case in the twenty or so articles that make up the Confutation. Rastell makes no apologies for his aims. Having written his work four years previously, so he says, 'for one friend alone' (Sig. A ii⁠) - 'my dear friend M. N.' (fol. 1r. Cf. fols. 8r, 159v) - he publishes it to atone for his former slackness, his goal being 'to continue the memory of the challenge' (Sig. A ii⁠) and expose its absurdities. 'Chiefly I intended to destroy the assertions of Master Jewel' (fol. 159r). Like Jewel himself he finds his best defence in attack.

Jewel's appeal to the first six centuries is not among the items which Rastell singles out for direct comment in his work. Nor, as I have insinuated, is he the person to construct a strong and exhaustive theological case against the use of such a criterion. But from the very beginning of his work and in a number of different contexts, Rastell is generous with his reflexions on the subject, one of his main points being that Salisbury's appeal to the primitive church is essentially a blind.
The first article in the Confutation is concerned with Jewel's use of the words, 'Let old customs prevail' (from one of the canons of the Council of Nicea), as 'a posy' and 'a golden clasp' to the sermon. In Rastell's eyes it is effrontery for Jewel to claim to be amenable to custom. His one criterion is 'the written word and bare letter' of Scripture (fol. 8v). There is no third or middle way as far as Rastell is concerned: one either opts for the private interpretation of Scripture, as Protestants do and as heretics have always done, or one accepts in their totality the 'traditions and uses of the catholic church' (fol. 11v), from time immemorial 'the chiefest stay' of the orthodox (fol. 6v). As a practical yardstick at least, the Holy Church - Holy Writ antinomy is complete for Rastell. When he 'cleave(s) to the Scripture only', Jewel thereby 'leave(s) the church' (fol. 42r) - meaning in this context, the customs and uses of the Church.

This seems, on the face of it, too insensitive a view of Bishop Jewel's position. The possibility of a via media was not something the exile writers considered. Jewel to them was a Lutheran or a Calvinist or a Protestant, depending on what they were discussing at the time; and in spite of the polemical use they sometimes made of the doctrinal divisions among Protestants, they would all have concluded, a priori, that Jewel must adhere to the Scriptura sola principle simply because he was a Protestant. Certainly Rastell adverts to none of the subtleties in Jewel's
position. Yet his final assessment, harsh though it first appears, is not far from the truth, given the limitations that Jewel arbitrarily introduced into his appeal to the Church. In a word, Rastell is less than fair to Jewel's intentions but he accurately weighs his performance.

Rastell sees that Jewel is being selective in two ways. Firstly, he listens only to the Fathers when it pleases him. The Protestants, according to Rastell,  

'sometimes give reverent and humble looks up towards them /the fathers/ and at other times, with scoffs and disdains enough, they pass lightly by them' (fols. 122r - 19r).

'Like as bells do sound in divers mens ears diversely, and diversely in one self same ear, as the mind is affected, so Scripture and custom are made to sound in these mens fancy even as their mind is to have this or that opinion to go forward' (fols. 18 - 19r).

When convenient, the Gospellers want all the bells to ring; but when this causes them trouble, they would have only one bell sound - the Scriptures (fol. 19r).

Secondly, there is Jewel's exclusive appeal to the first six centuries - a proposition that is anathema to Rastell. To discriminate between an 'incorrupt' age and a subsequent 'night of nine hundred years and more' (fol. 38r) is, of course, to run counter to the Papists' idea of a divinely-sustained Church, incapable of committing and authorising 'a universal idolatry' (fol. 80v. Cf. fol. 3r). 'God', says Rastell, 'never left himself without testimony' (fol. 81r). But it is
also to display that confidence in one's private judgment which is the stuff the Scriptura sola mentality is made of. Not only is Jewel illogical in confining himself to the testimony of the first five or six centuries (fol. 153°), but he is also demonstrating his readiness to set the 'private sense' above the Church when he presumes to impute worldly motives to all the saintly men of the past nine hundred years (fol. 67\textsuperscript{v}).

Such selectivity, in Rastell's estimation, is utterly inimical to an appeal to the Church and ancient custom, for three reasons. (1) Rastell would say that tradition, if it is to be a practical criterion, must be taken as an absolute norm. The words of Scripture alone cannot resolve controversies any more than natural reason can do\textsuperscript{1} - so attempts to use Scripture to sift the authentic from the spurious in the sayings of the Fathers must also be ineffective. (2) The search for a consensus in the patristic views should be an essential element in any appeal to antiquity.

'The faithful do consider always not what one or two do say, but what the whole company of learned men or the greater part do testify' (97\textsuperscript{r}).

\textsuperscript{1}... if natural reason shall prevail the Christian faith can not be so well persuaded, or rather it can not be persuaded at all. If by Scriptures only the truth shall be decided, then shall there never be found any end, where both parties allege the words of Scripture for themselves. Only therefore tradition, custom and manner is that thing which killeth the heretics hearts ... and it is the thing which defendeth the Catholic Christians, and therefore gladly do they follow the ways of the ancient fathers' (fol. 7\textsuperscript{v}).
Rastell is not exactly advocating majority rule. He is rather echoing the papist conviction that the universally-held tradition is the authentic one - a conclusion that followed irrevocably from the papist view of the Church.

'It is reason, authority and proof abundant for a Christian man that this or that thing hath been done or used universally in the church of Christ, were it used but for one year only, because the church is the pillar of truth and hath the Holy Ghost her teacher and governor for ever, and never hath been suffered utterly to have erred in all her members at one time' (fols. 133-134).

Such an outlook makes the statements of the ancient Doctors relevant chiefly in so far as they witness to a church-wide acceptance of a certain teaching or practice; and it obviously leaves little room for preferring the statements of one age to those of another, or of one school of thought to those of another. (3) The crucial test of any appeal to the Church in Rastell's eyes is that it include a submission to the Church as it is presently constituted. The authority of church-governors is, for him, the principal matter that needs to be resolved in the debate with Jewel (fols. 148v - 149r). As long as the bishop sets limits on his acceptance of church-custom then his appeal to antiquity, consciously or unconsciously, is a deception. He does not really mean to let old custom 'prevail' over 'the private sense'.

Rastell has more specific reasons also for finding Jewel's antiquity-criterion unsuitable. And it is here that his healthy irreverence for his opponent's assumptions shows through
to best advantage. What does it matter, he asks, if the terms of some of the Church's more recent doctrinal statements cannot be found in the Fathers? They could still be justified, for

'It is not the age which maketh verities, but the word of God and the content of the church whose voice especially is much to be considered' (fol. 82v).

Suppose tags to which Jewel objects - like ex opere operato - were not used in the primitive church. In my opinion, says Rastell - 'for what others will say I cannot tell' - they may still stand if their use is vindicated 'by the consent of learned men and the voice of the church which hath been since the 600 years of which you speak' (fols. 152r-v). It would be a sad-witted fellow, he argues, who would condemn August's fruit as bad because it was not on the trees in April (fol. 153r). And he concludes with an argument ex absurdo that throws interesting light on the marian piety of Englishmen:

'Where is it readen within six hundred years of Christ that our blessed lady was preached or named the mother of mercy, the hand-maiden of the Trinity, the spouse of the Holy Ghost, the Queen of Heaven, the Empress of Hell? Yet if you believe indeed, and in heart, and not say it only from the teeth forward that she is the mother of God necessarily all the other titles follow. Shall I then say she was not called the Queen of Heaven or spouse of the Holy Ghost in the six hundred years after Christ, ergo she may not be so called now, and the greatest key of our religion is broken? Yet common sense approveth that a King's mother is a Queen and not of no place, I trust. And thus I trust M. Jewel hath no cause to triumph hitherto' (fols. 153v - 154r).
This passage makes one important fact plain: Rastell is not maintaining that subsequent use can justify innovations in the church. The apparently novel statements and terms of later ages are already implicit in those approved by the ancient Church—either because the later formulations are simply other ways of putting what was already recognised in antiquity; or because they represent conclusions already implicit in principles enunciated in the first centuries. Thus, the term 'universal bishop' may not have been used in the primitive church, but 'the thing itself' (the authority of the bishop of Rome), according to Rastell, was there (fol. 138v. Cf. Fol. 136v). It is foolish to expect to find scholastic theories about the multilocation of Christ's body in the patristic writings, for it is

'not necessary that every conclusion be expressly written in the ancient fathers' works' (fol. 144r-v).

But they represent legitimate conclusions from principles the Fathers did state. As a general observation Rastell would claim that Jewel attempts to make the silence of antiquity more eloquent than it is. He 'stick(s) upon terms, which can never be found in the compass of the primitive church' (fol. 167v), refusing to admit later ones, and thus erects an unserviceable, and wholly unacceptable, criterion.

A similar line of argument is adopted in the Confutation with regard to ceremonies. Leaving many questions unanswered, and begging quite a few more, Rastell presses on with the standard distinction between 'matters indifferent' and the
'essential and necessary parts' of church services. One must assume that he considers the former - what he calls 'the garnishing and decking of the mysteries' - to be of human institution and mutable, whereas the latter are enjoined by divine (and/or apostolic?) command and are not susceptible to alteration. At all events, Rastell is critical of Jewel for wanting evidence from antiquity to support 'orders and ceremonies of which the governors of the church, have the making or removing in their discretion' (fols. 168r-v). Here, as before, Rastell takes his stand on the inevitability of change. Whereas in the case of doctrine he envisages a development through the explication of basic truths, here he thinks of an essential rite being added to or diminished as circumstances demand - his analogy being the clothes one and the same man puts on or discards depending on the weather (fol. 155v). As he says:

'... the circumstances of time, person, age and such like may cause the old custom not to be refused absolutely as nought but to yield for just causes unto the new' (fol. 5r).

Because this process of 'yielding' or bending before the demands of change must go on in the Church, Jewel's literalist appeal to

---

1. 'But for all that, there is great difference between the commandment expressly given by God and orders set by men as ministers of God. For with the one kind, none can dispense without special licence from God; and in the other kind the heads of the church have the power in their own hands without further question to set and remove, plant and pull up, as they shall see it profitable for the present state of the church' (fol. 13r). Cf. fol. 128r; 149r.
the primitive practice is redundant, especially as he sets 'great faces ... upon (the) small and simple matters' (fol. 168v) that are amenable to alteration.

These are the types of argument Rastell uses in rejecting Jewel's antiquity-criterion; and they show the scope of his critique. Within the limits he sets himself, Rastell's complaints are incisive and telling. But of course, the field of discussion is narrow. Rastell's misgivings extend principally to his opponent's use of the argument from antiquity. Jewel's appeal to the ancient church is first of all specious and insincere. Secondly, it fails to make the necessary concessions to legitimate change. These are useful polemical points. But however pertinent to the immediate case in hand, they do little to resolve the weightier questions looming in the background: what place should the argument from antiquity hold in the verification of Christian truth?; what precisely do the statements of the Fathers witness to? - the authentic meaning of the Scriptures only, or to authoritative unwritten traditions as well?; under what conditions is an argument from patristic statements theologically conclusive?; what is the relative value of the statements of saintly Doctors and those of the ancient Church Councils?

Rastell himself was probably not the man to answer such questions. Possibly the scope of his book precluded his
attempting to do so anyway. But the point is that the confrontation with Jewel tempted very few, if any, of the exile writers into a detailed statement of principle regarding the use of the argument from antiquity. Assumptions or possible preferences on the matters mentioned above can sometimes be deduced from odd remarks that they make. And Rastell is no exception here. But the Confutation’s readiness to let important questions go a-begging is typical - not only of the English writers, but also, I suspect, of Catholic polemicists generally at this stage.

Rastell’s tendency to stand off and weigh the value of certain lines of argument does result in one clarification however. We see in the Confutation, more clearly than in Harding’s Answere, that historical argument was essentially of secondary importance to the Catholic divines. Rastell, indeed, says as much in a revealing aside, when he complains of Jewel wanting Catholics to 'hang upon the report of historiographers', as though they 'had not a church to believe' (fol. 61v).

Establishing what the primitive church believed is not necessary to discover, or even to verify, the true Christian teaching. Its truth is guaranteed by the declarations and traditions of the church. This is made explicit in the Confutation. The conclusion is there to be drawn that one looks to the past only to illustrate the consistency of the Church’s positions and to refute the errors of the heterodox. Seen
therefore, from the high-ground of Rastell's theological principles, contesting antiquity with Jewel hardly appears more than an 'exercise', if not in charitable persuasion, then in distasteful, but necessary, polemics.

3. John Martiall: "To remember the old days".

Another approach to the argument from antiquity is revealed in the work of John Martiall, A treatise of the crosse, published in 1564 and dedicated to Elizabeth by her 'loving and faithful subject' and 'true beadsman'. It is less aggressively polemical than the works of Harding and Rastell. Instead of adverting to Jewel's over-all position as both of these had done, Martiall is content to isolate one topic for discussion - a technique that some other Louvainists were also adopting at the time, partly, one suspects, because they might not have felt competent to range over too wide an area of controversy, but also in an effort to vary the attack and put added weight on some of the more sensitive matters in dispute.

This narrowing-down of the debate leads, in Martiall's case at least, to fairly constructive results. He is more successful than most of the controversialists in stating a positive case in favour of the time-hallowed religious practices. Choosing a subject made delicate for the English reformers because of the Queen's known preferences in the matter, Martiall seeks to justify the setting-up and reverencing of the cross - a custom which Jewel
had condemned, a trifle more generically, in his original challenge.  

1 The contention of the Treatyse is that:

"by sufficient authority out of the old ancient fathers it is declared, that ever since Christ suffered death upon the cross, and sanctified that holy wood with the water and blood that fell from his precious body rent upon the cross, Christian men have had the sign of the cross in churches, chapels, oratories, private houses, highways, and other places meet for the same: and that the holy fathers of the primitive church worshipped and reverenced the sign of the cross, and counselled others to do the same: and that there can be no fear nor mistrust of idolatry in Christian men having and worshipping the cross" (fol. 2r).

While seldom passing up an opportunity to berate the 'new ministers' and the 'new evangelists' of the 'new Christianity' for rejecting the ancient customs, Martiall does get beyond refutation, constructing a case for the various uses of the cross in some ten articles.

Martiall's theme is not as restricted or as inconsequential as the title of the Treatyse might suggest. In the author's parlance 'cross', or 'sign of the cross', can mean quite a number of things: day-to-day devotional practices such as blessing oneself with the sign of the cross, erecting crucifixes in churches, carrying crosses in the Rogation Day processions, and venerating supposed relics of the True Cross; but also others with deeper theological significance, like the use of the sign of the cross in the administration of the sacraments, where Martiall defends the proposition that 'no sacrament [is] made and perfited

1 Item 14: 'Or that images were then set up in the churches, to the intent the people might worship them'.
rightly and in his due order without it' (fol. 8$^r$). It is typical of Martiall that he should champion all of these customs with the same intensity and see them all as integral to true Christianity. Pious practices like venerating the crucifix (sometimes termed 'sacramentals' by others) are lumped together with the sacraments themselves in his mind under the generic heading of 'outward sign'. And running through Martiall's book is the assertion that such signs are needed to complement faith.

Faith in the merits of Christ's passion, Martiall concedes to the reformers, is indeed essential to justification. But it is not a naked faith that is required. The faith that justifies is:

'steadfast, constant, and strong, joined with charity, builded upon hope, strengthened with prayer, augmented with fasting, and assisted by the sign of the holy cross' (fol. 20$^v$).

'The sign of the cross', he says, 'must concur with faith and faith with the sign of the cross' (fol. 21$^r$). Just as God works 'by the help of men as external means', so the merits of Christ's passion are applied to us through human signs, and preeminently through the sign of the cross which, of course, symbolises that passion:

'it is Christ that worketh in the virtue and merits all the effects which shall be, or may be mentioned, but by the holy sign of his cross, as an external mean, which he must use in all our necessities, as the physician doth his medicines in sickness, and leave the rest to God' (fols. 24$^r$-$^v$).

1. Rastell calls them 'sacramental things' (Confutation, fol. 4$^r$).
One can see that it is nothing less than the whole Catholic system of religion - its reliance on ritual and its belief in efficacious sacraments, as well as its use of images like the crucifix and of religious gestures like the sign of the cross - that Martiall is defending is his treatise. His belief in the power of the cross (whether it be the wood of the cross on which Christ died, the carved crucifix in the chapel, or the sign made in blessing) is closely connected with his belief - frequently stated in the Treatyse - that the sacraments achieve an effect in the soul of the Christian, or 'contain' the grace they signify. And both are linked with a more general, and typically Catholic, conviction that the outward sign, whatever its form, contributes to devotion even more powerfully than the preached or written word. As Martiall puts it:

'an image painted in a table ... doth more stir the minds of men to virtue, than the bare letter read in book' (fol. 118v).

The merit of the Treatyse is that, while appearing to dwell on minor issues, it states and attempts to defend a truly central papist assumption about religion - an assumption which was only partly a matter of dogmatic beliefs, but which was of decisive importance in shaping the Catholic reaction to reform teaching. Martiall, it could be said, speaks for a popular religion that knows the value of signs.

Granted that Martiall adverts to the broader implications of his theme, the fact remains that he is primarily an advocate for the devotional trappings of Catholicism. And
his dedication to material symbols such as the crucifix seems to be unqualified. While acknowledging that the cross has no power independently of Christ's merits, he nevertheless speaks as if there were some inherent efficacy in the symbol itself: the holy sign of the cross is 'medicinable against all conjuration, enchantment, sorcery, and witchcraft' (fol. 108v). In fact, it is precisely because the Christian must fight, not simply against flesh and blood, but 'against the wicked spirits in the air' that he needs, in addition to faith in Christ's passion, the outward sign of the cross, 'so dreadful to all wicked spirits' (fol. 17r). This attachment to the physical symbol is accompanied by very frequent appeals to the miracles the use of the cross has wrought. Wonder stories and spurious legends proliferate in the Treatyse; and tales of dragons and their 'venomous blasts' are likely to be found alongside citations from Justinian or the early councils.

This concern for the popular forms (and even, perhaps, the superstitions) of the traditional religion naturally makes its impact on Martiall's style of advocacy. So too does the fact that he is addressing himself in the Treatyse to a relatively popular audience. He nowhere states his precise aims expressly. But they can reasonably be deduced from the type of exhortation

1. 'I attribute nothing to the sign of the cross without special relation to the merits of Christ's passion ...' (Treatyse, fol. 24r).

2. See, for instance, Treatyse, fols. 39r, 98v ff., 105r, 109r ff.
he incorporates in the book. 'All ye fathers and mothers', he urges, 'tell them the Calvinists and the Lutherans to their teeth, that they are bringing in sects of perdition, and blaspheming the way of truth' (fol. 59\textsuperscript{v}). Or again:

'if any new minister exhort you to follow him, and forsake the catholic faith of the church, I desire you as you love your own souls, flee from him, as from the angel of Satan' (fol. 71\textsuperscript{r}).

'Say unto them, the heretics, that the same that kept St. Augustine, shall keep you in the sweet bosom, and comfortable lap of the church' (fol. 163\textsuperscript{r}).

Martiall is less the academic than the missionary, addressing himself to the laity, to stiffen their resistance to those wanting to discredit devotions that were part and parcel of their everyday religion. His aim is at once to revive the people's confidence in the familiar practices and undermine the credibility of those who attack them - the 'cross crucifiers' as he calls them (fol. 35\textsuperscript{v}). If these would-be preachers of Christ's faith in fact despise his cross and the symbols and customs associated with it, then, he contends, it must follow that their handling of doctrine is suspect (fol. 87\textsuperscript{v}). The appeal would seem to be to the common folk. And Martiall's style tends to reflect this, being frequently (if not normally) exhortatory and rhetorical.

In Martiall's case, it must be conceded, the attack is not very pointedly directed at practices associated with the Settlement. That is to say, he does not subject any specific
aspect of the current English legislation to his derision, although phrases like 'cross crucifiers' point clearly enough to the class of iconoclasts he had in mind. It is not Martiall's technique to name his opponents either. But Jewel is clearly his target: 'their raging Rhetorician', whose rhetorical exclamations Martiall likes to turn against him; the man who thinks himself wiser than others in Sacred Scripture, doctors and antiquities (fol. 114v); one of 'the patchers-up of the Apology' (fol. 81r).

What best reveals Martiall's preoccupation with Jewel is the style of argumentation he adopts. The very title of the Treatyse suggests its author's readiness to match arguments with the bishop of Salisbury; and the emphasis throughout the book is heavily on the statements of the 'ancient fathers of the primitive church'. Martiall is every bit as intent on appealing to patristic authority as Harding and Rastell, but he does so differently from either of these.

He is more restrained than Harding when it comes to multiplying patristic texts in order to prove a point. Having reproduced a few passages, he is normally happy to call a halt—or, as he puts it in one place, to 'pluck down sail, cast anchor here, and rest' in the authority of the three or four authors he has cited 'as in a sure haven' (fol. 62r). Harding, of course,

1. Cf. Treatyse, fol. 162r.
is as anxious as Martiall to insist that he wants his treatise 'to be short: not long and tedious' (fol. 73v). But the disclaimer in Martiall's case is more than merely formal; and the difference, minor though it might seem, points to an interesting difference in approach. Martiall has fewer pretensions to learning than Harding: he is the 'Student in Divinity' and knows it. He is also less relentless about haring after every possible slip of Jewel's pen: he is presenting a case as well as writing to refute. And, finally, there is the point that he is discussing more popular matters than Harding, and probably with a less cultivated audience in view.

On the other hand, Martiall is a lot less discriminating than Rastell in pursuing a chosen line of argument. He is apparently committed to citing patristic statements in favour of any and every matter he raises, whether it be the propriety of carrying crosses in processions and of venerating relics, or whether he happens to be defending the primacy of the bishop of Rome. The roots of this are partly combative. Martiall is the serious and unimaginative apologist, prepared to accept his opponent's criteria for the sake of argument and then apply them, quite mechanically, on every possible occasion. But there is also a more positive basis for Martiall's appeals to antiquity. He may not have self-consciously assessed the value of such a line of argument, as Rastell could possibly be said to have done. Yet he has a general, somewhat untheological, and (one could
assume) characteristically Catholic, appreciation of the relevance of the past to the present-day Church. Where others make deliberate and self-conscious appeals to antiquity, Martiall, the popular spokesman for things catholic or traditional, appeals almost spontaneously to the views and customs of his forefathers in the faith.

Martiall's simplistic attitude to antiquity is clearly to be seen in his method of citing the fathers. His professed ambition, of course, is to be rigorous:

'\(/	\text{to cite the chapter and quote the place of the authors he refers to;}\quad \text{that each man may confer, and see from what fountain I set this sweet water, that I offer you to drink: which although I call water, yet let it nothing loath you to taste of it'}\ (\text{fol. } 9^v).\]

And, as in some of the other works coming from Louvain, the Treatyse lists the patristic authorities quoted, along with 'a true note of the time when they lived' (fols. 10rff.). But Martiall's unsophisticated treatment of his sources makes something of a mockery of these pretensions at historicity. His evidence habitually consists of statements, often of doubtful authenticity, cited after the manner of medieval auctoritates, with scarcely any advertence to context or even to those problems of interpretation and reconciliation which the scholastics themselves had adverted to. In practice Martiall treats the past as a uniform continuum: the fathers are normally assumed to have spoken 'with one uniform consent';\(^1\) and with almost alarming

\(^1\) For instance in their interpretation of Christ's promise to Peter (\text{mth. xvi}), Treatyse, fol. 141v.
naivete, Martiall asserts an uniformity of church-practice from the beginning, even with regard to devotional minutiae. The sign of the cross, he maintains, has always been used in confecting the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, from the time of Christ onwards (fol. 65\textsuperscript{v}). The reformers and 'reducers of all things to the state and order of the primitive church' are in error with regard to the sacrament of Confirmation quite simply because they have not reproduced the rites that were already in effect in apostolic times: it is not that their principle of reform is wrong, but that they have in fact 'profaned the holy ceremonies taught and used by the fathers of the primitive church' (fol. 59\textsuperscript{r}). The custom of blessing oneself was already established 'in the time of the Apostles ... and hath continued ever since' (fol. 79\textsuperscript{v}). The list could be extended. Apparently Martiall makes no concessions whatever to development, even though he is principally concerned with the area of church-discipline.

While doggedly citing the Fathers, Martiall does so, one can see, without having formulated any clear theory as to the relevance of the patristic argument - or more particularly, of an argument based exclusively on the writings of the first six centuries. He appeals to the Fathers of the early church as 'grave, virtuous, and learned men' (fol. 79\textsuperscript{v}). Their words may be 'an instruction, and sufficient warrant for us' to follow their example (fol. 128\textsuperscript{v}). Indeed, one might go so far as to say that teaching which contradicts theirs also contradicts
God's word (fol. 81V). But the fact seems to be that Martial looks on the early Fathers as adequate, yet not especially privileged witnesses to Christian truth.

There is one passage in the Treatyse where he explains why he considers the Fathers' teaching authoritative, and it is quite revealing. The Fathers, he says, knew how to discern 'verity from heresy', because

'with humility [they] made their own senses and fantasies captives to the service of Christ, and with devout prayer, holy life, and good intent, sought it [the true meaning and right sense of Scripture] of the Holy Ghost, kept themselves in the unity of the church, and were nigh the Apostles' time, when traditions and doctrines were then fresh in men's minds, and delivered as it were from hand to hand' (fol. 80r).

Martial obviously sees their proximity to the apostolic age as giving the Fathers of the first centuries some preeminence: this was a time when the traditions were fresh. But in context the real reason why Martial considers the Fathers reliable is not that, chronologically, they were in a good position to remember, but that they recognised the need to remember, listening with humility to the Spirit and entering faithfully into that process by which God meant the apostolic teaching to be retained. It is precisely this, Martial argues, that distinguishes the Fathers from the present-day reformers (fol. 80r). The chief reason why the Doctors of the primitive church must be listened to is that they taught 'not of themselves, but as they had received and learned of their forefathers' (fol. 79r).
Thus, it is from within an acceptance of an active process of 'tradition' and the reliance that the apostolic traditions are retained in the Church, that Martiall makes his appeal to the past. From his view-point the universal practice of the present-day church is its own guarantee. For the Holy Spirit presides over the Church (fol. 115r), 'teaching all truth and directing the church in all her doings' (fol. 60r) - not, however, opening men's minds to new truths, but strengthening their grasp on the true meaning of Scripture first of all, and also on those 'customs which are not written' (fol. 82r) but which Christ and the apostles meant to impose permanently on the Christian Church.

This pattern of thinking is, of course, familiar. What is striking about Martiall is the absence of any theological precisions. Phrases like 'directing the church in all her doings' faithfully reflect his approach. At no time, for instance, does he make any distinction between customs of merely ecclesiastical origin and those imposed on the church by apostolic authority, even when discussing practices like blessing oneself with the sign of the cross or erecting crosses on churches. On one occasion he remarks of a particular practice: 'this custom came of tradition' (fol. 82r). But there is no real indication that he recognised the existence of customs that were not sanctioned by tradition. Martiall merely leaves his reader with the impression that the Church must always be right, never attempting to specify the conditions under which this might be expected to be so.
This is not intended here as a criticism of Martiall, but as evidence of the broad, rather moralistic way in which he makes his appeal to the past. Standing, as he says, with Basil, Leo and Cyprian, he works from these assumptions:

'The doctrine which is preached in the church, we have partly out of the written Scripture, and partly we received of the traditions of the Apostles, brought unto us in mystery; which both have like force and efficacy to piety. And no man doth contrary to again say them, who hath any mean or simple knowledge in the laws of the church' (fols. 82 - 83).

'It is not to be doubted, but whatsoever is retained of in the church into custom of devotion, cometh either of the tradition of the Apostles, either of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost ...' (fol. 83).

One notes, once again, how unrestricted these statements are. Acceptance of the existence of an authoritative tradition leads to a blanket-acceptance of all 'the doctrine which is preached in the church'; and not only this, but of all the devotional practices 'retained of' in the Church as well. Again one hears in Martiall the voice of a devout, popular, relatively untheological Catholicism. And the same reechoes through his arguments from antiquity, for which his view of tradition forms a base.

Although the very fact that the present-day Church endorses them is sufficient guarantee of the authenticity of customs for Martiall, he can, on his view-point, confidently look to the past for verification that these same customs were practised in every age. So, an appeal to the Fathers can never
embarrass the Catholic. Moreover, it shows the right kind of piety to look to the past: Christians are faithful to the heritage bequeathed them by Christ and the apostles when they listen with humility to their forefathers in the faith. Martiall makes this point in a highly instructive passage which shows, I think, the real grounds for his conservatism and theological simplicity:

'... he [God] willing to have the glory of his name magnified for ever, and his mighty power known from generation to generation, would have us believe those that lived before us: and willeth his miracles to be declared by the father to the son, and by the son to his children, and so forth from man to man, that they may know what wonderful things he hath done ... he [God] giveth every man commandment to remember the old days, and think upon the generations and ages that be past' (fols. 111r - 112r).

'To remember the old days, and think upon the generations and ages that be past'. For Martiall, the past is to be clung to. Every period of the Church's history unequivocally corroborates the practices and teachings of the present-day institution. The doctors and teachers of the first centuries are forefathers, venerable witnesses to an unbroken tradition, speaking precisely the same truths as, say, the members of 'this last synod of Trent'. To innovate, or even to attempt to refine and abolish, is to diverge from what Martiall calls 'the king's highway' along which true Christians go by 'standing to the doctrine of our holy and most godly fathers, and observing the tradition of the catholic church in which the Holy
Ghost dwelleth' (fols. 40v - 41r).

Martiall's confident and unsophisticated appeals to the Fathers - a feature of almost every page of the Treatyse - bring us to what might be thought of as the devotional mainspring of the Louvainists' hostility to Jewel's arguments. In this work devoted to popular matters, and seemingly aimed at an unacademic audience, one can discern (perhaps more clearly than in the works of Harding and Rastell) the almost pre-theological assumption that was intrinsic to the Catholic position. Its roots lay in a total, unquestioning dedication to the Church, and with this, to the process of transmitting that same dedication from one generation to the next - fealty to God consisting, not ever in looking beyond the Church, but in serving that process which God had initiated in his church. This religiously-inspired (but, I repeat, largely untheological, or pre-theological) conservatism was, obviously, a vital ingredient in the Catholic stand, making an appeal to the past congenial, yet also imposing an uncritical and a-prioristic view of the past on the would-be Catholic apologist.
It need hardly be said that these samples do less than justice to the early works of the Louvainists on a number of important scores. They give little idea, for instance, of the variety of the tracts produced by the small, ill-equipped group of exiles; and still less of the range of arguments that they somehow managed to marshall. Nor do they convey much of the admirable spirit of these young idealists caught up in a truly tragic situation. Worse still perhaps, the samples do not include the best of their theological writing - to be found, in my opinion, in Thomas Heskyn's prolix but skilfully-constructed work, *The parliament of Chryste*, and Stapleton's *A fortresse of the faith*, both of which could lay modest claims to originality and which alone among these early productions rival the distinction of the *Apology* in their separate ways. But I think a survey of these three approaches - the apologetical (Harding), the critical (Rastell), and, for want of a better word, the popular (Martiall) - provides a suitable basis for weighing the fortunes of the argument from Christian antiquity in the corpus of early writings.

The triumph of polemics in all three of the works mentioned is obvious. And in this they are thoroughly representative of the others. It was doubtless inevitable that the first published reflexions on the Settlement from the Catholic non-conformists should emphasise its theological consequences. But it was not inevitable that they should have stated their case as negatively and as indirectly as they did. For there was a
sturdy positive basis for papist non-compliance in 1559, the bishops witnessing to it nobly, if somewhat inarticulately, by their conduct in the Parliament and elsewhere - as did the exiles themselves by theirs. But in the same way that the positive ingredients of the Catholic stand had become obscured in the wrangling and point-scoring of the Westminster Disputation, so were they kept in the background when the exiles went full chase after Jewel. The rights and wrongs of the Settlement are broached indirectly, the Louvainists coming at the Settlement only via Jewel's defence of it - which is one reason, for instance, why surprisingly little is said of the Supremacy in these early writings. The tendency is for them to define their own position, as it were, by default, simply by ranging themselves against Salisbury's extravagant claims. All the treatises - including those of Hesky, Sanders and Stapleton (which, like Martiall's, are not meant simply to be works of refutation, but aim at expounding some crucial aspect of the traditional faith) are radically coloured by the terms of Jewel's stand and are, in the last analysis, narrowly combative. This naturally helps to explain why the argument from Christian antiquity, so favoured by Jewel, assumes an overriding importance in the tracts; and why, in the main, that argument is handled merely as an apologetical device.

The frequent recourse to the argument is obvious and needs no stressing. Again, what one sees in the samples is representative. The second point, however, requires some
elaboration, namely, that in the body of Louvain writings the apologetical concern, epitomised in Harding's Answere, outweighs the critical concern (seen in Rastell's Confutation) and forces it into the background.

Rastell's misgivings about the theological value of arguing from the first six centuries exclusively are indeed shared by all his colleagues. As we have seen, even Harding himself voices them, at times quite forcibly. All the Louvainists are inclined to question the arbitrary separation of the witness of the first centuries from that of subsequent ones. They may sometimes speak of the special purity of the faith and discipline of the primitive church, as Jewel does. But they do not accept the Church of the Fathers as the sole, or even the prime arbiter of theological propriety for present-day Christians. Some of the exile divines, with Rastell, even ask whether the primitive should be considered normative in any sense, simply as it stands, given the inevitability of change, the possibility of doctrinal amplification, and the right of church-leaders to reshape ecclesiastical discipline as conditions alter. Moreover, they have one other reservation which seriously undermines the whole enterprise of seeking to demonstrate what the primitive church did or did not hold. Quite apart from the fact that some of them recognise such a demonstration to be impossibly difficult anyway, the Catholic divines emphasise the hiatus between historical proof and faith. Historical doubts or questioning cannot subvert the faith of the individual. Nor, on the social scale, can the
church's assurance of its beliefs be ever made to depend on the investigations of historians.

The strength, and the limitations, of such critical reserves are to be seen at their clearest in John Rastell's work. Rastell openly adverts to the inadequacies of using the first six centuries as a criterion, stating the case rather more boldly than his colleagues yet only voicing misgivings which they also feel. However, his critique stays close to Jewel's use of this mode of argument. Rastell does not make an issue out of the question of theological criteria. Nor, again, do any of his associates. In fact, criticism of the argument from antiquity as a mode of theological reasoning is noticeably muted. The apologetical concern prevails in practically every case. Waiving whatever reservations they might have about the value and feasibility of arguing from the primitive church, the Louvainists proceed, as Harding does, to contest Jewel's reading of the first six centuries - for the sake of argument, as it were.

This is so in spite of the fact that none of his collaborators are as narrow or as literal in their efforts to refute Jewel as Harding himself. Thomas Dorman, obviously an admirer and a protégé of Harding's, comes closest to reproducing his mentor's polemical stance. Yet even he at least isolates the major planks in Jewel's platform before attempting to demolish it, thus exerting a better measure of control over the debate. Others, in the manner of Rastell, go further than
Harding in actually contesting Jewel's assumptions. Thomas Stapleton is perhaps the most notable example of this. For not only does he aim at simplifying the controversy by reducing it to a fundamental difference in ways of conceiving the church, but in the process he launches a far more forceful theological attack on Jewel and his coreligionists than does Harding in either of his works. Other Louvainists set themselves apart from Harding by pursuing, as Martiall does, a rather more positive end. Sanders and Heskyn, for instance, meet Jewel's challenge ostensibly by setting out to provide a comprehensive doctrinal defence of the Catholic position on the Eucharist. And their efforts are supplemented by Pointz, whose Testimonies is a kind of source-book enabling readers 'to judge more uprightly and sincerely' of the ancient faith in the Real Presence. All of these works would have to be lodged in a different category from Harding's. Indeed, none of the other writers follow quite the same painstaking route as their elder associate - possibly for the obvious reason that authors like Harding, who 'will persecute the enemy so narrowly that sentence by sentence they examine his truth and fidelity', leave others precious little room for imitation.

Yet, for all the promise of variety held out by these differing styles of refutation, the over-all orientation of the Louvainists' argument remains, in the final analysis, pretty uniform indeed. The temptation to vie with Jewel for the support of the first six centuries proves irresistible in
virtually all cases. As if mesmerised by their opponent's provocation, the exiles return again and again to the questions: which discipline and which set of views prevailed in the ancient church?; which side has the support of the Fathers?; which of the opposing ideologies is 'new', and which 'ancient'? In this respect, Harding's preoccupation with what I have called the 'historical' (and with this, his apologetical stance) is typical. The critical, or 'theological', is not allowed to dominate. The only difference between the exiles on this score lies in the degree to which the first preoccupation is permitted to control the second.

The only other general observation to be made is that the pre-theological or 'popular' outlook, evidenced in Martiall's Treatyse, is an important ingredient - and perhaps even the backbone - of all the contributions. One might conceivably couch this viewpoint in doctrinal terms, identifying it, say, with a particular conception of the Church; or with a belief in a body of traditional teaching understood to complement (in some way) the Scriptures - that is, with what seem to be basic tenets of Catholicism. Yet it bears more directly on attitudes, I believe, than on doctrinal convictions as such. Rather than a distinctive view of the Church, it suggests to me a distinctive style of churchmanship, the essence of which, for the Louvainists, consists in distrusting one's own interpretation of things and consulting one's forefathers in the faith, standing fast with them, in fact, by loyally accepting and passing on the 'received
faith' as participants in a continuing process. That is, as well as the belief in a body of traditions, there is here (and it would seem to be primary) a traditionalist mentality - the antithesis, as these divines see it, of the Sola Scriptura mentality, in which there is independence of one's elders in the faith, and hence, presumption. The main-spring of the Louvainists' attitudes - those of a doctrinal kind, and their firm historical assumptions also - appears to me to reside in this particular ethic of Christian fidelity. The force of that conviction helps to explain their readiness to contest the Fathers with Jewel. Habituated to listen reverently and conform, they could only believe that the ancient Fathers were theirs.
What the tracts of the Louvainists reveal is the consolidation of the trend towards 'verification', commented on in an earlier chapter. The movement away from the traditional methods of theological refutation is by no means complete in them. But it is restrained by the polemical intent of all these writers and their preoccupation with the terms of Bishop Jewel's challenge - or, more widely, with the assured claims to 'catholicity' being made on behalf of the Settlement. One recalls the bishop of Lichfield and Coventry's remark at the Westminster Disputation:

'I never thought that they would have done so much as have named themselves to be of the Catholic Church, challenging the name as well as we'.

Something of the same consternation lies behind the readiness of the exiles to settle the historical issue of which set of practices was the more ancient.

The papist tendency to assert the support of antiquity for its own case obviously widens here into an effort at demonstration. The Louvainists devote themselves to documenting an historical case, in the way Gardiner was beginning to do in his later treatises. But again, the complexion of the challenge has

made the search for 'notable, evident and most plain places' in
the literature of the first six centuries more concentrated.
Moreover, the personality and background of the controversialists
themselves leave an evident mark on the treatises they wrote.
Allen's phrase, 'scholastical attempts', remains the best
description of them: it says something of the academic outlook,
the youthful energy, the confidence in the power of argument
and learned testimony, and also, I believe, the relative lack
of theological experience that went into the Louvainists'
painstaking accumulation of patristic evidence. Although for
different reasons, the exile scholars were as susceptible as
Jewel himself to the temptation of striving 'upon terms only'
and 'spend(ing) the time in a question not necessary' - that is
to say, of allowing the matters of pedigree and antiquity to
shoulder pertinent theological issues into the background.

It is possible that some of the Louvainists' at least
might have considered such theological issues beyond them.
Discounting the rhetoric, one often discovers in the introductions
to their works a genuine modesty about their competence as divines.
Many signed themselves 'student of divinity', and of course the
appellation was meant to be taken formally: they were currently

1. Rastell makes this remark of Jewel, Confutation, fol. 140v.
reading for theological degrees. Moreover, the translations made by Stapleton and others, and compilations like Pointz's Testimonies, suggest a certain distrust of their own abilities in theological matters. I suspect this is one reason why the enterprise of collecting texts to refute Jewel may have seemed so attractive to them: it is always easier to harvest other men's flowers than to sow one's own intellectual crops. And in most cases the theological careers of the Louvain writers were only beginning in these first years of exile.

But whether it was the result of a deliberate reticence, insensitivity, or simply the mounting pressure of polemics - which, by this time, was forcing Catholic divines everywhere into dogmatism, and rendering the exploration of positions virtually impossible - speculative doctrinal matters certainly seem to be

1. Martiall, Stapleton, Dorman, Pointz and Allen all describe themselves in this way on the title-pages of their works. The formal term is also used in the privilegia appended to the treatises: 'Sacrae Theologiae candidatus'. Regarding Stapleton, McDermott accepts the idea that he may have studied theology at Louvain under the supervision of Dr. John Ramridge (op.cit., p.73). But all the Louvainists took their theological degrees from the University of Douay: Dorman, B.D. (1565); Martiall, B.D.(1568); Allen, B.D.(1569), S.T.L.(1570), D.D.(1571); Stapleton, B.D.(1568-9?), D.D.(1571). It is interesting also to observe that the marginal note on Rastell, in the list of recusants referred to earlier, reads: 'Wilful scholar, and not learned in divinity' (Gee, Elizabethan Clergy, p.180).

2. 'Les apologistes de l'époque de la Réforme ne soumettent à une critique systématique ni leurs notions, ni leurs arguments, ni leur terminologie. La polemique est trop confuse, trop absorbante aussi, pour leur laisser ce loisir', G. Thils, Les Notes de l'Église dans l'Apologétique Catholique depuis la Réforme (Gembloux, 1937), p.2.
suppressed in the Louvain treatises. As the historical issue assumes primacy, theological reservations tend to be silenced, doctrinal uncertainties are more easily pushed aside, and there is no concentrated discussion of the theological differences between the two parties. It may not be possible to say that theology suffering because of the prominence given to the historical question. But certainly, the dominance of the latter coincides with a constriction of theological enquiry. Probably the two phenomena together signal the breakdown of constructive argument and the advent of a counter-reformation intransigence.

To illustrate the arresting of genuine theological debate one has only to instance the restraint of the Louvainists in discussing the matter of the criteria of theological verification. As I have said, they implicitly acknowledge that there are significant differences between themselves and Jewel on this score by their repudiation of his use of the first six centuries as a means of discriminating between true and false, authentic and spurious. Yet Harding's comments on this obviously-pertinent point of difference are no more than asides. Not only does he refuse to make an issue of the matter, but he renders his own position ambiguous by proceeding to use Jewel's criterion (the testimony of the first centuries) without ever indicating the precise reasons he has for considering the testimony of the Fathers important - or still less, the precise limits he sets on the value of that testimony. Quite patently
in Harding's case, concern for the historical issue causes him to gloss over the need for theological precisions as to the function of the patristic witness. And he does not expressly raise the questions associated with this: the role of Tradition, its contents and their relationship with Scripture, or even the highly-relevant matter of whether the Scriptures of the Church should be held the final arbiter of Christian truth. Clearly Harding has a stand on such topics, but it is either a covert one and has to be deduced from incidental remarks or, if it is clear, it is a position assumed without defence or explanation.¹

When the theological refutation of Jewel's position does become more explicit, as in John Rastell's treatise, the problem is still treated polemically, in the way I have indicated.² The bishop's use of the argument from antiquity is criticised, but the discussion remains one step removed from a true rebuttal of Jewel's principles and Rastell's own position is certainly not fully articulated. In one respect, the Louvainists' treatment of the problem of criteria is far less satisfactory than John Fisher's - even though the Council of Trent had stated its stand on the matter in the meantime.³ The exiles are not as forthright about broaching the question, and

their teaching remains rather more vague than Fisher's was. Paradoxical though it might be, the heightened emphasis on the testimony of antiquity obfuscates rather than clarifies the theological issues at stake in appeals to the teaching of the early Councils and the Christian Fathers.

One fault I have to find with some recent studies into the teaching of the Louvainists on the criteria-question is that they give no inkling of the limits of the exiles' advertence to the matter, and so create a somewhat false impression as to their stand. My own conclusion is that, if the Louvainists modified the traditional understanding of the patristic witness, it was because of what their widespread use of the antiquity-argument did, rather than of what they themselves may have concluded as a result of theoretical discussions.

While it is almost impossible to state boldly all that earlier theologians had expected to find in the testimony of the Church Fathers, one thing at least is reasonably clear. Classically the witness of the Fathers was held to be complementary to Sacred Scripture. That is, the Fathers were considered the privileged and authoritative interpreters of Holy Writ; and

therefore their views were appealed to as sacred and binding, especially when there was controversy as to the precise meaning of scriptural texts. If an argument from the Fathers was held to be second only in importance to an appeal to Scripture itself, it was because the two were not really dissociated. In ancient and medieval times the Fathers and Scripture were believed to coinhere in one another, and no very firm line was drawn between them. In the Louvain writers, on the other hand, at least a factual (if not an ideological) dissociation occurs; the witness of the Fathers is turned to a rather different purpose; and as a result, the role of the Fathers as interpreters of Scripture becomes obscured. The consequence is a dislocation of the traditional understanding of their role. The malady was not endemic to these earlier polemicists only. If anything, it became aggravated in the emerging counter-reform theology.

Present-day commentators normally agree that counter-reformation theology did depart from the traditional conception of the patristic witness - or, to state this in more general terms, from the traditional conception of the relationship between Church and Scripture - some adding the rider that this development took place in spite of the Council of Trent, whose decree on 'The Sacred Books and the Traditions of the Apostles'

(1546) was, they claim, widely misconstrued at the time. The part played by the Louvainists in this phenomenon, however, is open to some debate.

Looking at the problem in the broadest of terms, Fr. Tavard reaches some conclusions that are relevant. His interest is in the build-up of an antinomy between 'Holy Church' and 'Holy Writ' in Catholic circles, a process that he sees beginning well in advance of the Council of Trent, and which he agrees was accelerated by the Reformation controversies. Among the Louvainists he finds two shades of opinion: writers like Stapleton (who 'embodies the spirit of the Counter-Reformation at its purest') take the 'reactionary' view, adhering to the 'dualistic conception' of Church and Scripture; others like Harding (whose 'mind is not entirely at home in the Counter-Reformation') are more 'moderate' and stand for the close association of Church and Scripture. These latter, Tavard says,

---

1. This is the central point in Tavard’s *Holy Writ or Holy Church*. He did, however, concede in a later article that some of the post-Tridentine writers did not adhere to the doctrine of two distinct sources of revelation as unequivocally as he had previously claimed, "Tradition in Early Post-Tridentine Theology", *Theological Studies*, XXIII (1962), esp. pp.402-3.

For the view that Trent did not intend to present Scripture and Tradition as distinct sources, see J. R. Geiselmann, "Das Konzil von Trient über das Verhältnis der Heiligen Schrift und der nicht geschriebenen Traditionen", in *Die Mündliche Überlieferung*, ed. M. Schmaus (Munich, 1957), pp.123-60; *Die Heilige Schrift und die Tradition* (Freiburg, 1962), esp. pp.91ff.
'perpetuate, with the occasional bitterness and resentment fostered by persecution, the Henrician doctrine for which Gardiner had previously fought. Their kinship is with Schatzgeyer in Pre-Tridentine Germany and with the minority opposition at the Council of Trent.'

Indeed, one of the ironies of the controversy is that their views are remarkably close to those of Jewel himself:

'It is at times hard to perceive any difference between the doctrine of some of the Recusants and that of some of the Anglicans. Apart from his assignment of only six centuries to the valid Catholic unanimity and continuity, John Jewel's conception of Scripture and his regard for the Fathers are amazingly near to those of his arch-adversary, Thomas Harding'.

What I would challenge principally in this survey is the implied contention that the Louvain writers had firm views to expound on that aspect of the Church-Scripture question which Tavard alludes to; and his claim that they separated into two parties on the issue. The presence of conflicting trends in the Louvainists' tracts can be established. But Tavard leaves one with the impression there was debate among these divines; that positions were consciously chosen, and then uniformly adhered to by those who adopted them. Whereas in fact there is remarkably little discussion of the relationship between church-tradition and Scripture in the works I have been considering. Moreover, there is absolutely no recognition of any dichotomy between the type of thinking that Tavard calls 'reactionary' and that labelled 'moderate', for indeed, statements that support both can be found

in one and the same work.

As they stand, Tavard's firm distinctions are misleading. Instead of differentiating authors, it might be more profitable to differentiate between the periods of the Louvainists' works, for after all, it is the Latin tracts of the mature Stapleton that Tavard contrasts with Harding's *Confutation* of 1565. One may grant that the 'reactionary' counter-reformation attitudes were maturing in the early Louvain treatises. But the distinction that now has to be made is not one between authors, but between the stage when views on church-tradition were very much in a state of flux and the stage when positions were beginning to crystallise and the 'dualistic' conception was gaining an explicit acceptance.

It is to the earlier phase that the books we have been discussing belong. Although written some two decades after Trent's decree on church-tradition, they are surprisingly free of hard-and-fast theological pronouncements on this subject. The views Tavard describes as antithetical are to be found rubbing shoulders in the same work, without any apparent embarrassment. And given the absence of discussion, and the practical grounds on which these seemingly-irreconcilable principles are normally invoked, it would be pointless to distinguish between reactionaries and moderates at this stage. Yet one senses the Church-Scripture dichotomy emerging - not, however, as a result of explicit theological discussion (in the way Fr. Tavard seems to suggest it did), but
as the accompaniment of a new kind of practical emphasis on the
Fathers, itself the outcome of controversy, and of controversy
over antiquity in particular. It would appear that the
'dualistic conception' of church-tradition and Scripture which
Tavard and others rightly identify with counter-reformation
theology owed as much to what was being done by controversialists
as it did to the formal discussions of divines.

If one examines the early tracts one finds plenty of
incidental remarks that acknowledge the classical association of
the Fathers and Scripture. And this applies not only to the
works of the so-called 'moderates' - Sanders, Heskyn, Dorman and
Harding - but to Stapleton's Fortresse also, and the works of
Rastell, Martiall, Aalen and Pointz as well. 'Cleaving to the
Scriptures, and the ancient fathers of Christ's church' is a
familiar formula in the recusant writings,¹ and the logic of this
association is frequently enough explained in passing. There is
a substantial uniformity between the views of the Fathers and the
teaching of Scripture: 'They are not wont to be contrary to the
word of God', says Sanders; and ideally, one should propose no
interpretation of Scripture that is not sanctioned by 'some holy
writers of the antiquity'.²

1. Dorman, Proufe, fol. 35v.
2. Sanders, Supper, fol. 48r. Cf. fol. 42r. While granting that
the authority of the Fathers was greater than that of others,
Sanders insists on the superior, divine authority of the
Scriptures; and is more interested in contesting Holy Writ with
Jewel than in appealing to patristic testimony, fols. 50v, 54-
55, 58r.
See also Allen, Defense, fols. 55v, 92r, 97r - 97v, 273r;
Heskyn, Parliament, Sig. G iiiii.
In point of fact, the suggestion seems to be that it is the holiness of the ancient Fathers that guarantees this correspondence. When we build, Sanders argues, we call in a carpenter to counsel us. In the same way, to judge wisely of things divine we need to consult the holy doctors of the Church, for 'not only are they cunning by long labour bestowed upon the science of divinity', but they

'so virtuously used themselves, that they have been abundantly instructed in all knowledge by marvellous inspirations of the holy Ghost'.

It is because their opponents know the ancient Fathers are saints in heaven that they pretend to have the first six hundred years on their side. The exiles apparently believe that the conformity of the patristic witness with Scripture is a divinely-ordained phenomenon, a kind of miracle of Providence, with the Fathers as it were 'inspired' by God to understand Holy Writ. Heskyn mentions the wonder of finding the Fathers of the East and West 'so expounding the Scripture as though they had been in one time, and had conspired upon one sense and understanding'. And Pointz elaborates: just as the Holy Ghost is responsible for the Scriptures, so He 'hath inspired also the holy doctors of the Church marvellously to consent as well in their expositions made upon those special places of Holy Writ'.

1. Sanders, Supper, fol. 311v.
2. Heskyn, Parliament, Sig.Ø v.r.
3. Pointz, Testimonies, fol. 3r. Cf. Sanders, Supper, fols. 50r - 50v: 'The Fathers when they agree in any one article are known to have the Spirit of Christ, and they bear witness that we have rightly expounded the holy Scriptures'.
Clearly, these divines are hearking back to the classical ideas of the Fathers' role. And of course, they formally subscribe to the notion - strongly affirmed by St. John Fisher in the early English debates - that it is to the Fathers one should turn when controversies as to the meaning of Scripture arise. Moreover, they work on this principle to a limited degree at least. That is to say, it is in the context of their attempting to explain a particular scriptural text that they sometimes bring forward the testimony of certain Fathers. Among others, Sanders does this quite frequently. And Heskyn more or less adopts this practice as a consistent technique of demonstration.

But in practice these remnants of the classical conception are fast being negated by the particular style of pleading that is going on. When two sides say to one another:

'Let the doctrine of the received Fathers ... decide the controversy that is betwixt us. If I bring not more sound antiquity to confirm my truth than you can avouch for maintenance of your error ... the shame be mine'.

2. V.g. Sanders, *Supper*, fols. 100r⁴ff. Charging Jewel with 'the abuse and contempt of the authority and doctrine of the holy Fathers', Heskyn brings them forward 'in couples', Greek and Latin, to show the true interpretation of the Scriptures, although he uses the testimony of later writers as well as that of the ancient Fathers.
then the traditional criteria are being turned to a rather new purpose. In practice at any rate (whatever theoretical reservations these divines might have in their minds), the Fathers are being used as an independent principle of verification: it is 'the doctrine of the received Fathers' that 'decides'. Instead of wanting to hear in the testimony of the Fathers echoes of the scriptural teaching, one is attuned to a different kind of correspondence - especially in the case of the Catholic writers, for reasons I shall mention in a moment. One is now asked to focus on the factual correspondence between the testimony of the Fathers and the teaching of a later age, so that the prized epithet, 'ancient', can be claimed for this teaching. As a result, the sayings of the Fathers are now treated as so much historical evidence. The Fathers are called on to witness to the existing state of affairs in the church of their time. Chrysostom is used, for instance, to demonstrate that the priests of his time said Mass when none did communicate.¹ Or Origen is appealed to to 'help us to the usage of his time and church'.² The idea of 'the Fathers bearing witness to the belief of the people'³ of their particular age is, in practice, taking over from the classical one. And although these divines would still in principle, have espoused the classical idea, the type of argumentation they favoured was encouraging a forgetfulness of it.

1. Dorman, Proufe, fol.93v. Cf. fol.21r.
2. Allen, Defense, fol.164r.
3. Sanders, Supper, fol.322r.
The movement towards dissociation of Fathers and Scripture was especially pronounced in the case of the Romanist controversialists, because where Jewel was using the Fathers as a kind of cloak for a 'Scripture only' principle of verification, the patristic argument, in the Papists' hands, was really a veiled appeal to the authority of the Church - or at least, to the authority of someone other than one's self - and to the authority of custom.

It is probably best to see this as a difference in concrete emphases rather than of express doctrine at this stage. Acquiescence in the contrasting of Scripture and Church as the final principles of authority may have characterised later phases of the controversy between Anglicans and Catholics. But that point had not been reached in the works we have been discussing. The contrast sometimes seems to be coming to the surface, as when Rastell differentiates between the Catholic who ever speaks 'after the voice of the Church' and the heretic who 'babbleth only after the letter of the book'; or when he speaks of reformers leaving the Church in order to cleave to the Scripture only. ¹

In context, however, Rastell's real concern (and that of his colleagues also) is with the dangers of private judgment. What he deplores is interpreting Scripture according to one's 'private sense' only, in 'neglect of all kind of tradition'. ² Moreover,

---

1. Rastell, Confutation, fols. 8v, 42r.
2. Rastell, Confutation, fols. 10v, 165r.
at this point the controversialists even explicitly resist the contrasting of Scripture and Church, for it was being used by their opponents as the basis for a popular kind of argument which ran: 'we should believe God's word (the Scripture) in preference to man's (the declarations of the Church)'. Rejecting this dilemma, Allen, for instance, reverts to the classical association of Scripture and Church:

'Whereby you see, we must not now reason, whether we ought to believe the doctors or the Scriptures better, but whether for the true sense [of the Scriptures], we must not believe the old fathers better than these new fools'.

As I have said, the doctrinal dissociation was by no means clear-cut. It was practical emphases that were subtly conditioning Papists to accept it.

In their actual argumentation the Catholic polemicists were putting more and more weight on the custom of the Church as the best interpreter of Scripture. And the Louvainists' appeals to the Fathers are very often a covert appeal to this criterion. Sanders, at the very beginning of his work, insists on joining the use and custom of the people of God to the interpretation of Scripture. The Church's practice, says Allen, is 'the best construer of God's word'.

1. Allen, Defense, fols. 273v-274r.
2. Sanders, Supper, fol. 1r. Cf. fol. 322r.
in discipline and teaching, according to Stapleton, is 'the only true trial and touchstone of the right interpretation and meaning of God's holy word'.\(^1\) 'Custom', for Martiall, is the 'increaser, confirmer, and observer of faith'; and 'traditions are not so lightly to be passed upon, or cast away as our new masters make men believe'.\(^2\) The English divines make much of the apostolic traditions present in the Church. And without having any firm criteria for enumerating them, or for differentiating them from less-authoritative ephemeral traditions of merely ecclesiastical origin, they are drawn increasingly, in practice, to defend all inherited customs as binding. Working within this intellectual frame-work, they naturally see the witness of the Fathers to the customs of their times as particularly relevant to the defence of the present-day institutions which the reformers were repudiating. And by appealing to the Fathers in these terms, as historical witnesses to 'tradition', they equivalently erect them into authorities that are independent of Scripture.

But if the increased emphasis on 'verification' had the effect of suppressing discussion on certain key theological issues - and also (if I am correct) of working partly-unsuspected changes on the attitudes of divines - it also left its mark on theological methods. For one obvious product of the apologetical concern for antiquity was that divines were becoming embroiled in

---

1. Stapleton, Fortresse, fol. 6\(^r\).
2. Martiall, Treatyse, fol. 82\(^r\).
the establishing of historical facts. This represented a change, and a significant one. 'The historical preoccupation', it has been said, 'was habitually absent from the medieval theological horizon, as no attacks were then drawing attention to the ancient past in order to justify the present'. ¹ Theologians of earlier ages took it for granted that the past supported them. It was only rarely in medieval times that controversialists were led to scrutinise the testimony of antiquity in order to establish a particular case: the major instances would be the debates over investiture in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and the 'Filioque' controversies with the East.² Now historical questions were being raised on an unprecedented scale, and indeed were assuming a central importance in the theology that grew out of the Catholic reaction to the Reformation.

This was more than a case of a new dimension being added to theological enquiry. There was even the likelihood of history supplanting the traditional activities of the theologue. For while the Louvain writers are to be found insisting that faith cannot be made to 'hang upon the reports of historiographers',³ and no doubt would have contended that their attempts at historical proof were merely illustrations or verifications of truths that

³. Rastell, Confutation, fol.61v.
faith dictated (and that, as such, they were of secondary importance only to theology), we have seen them virtually suspending theological criticism in order to contest the historical facts with their opponents. And not only this, but in so eristic a setting there was even less place for the detached enquiry and speculation that had characterised the best theological work of the past. To take an example: tracts on the Eucharist were now conceived very narrowly. They no longer taught their readers to wonder, or marvel at the congruities of the Divine Plan. Instead, they 'proved' the truth of the Real Presence or some other doctrine in dispute, more often than not by showing these to have been the 'ancient' faith.

And yet the very preoccupations which brought historical questions to the fore also militated against the emergence of a critical historical spirit in the theologian. For in spite of the intense unprecedented scrutiny of Christian antiquity that was going on, the scholarly gains won by the humanists were fast being jeopardised by the apologists. Where the former studied the authors of the past with some sense of kinship, the latter simply used them. They show, it is true, some sensitivity to the historical situation of the ancient Fathers, especially when it suits their polemical purposes to appeal to historical differences. In 'the innocency and perfect simplicity of those days', they say, the doctors sometimes used different terms from later writers; also circumstances may have forced them into extreme statements from time to time, and so
their meaning has to be deduced. Again, the apologists concede certain questions of interest to later ages had not arisen in the primitive church. But on such occasions they will turn to reflecting on what Basil and Jerome would have said if ... and silences are made eloquent.

The Fathers are habitually canvassed on questions that did not concern them. 'Proofs' tend to become collections of assorted precedents, with 'sayings' assumed to be adequate summaries of a Father's thought, and a number of them taken as evidence of an over-all consensus. Random statements of the ancients are multiplied without advertence to background;

1. Dorman, Proufe, fols. 80r-81r, 103r.

2. Sanders, Supper, fols. 13r, 317ff.; Dorman, Proufe, fols. 56v, 80r, 86r. Stapleton, in rejecting Jewel's use of the first six centuries as a criterion, says: 'Again these six hundred years they were bold to admit, because they hoped, little would be found against them clear and open in those times. To this they were moved with divers reasons. First the great persecutions of the primitive church was the cause that few books were written. Then the sundry spoils and wastes of libraries in and since that time, much more the late negligence of many hath been the cause that many of those few were lost. Thirdly Christian cities being that time stuffed yet with heathen, Jews and heretics, every mystery was not opened in pulpit, nor committed in writing to the posterity. Last of all divers of these controversies now in hand being in those years never heard of, and therefore the Fathers or Councils having no occasion to speak of them, protestants conceived a great confidence in their cause, that little or nothing could be brought against them', Fortresse, fol. 67v.

3. V.g. Dorman, Proufe, fols. 2v, 59v.

4. V.g. Sanders, Supper, fols. 48v ff., 312v ff.; Dorman, Proufe, fols. 54v ff.
discussions of context are normally occasioned only by controversy - and the technique is still essentially the medieval one of citing and 'expounding' authorities. That is to say, the Louvainists begin, as the medieval theologians did, with the confidence that the testimony of the past is uniform; they show much the same unquestioning acceptance of the worth of any one 'word' of the venerable Fathers, sure that that word alone is evidence of the sacred inviolable tradition; and when confronted with difficulties or apparent contradictions arising out of the patristic texts, they equivalently take as their motto the scholastic rule-of-thumb, _Non sunt adversi, sed diversi_, explaining such inconsistencies away with the broadest (and often, the most tendentious) of reasoning. The pressure of debate makes it difficult for them to concede the possibility of error in the Fathers. And it also encourages an a-priori approach to historical facts. In short, many of the very abuses which the humanists had deplored in the scholastics begin to reappear in the writings of the apologists, though the latter are now frankly confronting historical questions.

1. See, for instance, Dorman's explanation of the statements of Gregory and John Chrysostom relating to private Mass, _Proufe_, 102 ff. Controversy causes some advertence to context, however rudimentary and tendentious.

2. While admitting there can be differences of opinion among the Fathers in respect to details, Sanders seems to hold that they could not have been mistaken (on major issues?), or even uncertain, _Supper_, fols. 3ª, 43ª. Stapleton also criticises his opponents for saying the Fathers erred, _Fortresse_, fols. 40ª ff., 67ª. Cf. fol. 42ª.

There is even something worse than a regression in historical sensitivity here, for learning is frequently abused in these polemical works. Historical techniques are not entirely ignored. The most rigorous standards of criticism can be appealed to when it comes to proving that their opponents have 'mangled' the sacred histories and misconstrued the statements of the fathers. At other times they will be conveniently overlooked. Earlier discussions of the authenticity of certain texts, for instance, are quite consciously put aside if passages in them afford some polemical advantage to the exile divines. A double standard applies, at least in the more grossly polemical writings. The same is not necessarily true of counter-reform theology generally. But the fact remains that there could be little scope for unfettered criticism in works that set out to defend pre-established conclusions. If they contributed to the emergence of an historical sense, it was only, as I have said, indirectly.

The impact of polemical tracts like those of the Louvainists on Catholic methods of teaching and writing theology was considerable however. As is well known, the system of imparting a knowledge of divinity via commentaries on Peter Lombard's Books of Sentences came under fire from the humanists

1. See esp. Sanders, Supper, fols. 422ff. Cf. fols. 4v, 90r. Also Dorman, Proufe, fols. 41ff., 46, 66v, 92, 101ff.
2. V.g. Dorman, Proufe, fol. 82r.
early in the sixteenth century. Quite apart from the issues of style and subject-matter, there was the complaint that the scholastic commentaries obscured the true source of theological learning. In a debate that had a kind of symbolic significance for the rest of the century, Erasmus and James Latomus of Louvain had argued, in the twenties, over the 'method of conveniently arriving at the true theology'. The battle was about priorities. For Erasmus the works of the Fathers were rivers of gold, and those of the dialecticians muddy rivulets: the ancients must be explored first. Latomus, on the other hand, considered the theology of the Fathers obscure and inchoate: the place to begin one's studies was in the writings of the great scholastics, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure and Alexander of Hales. Roughly speaking, the point of view of Erasmus later became that, not only of the eirenici and those who hoped for some kind of compromise with the reform movement, but also of some of those controversialists who were most actively engaged in combating the reformers - and even (in a very limited sense, admittedly) of those who were working for a revival of scholasticism from within, like the theologians of Salamanca. Against them stood the forces of conservatism, represented by the divinity faculties in universities like the Sorbonne and Louvain.\(^2\)

1. This was the title of Erasmus' treatise, *Ratio seu methodus compendio perveniendi ad veram theologiam*. On the debate, see E. A. Ryan, *The Historical Scholarship of Saint Bellarmine* (New York, 1936), pp.43ff.; and for the situation at Louvain, R. Guelluy, "L'evolution des méthodes théologiques à Louvain d'Erasme a Jansénius", *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XXXVII (1941), pp.31ff.

This is not the place to survey the course of this controversy; but some idea of its outcome may be drawn from a rather unlikely source: the famous *Spiritual Exercises* written by St. Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits, in mid-century. Ignatius' distinction between those he terms 'the positive doctors' (meaning, in this context, the great Christian Fathers - Jerome, Augustine, Gregory and others) and 'the scholastics' points to the two alternate ways of studying theology that men of this period were beginning to recognise. To use the titles that were later to become standard: there was a 'positive theology' (one based principally on a scrutiny of the 'sources', or loci, of theology), and a 'scholastic', or speculative, one. Not surprisingly, the Jesuit has a good word to say for both: a reading of the positive doctors moves the heart to love God, and to serve Him, whereas the scholastics 'define and declare' the things necessary for salvation. But for the purposes of study, Ignatius' preference goes to the latter: their teaching is the more appropriate to the needs of the time.  

This verdict foreshadows the type of compromise that was eventually reached in the major schools of theology. Scholasticism was not dethroned, but Aquinas' *Summa* replaced the *Sentences* as the basic text for theologues and, under the circumstances, this represented a certain concession to those advocating change. Just as significantly, the need for making

---

use of the texts of the Fathers for controversy with reform divines was acknowledged. Chairs in what might be called polemical theology were established in a number of the major faculties of Europe - even Louvain - and with this developed at least a pragmatic handling of the ancient Christian literature. This was a far cry from what Erasmus had hoped for of course. And yet the sum of these innovations was that an historical perspective had at least been imperfectly added to the theology of the schools; and the technique of what I have called 'verification' became a standard part of Catholic theological method. In the long run the theology being taught even in conservative centres like Paris, Louvain and Rome at the end of the sixteenth century was markedly different from the theology of the late medieval schools. And the change owed a great deal to the efforts of scholars like the Louvain exiles.

Although we are told that Robert Bellarmine was profoundly influenced by the work done by the Louvainists, it is hardly possible to claim that the books we have been considering

1. A course in Controversial Theology was being given in 1568 at Louvain by Robert Malcot (Ryan, op.cit., p.56). But the most famous move in this direction was taken at Rome by the Jesuits, in their Collegio Romano. A chair of Controversies was established there in 1576, Robert Bellarmine being the first incumbent. The idea was that students from the German, and later, the English Colleges would be trained in the refutation of heresy, R. G. Villodlada, Storia del Collegio Romano dal suo inizio (1551) alla soppressione della Compagnia di Gesu (1773)(Rome, 1954), pp.72f.

fed directly into moves towards a 'positive' theology. The fact that they were in the vernacular would make any such suggestion suspect. However, their treatises exemplify - and indeed, probably provide an extreme example of - the trend in this direction. It is likely, too, that the English divines themselves would have been very much behind a theology that paid more attention to the Fathers than to the scholastics.

It is worth remembering that as early as 1535 the Sentences had been replaced, not by Aquinas, but by the Scriptures themselves, as the basic text for theological studies at Oxford.¹ The conservative-minded Papists may not have entirely approved; but this was the environment they sprang from. At Louvain in the early sixties the struggles between those who advocated a positive theology attuned to the needs of the time and the supporters of scholasticism were still far from unresolved. Just a few years previously, Philip II himself had recommended to the divinity faculty that it consider adopting a more suitable text than the Sentences, giving as his reason the fact that the current controversies demanded a deeper knowledge of the testimony of the ancient authors.² The faculty rejected the proposal, but some of its members were very strong advocates of a theology oriented around the Fathers.

¹. It was only in 1596 that the Sentences were replaced as the basic text at Louvain; and in 1600 that revisions of a similar kind were made at the Sorbonne.
Michael Baius, a member of the delegation to the Council of Trent which had presented the petition for Elizabeth's excommunication on behalf of the English exiles, was the most prominent of these. His belief was that the teachings of the reformers could best be countered by setting aside the scholastics and returning to the Scriptures and the ancient Doctors. 'I endeavoured', he said, in a letter written to Cardinal Simonetta in 1569,

'to bring theology back to Holy Scripture and the writings of the Fathers, those at least who still enjoy some credit with the heretics: Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Leo, Prosper, Gregory, and the like'.

It is likely that the sympathies of the Louvainists were with Baius in this attitude at least, although some of them would later oppose his theological opinions on other matters. We know, for instance, that a number of his works were in Harding's library; and it is said that one of the reasons why certain of the exiles first opposed the establishment of a college at Douay was that they objected to the 'scholastical theology' being taught at the university there.


2. De Vocht, art.cit., p.238. De Vocht believes it is 'almost certain that the Louvain faculty of theology exercised a great influence on the English apologetical school' (art. cit., p.239).

A number of obvious factors separate the early works of the Louvain exiles from the typical products of counter-reformation theology - the style of dogmatising which grew out of the Tridentine reaction and crystallised its spirit, and which is best exemplified in the treatises of a Robert Bellarmine. For one thing, the interests of the English divines are parochial by comparison with Bellarmine's. They may touch on a wide assortment of topics, but their treatment of them is normally particularised and local, being aimed simply at one set of claims. With only one or two exceptions, they display a noticeable reluctance to abandon ad hoc polemics in favour of full-scale theological refutation.

With writers like Robert Bellarmine, and even Thomas Stapleton in his later Latin works, the debate between Catholics and their opponents is systematised, and differences are reduced to matters of principle.¹ One finds no more than the beginnings

¹. The English divine, William Whitaker, commented (in 1588) on the 'largeness' with which Bellarmine discussed matters in controversy, Brodrick, op.cit., vol.1, pp.139-40. This, in fact, was Bellarmine's stated aim: to systematize and unify. '... exstant hodie de singulis ferme controversiarum capitibus variorum auctorum plurimae eaeque doctissimae, et (quod necesse erat) longissimae disputationes ... Quapropter post insignium virorum doctissimos labores, id etiam desiderari videbatur, ut controversiae omnes in unum quasi corpus redigerentur, certaque ratione ac via ita proponerentur et explicarentur, ut parvo tempore, facili sumptu, nec magno labore, ex uno armamentario, qui vellent, arma peterent, quibus utcunque saltem instructi, sine magno suo periculo adversus hostes in acie starent', Disputations ... De Controversiis Christianae Fidei, adversus huius temporis haereticos (Ingolstadt, 1586), preface to the reader. This enterprise of course grew out of Bellarmine's lecturing in Rome to students from many countries.
of this in the Louvainists' contributions. In fact it is observable only in Stapleton's *Fortresse*, where a contrast between Catholic and Protestant conceptions of the church is hesitantly advanced as a necessary starting-point for any debates between the two parties. Also, what has not quite emerged in these English works of the middle sixties is the clear acknowledgment of the fact of ecclesiastical schism — in spite of the *Apology*, where Jewel was in effect campaigning to make this fact plain and have it accepted.

Though their outlook on this point has to be deduced from odd comments and their general approach, the Louvainists appear loath to recognise the existence of competing churches in their apologetics. Taking particular tenets of their opponent's case, they try to uphold the charge of heresy with regard to them. Only rarely does one find these early works systematising their polemics in the way the classical counter-reform treatises do, by depicting the conflict as a competition between opposing 'bodies' for the title of 'true church', or exponent of 'the only true Christianity'.

1. Stapleton's *Fortresse* takes as its starting-point the question of whether or not the Church has erred, with the author contrasting the Protestant and Catholic answers to that question, see fols. 8 ff.

2. Stapleton, while concerned principally with heresy (his theme is to show that his opponents 'depart from the faith first planted among us Englishmen', *Fortresse*, fol. 3r), has reached the stage of contrasting what he and his opponents stand for as 'religions' (fol. 7). Sometimes his statements foreshadow the notion of competing 'churches': 'papistry is only the true church of Christ' (fol. 17); he prays that 'we may all say one thing, that there be no schism nor division among us...' (fol. 8).

Sanders makes this statement: Luther achieved some good, for
removed from framing an apologetic around such a dilemma. They are not yet prepared to argue as if the break between the English church and the church of Rome were definitive. What they oppose principally is the heterodoxy of the ministers and governors of the English church, treating the differences still, one might almost say, as an internal church matter.

Such characteristics as these remind us of the distance between the vernacular treatises of the middle sixties and the more rigorous works of polemics that were appearing by the end of the century. But there is a continuity to be observed; and specifically, the trend towards 'verification' and the emphasis on historical argument feed unmistakably into the new theological methods that were beginning to take shape in Catholic circles. 1

Now 'two bodies are made, one of Catholics, another of the Protestants'; the Church is marvellously purged, whereas previously the evil were mixed with the good (Supper, fol. 13v).

Some also acknowledge the contribution made by Bellarmine, see Y. De Montcheuil, "La Place de Saint Robert Bellarmin dans la Théologie", in Mélanges Théologiques (Paris, 1951), pp.136f. The effect of the works of the earlier controversialists should, I think, be more widely acknowledged.
CONCLUSION

Edmund Burke once described the 'principle of reference to antiquity' as the oldest orthodoxy in English politics. The same thing could obviously be said, with even greater conviction, of the Christian religion. It was a system based on historical happenings; the standards of its founder, as reproduced by his personal emissaries in the pages of the New Testament, were always understood to be definitive; and the technique of judging truth and falsehood by an 'ipse dixit ...' was established practice in its theology, quite literally from the very beginning.

Yet for English sovereigns and Christian divines alike, antiquity as such was not always alluded to explicitly as a criterion of the valid enactment. There was a progress towards what might be called 'self-consciousness' in this respect. It is possible to be tolerant without knowing or saying one is so; and even more, without feeling it necessary to prove that one is so. In much the same way, concern for ancient law and primitive standards could be a vital and spontaneous ingredient of an institution's existence, and be no less real for remaining unreflective. Even into medieval

times it was only at certain points that theologians and lawyers resorted to pleading the antiquity of a case - and then it was normally the outcome of controversy of some kind. Of course the testimony of the past and ancient precedent were constantly being invoked. But authority was the staple of all demonstration; and it was as auctoritates, and not simply in their capacity as ancients, that the Church Fathers and others were appealed to.

During the sixteenth century, however, the situation changed markedly. In religion, the very terms of Luther's challenge to the Church forced an advertence to the status of the traditional authorities into the minds of theologians, and this would never afterwards be lost. Also, the subsequent emergence of a variety of stable Christian churches gave an unprecedented importance to the problem of verification. But as well as this, habits of mind were changing. Men looked on the past with a new-found sense of distance from it, and also with a relish for purity that had been squandered. Ideas of a 'return' to the better features of earlier times were more widespread than ever before. And, for a time at any rate, 'antiquity' emerged from being something that was assumed and unconsciously prized to become an ideal, a token of authenticity, a title to be jealously claimed - and even, in the last analysis, laboriously defended.

The England of 1559 witnesses in quite a remarkable way to this development. All parties closely involved in the
Elizabethan Settlement - the Queen herself and those who framed her legislation, the theological spokesmen for the new measures, and of course their opponents, both the Marian prelates and the younger papist exiles - attempt to make a case for the antiquity of their own position. Their dominant reasons for doing so have been examined in the course of the preceding pages; and I have attempted to summarize the results in the titles of the various chapters.

A consistent theme in the study has been the effect which this unrelenting recourse to the testimony of the early church had on the English reformation-debates. I note the emergence of what I have called 'the historical question', and the movement from theological 'refutation' to 'verification'. Others have described this change rather more boldly than I. Looking at it against a far wider background, Owen Chadwick observes that 'The centre of theological gravity was shifting from the Bible into the field of ecclesiastical history', and he explains:

'The Reformers, in appealing from the contemporary ecclesiastical authorities to the Bible and the Church of the first three, or the first six, centuries, had implicitly appealed to fair historical investigation. The defenders of the Counter-Reformation, on their side, needed history not only as a weapon and a shield, needed Annals / i.e. of Baronius / to set against Centuries / i.e. of Flacius Illyricus /; they needed common ground with the Protestants if they were to argue with them. They could find a bridge for communication and debate neither in the Bible ... nor in the decisions of ecclesiastical authority ... But the bridge, the common ground, they could find in the scholarly study of antiquity. The Counter-Reformers could sustain their argument from tradition only if sufficient evidence
from antiquity could be discerned to favour it. Upon the evidence of antiquity, therefore, both sides were prepared to reason and to listen. It was not surprising that eminent Catholic scholars from Melchior Cano to Mabillon put ecclesiastical history in the van of theological study.¹

Thils and Polman, on the other hand, speak of a change from dogmatics to apologetics.² The terminology largely depends on how far one's eyes are travelling into the future. Seen from the viewpoint of seventeenth-century developments (and those in Catholic theology in particular), the changed orientation that I speak of does anticipate an increased emphasis on ecclesiastical history.³ From the vantage-point of a later period still it would be equally feasible to say that it heralds the advent of apologetics - that is, those efforts to demonstrate the credibility of the Catholic religion from reason which were so favoured in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries.

Concerned more with its genesis (and only in the English debates), I have tentatively located the emergence of this change in the later writings of Gardiner and Cranmer, while

stressing the even greater emphasis placed on the historical issue in the early controversies of Elizabeth's reign - particularly with the Apologia, and the works of the Louvainists which contested Jewel's challenge. Although never entirely separated from strictly theological discussions, the matter of establishing the identity of sixteenth-century practice with that of the ancient church dominated the argument of these treatises. And even in the short term, this concern for historical verification had notable, and sometimes unexpected effects on the orientation of religious debates.

A. G. Dickens has made the remark that 'From Colet to Bale, to Foxe, to Hooker, the progress of Reformation thought is coupled with a steady enrichment of historical perception and method'. In one sense this is perfectly true. Yet it is also obvious that the kind of polemics that developed between the Reformers and their opponents often retarded such progress in both parties. One would anticipate, for instance, that the new interest in the historical question might further the use of critical methods, and lead to better assessments of the facts of antiquity and of the opinions of the Fathers. Indirectly, and over a long period, it may have done so. But the immediate effect of the large claims to conformity with the primitive church was often, I think, to abuse and distort the gains that

a few generations of humanist scholars had made.

Another fact emerges from the study, and it is probably less surprising: the new interest in historical questions was accompanied by a noticeable reluctance to explore the theological issues separating the two parties. This suggests to me that the divines' recourse to the argument from antiquity was itself symptomatic of the break-down of constructive (and even, perhaps, normal) theological debate between them. The contest over titles was, in part, a substitute for real argument, and a token of the heightening intransigence apparent now on all sides.

Finally, one might well draw from the preceding pages the conclusion that, in this particular sixteenth-century debate at least, the arguments did not really match the issues. The appeal to antiquity, as we have seen, meant something slightly different to all the parties who used it. And more than this, it camouflaged the differences, including the more significant ones. The two major groups in the debate favoured the antiquity-criterion partly because they found it was compatible with their own most basic principles: for one side 'antiquity' was a synonym for 'Scripture'; and for the other it amounted to 'Church'. The appearance of common-ground was, in the long run, illusory. And the discussions did little to elucidate what we, from our privileged vantage-point, would confidently regard as the real issues at stake.
But then, is not our vision of the conflict coloured by the images and ideals of our own age? What I hope I may have demonstrated—or, at any rate, insinuated—in this study is that the apparently-pure theological preoccupations of sixteenth-century divines were, in some sense, created for them, not by the so-called 'issues' merely, but also by their society and its fondest notions of what was precious.

One should not forget that the same Cecil who sponsored the Apologia was the sort of person who would later have himself invested with a brilliant genealogy (even hinting at some association with the gens Cecilia in Rome) in order to hide his humble origins. Or that Archbishop Parker, who was so staunch a protagonist of the 'catholicity' of the English Church, could also cause ink to be spent on pamphlets which argued that his alma mater, Cambridge, was the older (and therefore the better?) of the two universities. Along with the Queen's claims that she had changed no ancient ceremony of the primitive church, one should perhaps think of the royal portrait gallery and its unspoken (yet very audible) assertion of impeccable ancestry. Or call to mind that in the Parliament in 1563 the Speaker could blandly refer to the prerogative of freedom of speech as being 'according to the old ancient order' when, as Neale remarks, 'it was in all likelihood the fortieth birthday of the privilege'. Small wonder, then, that the age translated its theological concerns into a battle for 'antiquity'. Are our versions of the 'issues' immune from an analogous fate?
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