

‘Because Thy God Loves England’:
Bishop John Jewel
and the Catholicity of the Church of England,
1535-1599

Angela May Ranson

Doctor of Philosophy
University of York
Department of History

October 2013

Abstract

John Jewel (Bishop of Salisbury 1559-1571) became the champion of the Church of England mere months after the formation of the Elizabethan religious settlement. He preached a sermon at Paul's Cross that challenged the Roman Church to prove that certain traditions had existed in the early church; a strategy that allowed him to portray the Church of England as the true inheritor of the apostolic church, due to its pure doctrine and right administration of the sacraments. This sermon started a decade of controversy, which influenced the development of demarcation lines between the Church of Rome and the Church of England.

This thesis argues that Jewel's work as a polemicist and apologist for the Church of England was a key factor in the development of a Protestant self-identity for the Church of England. Using a unique methodology and a vast knowledge of patristic and Biblical sources, Jewel re-defined the term 'catholic' in a way that enabled him to argue for the catholicity of the Church of England while still separating it from the Catholic Church. He gave the English Church authority and legitimacy by portraying it as both part of the true universal church, and yet distinctly English.

Drawing on Jewel's own works, as well as the works of the men who fought for and against him, this thesis demonstrates that Jewel made a significant contribution to the establishment of the Church of England as a national institution. It shows that Jewel was an active, popular leader who was involved in many of the defining moments of the early Elizabethan church. Also, it shows that his popularity did not end with his death in 1571. Rather, his work continued to influence the development of the Church of England throughout the reign of Elizabeth and beyond.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Table of Contents.....	3
Acknowledgements.....	5
Author’s Declaration.....	6
Introduction.....	7
Chapter One: Forming a Reformer	23
Birth of a Reformer	26
Reformations of the Universal Church (1530-1547)	35
Training a Reformer.....	43
Conclusion	48
Chapter Two: John Jewel and the Community of Reformers	49
Foreign Influence and Domestic Faith.....	51
The Myth of Martyr	55
Part One: Conflict and Communion in Oxford.....	58
Communion and Reform.....	64
Part Two: Conflict and Crisis in Exile	67
Troubles in Frankfurt	70
Community in Exile.....	75
Conclusion	81
Chapter Three: Thundering and Enlightening	84
The Path of the Controversy	86
Historiography of the Jewel-Harding Controversy	89
The Challenge in Context	93
The Challenge	97
Between the Lines.....	101
The Prize of Soul and Body	106
The National Universal Church	117
The Nation and its God.....	123
The Nation and Its Future	125
Conclusion	128
Chapter Four: Textual Communities and Catholicity	131
Identity and Catholicity.....	133
Authority and Catholicity	138
Two Textual Communities	140

Unity in Texts	143
Follow the Leaders.....	146
Re-defining ‘Catholic’	152
The Universal Church of England	160
Governor of a National Universal Church	162
Past, Present and Future	168
Print and Pulpit	171
Conclusion	178
Chapter Five: Sword and Shield	180
Readers and Listeners	186
The Polarization of the Faith.....	190
Response of the Divines.....	194
Response of the Laity.....	200
Internal Conflicts 1559-1571	208
The Parliament of 1571 and its Results	211
Internal Conflicts 1572-1599	216
Conclusion	228
Conclusion	230
Bibliography	238

Acknowledgements

I could not have asked for a better supervisor, so great thanks must first go to Dr John Cooper, who always managed to balance helpful criticism with equally helpful encouragement. He has also given me teaching opportunities that proved both enlightening and amusing, which simultaneously added to my teaching experience and enhanced the experience of teaching. For all of his leadership, I am very grateful.

Further thanks go to the brilliant scholars on my advisory panel, Dr William Sheils and Dr William H. Sherman. They always brought out new ideas and helped me to look in different directions, and the diversity of their areas of expertise made TAP meetings richly rewarding. I am also grateful for the encouragement and support of my examiners, Dr Brian Cummings and Dr Kenneth Fincham. Their insight into my work has proved invaluable.

Latin and I have had a long and tumultuous relationship, and I am still not entirely sure that we will stay together. However, through our struggles we have had help from many great people: my tutors Elizabeth Shields and Marian Wernham, my friends Paul Simpson and William Grant, and my dear friend and fabulous flatmate Bianca Brajuha. *Gratias vobis ago*. Your help meant that I could discover nuances in Jewel's work that I never thought possible.

My dear friends Nia and Andrew Passmore, Casey Smedburg and Sam Stadlen have been incredibly supportive in a dozen ways, and I cannot thank them enough. For fondue parties, lunches at Bettys, suppers at the Red Chili, drives in the countryside, endless cups of tea, study parties, Josh Groban concerts, the guilty pleasures of Viking Kitchen and celebrations at McDonalds, I thank you. You bring bright colour to my life whenever it gets grey.

Last but never least, I want to thank my family for their prayer cover, their humour, their encouragement and their support. Thanks to my mom for reminding me that if Cranmer can go through the fire, so can I. Thanks to my sister for hours spent giggling on Skype, to my brother Andrew for really fun conversations about Gordon Ramsay shows, to my brother Paul for his fascinating insight into the Church of England, and to my sisters-in-law for their cheer and their interest. I love you all very much.

Except we take heed, except we look about, except we put to study and diligence,
all things will easily slide and fall into their former estate.
A lamp, except you put oil often in it, will soon be out.
The victory is kept even by such means as it is gotten.
- John Jewel, 1551

Author's Declaration

Some of the material presented in this thesis has been published in the following paper:

1. 'The Challenge of Catholicity: John Jewel at Paul's Cross'. In *Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion*, edited by Torrance Kirby. Leiden: Brill Publishing, 2013.

In addition, the following paper has been submitted for consideration:

1. 'Separating the Universal Bishop from the Universal Church in the Jewel-Harding Controversy'. In *Sin and Salvation in Reformation England*, edited by Jonathan Willis (submitted April 2014).

All the work contained within this thesis represents the original contribution of the author. It has not been submitted for examination at this or any other institution for another award.

Introduction

When Bishop John Jewel became the first apologist of the Elizabethan Church of England, he was defending a church that was still coming into existence. The work of creating a living church out of the terms of the Elizabethan Settlement had barely begun when he preached his famous Challenge Sermon of 1559, but that sermon provided a badly needed impetus. It sparked a controversy which inspired many of Jewel's fellow divines to join his efforts to make theirs a legitimate church in the eyes of their fellow countrymen. The result was a fresh awareness of the importance of catholicity and new criteria for membership in the true universal church. This led to the development of strong demarcation lines between the Church of England and the Catholic Church of Rome, which many English divines no longer considered a 'catholic' church at all by the early 1570s.

In the Challenge Sermon, Jewel portrayed the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559 as a return to the doctrine of the early church, and gave Queen Elizabeth credit for restoring the true faith in England.¹ Ten years later, in a sermon preached in response to the papal bull which had excommunicated Elizabeth, Jewel maintained the same message. He reminded his listeners that Elizabeth had become queen 'because thy God loves England', not due to an upset of the natural order or as a punishment.² Such divine approval for crown and country was the basis for Jewel's defence of the Church of England. He portrayed it as a legitimate heir of the apostolic church due to its right administration of the sacraments, and the doctrine 'which we receive from God and learn by the word of truth'.³

As this thesis will argue, this emphasis played a major role in the development of a unique self-identity for the English Church, and helped establish the Church of England as an institution that was recognized both by its members and its enemies. Jewel claimed that the Church of England was both an English institution with its own unique structure, and truly 'catholic'. It was, essentially, a national universal church. Jewel defended this paradox for his entire career as an Elizabethan bishop, and his work influenced a gradual re-definition of the term

¹ John Ayre, ed, *Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*, vol 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1835), 3-5, 7.

² John Jewel, *A viewe of a seditious bul* (London, 1582), 73-74. Please note that spelling and punctuation has been modernized for all sixteenth-century quotations in this thesis. Also, modern rules of spelling and capitalization have been applied to titles in the text of this thesis, but the titles are presented in their original form in the footnotes to facilitate retrieval.

³ Jewel, *A viewe of a seditious bul*, 21-22.

‘catholic’ in the ferocious debates over the nature of the church that occurred throughout the 1560s.

The polemical whirlwind of this decade produced several of the defining documents of the Elizabethan church, many of which have not yet been studied in context with the debates to which they contributed. In truth, the 1560s are a neglected decade in Elizabethan studies, and Jewel is a near-forgotten leader, hidden in the shadow of divines such as John Whitgift and Richard Hooker. Historians of the Elizabethan church tend to examine the 1559 religious settlement, and then skip ahead to the controversy over the vestments in 1566 before leaping forward once again to the excommunication of Elizabeth and the advance of the Jesuit missionaries. The result is that the meticulous process of defining and defending the church which took place during its first ten years is overlooked.

In those years, the channels of communication were still open, and the form of the Church of England was still under negotiation. These channels closed in the later years of Elizabeth with the advent of new challengers to the church’s authority, and yet Jewel’s work continued to influence the direction of debate. Many of the Elizabethan church’s later defenders, such as Richard Bancroft and John Bridges, worked to preserve the church as Jewel had defined it. For this reason, Jewel needs to be factored into studies of the English Reformation. If scholars are fully to understand the Elizabethan church, Jewel must emerge from the shadows and be returned to his place as a leading figure in its foundation and development.

This thesis intends to provide just such a re-assessment of Jewel’s work and impact, without becoming a biography of Jewel himself. Although it follows the development of Jewel’s thought throughout his life chronologically, it is at its heart an intellectual history of the ideas that formed the early Elizabethan church. Jewel brought the church out of a defensive position and placed it on the offensive against the papacy. He influenced a change in its self-portrayal that removed it from the Catholic Church and placed it in a universal church which was, significantly, Protestant. He also managed to make the royal supremacy a point of pride, rather than a weakness. Jewel’s work changed how people *thought* about the Church of England.

Thus, focusing on the work of John Jewel makes this a study of the English Church itself, and its own self-perception. It takes a similar approach to that of Alec Ryrie in his *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*, which focused on the ‘lived experience of religion’: the way in which abstract doctrines were applied in daily life

for Protestants of the sixteenth and seventeenth century.⁴ Where Ryrie focused on personal writings of individual Protestants, this thesis focuses on the publications of individual Elizabethan divines, to see how they were affected by the changes in the core concepts of the Christian faith that developed from Jewel's work.

This leads us into the three distinct areas of inquiry which will be addressed in the following chapters. First, how did the work of John Jewel influence the debate over the legitimacy of the Elizabethan church? To answer, there are two aspects of Jewel's work that must be considered: the verbal and the written. Jewel often preached at court and at Paul's Cross. He was known for the elegance and effectiveness of his rhetoric, and this popularity supported his published polemic and apologetics. Both his sermons and his writings also show an acute awareness of his audience and their needs, which allowed Jewel to have a direct effect on the debate over the nature of the church and the development of its authority.

Second, how did the work of John Jewel influence the development of a Protestant identity for the Church of England? By addressing this question, this thesis will contribute to the discussion of a common question in recent Reformation scholarship, one most creatively asked by Patrick Collinson in his famous illustration of the historically-minded insomniac: when did England become Protestant?⁵ An answer can be found in the 1560s. Jewel aligned the Church of England with Protestant churches on the continent when he created a history for the church that was based on continuity of beliefs, rather than apostolic succession. He also encouraged the development of a Protestant identity by infusing it with national pride, through his defence of the royal supremacy.

Third, how was Jewel's work used to defend the Church of England? Jewel's legacy has not yet been fully studied in its historical context, despite the continuing use of Jewel by sixteenth and seventeenth-century divines aiming to defend the Church of England. These divines fashioned Jewel in their own image, and applied his works to circumstances for which they were not originally meant. This construction of Jewel has not yet been examined in any detail. It deserves further study, because of the insight it provides into the self-perception of the early modern church.

⁴ Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 2-4.

⁵ Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (New York: Palgrave, 1988), ix.

The ecclesiastical historian Bruce Gordon has noted that there is a ‘desperate need’ for work on late sixteenth-century Protestantism that does not confine itself to theology: ‘we need to know about scholarly networks, patterns of reading, preaching, lay education, and personal libraries’. Gordon sees this as a way to move Reformation studies forward, because ‘until this is undertaken we shall be compelled to rehearse the same pieties about...Reformed religious cultures’.⁶ This thesis will undertake such a study. It will contribute to recent scholarship on early modern preaching, such as the work of Peter McCullough, Arnold Hunt and Mary Morrissey, and discuss both lay education and scholarly networks. As will soon be set out in more detail, such networks are its pivot point. Jewel was not only a controversialist and an apologist, but also the lodestar for a distinct group of learned divines. This leadership role has not yet been examined, which means that his active contribution to sixteenth-century religious culture has not yet been given the attention it deserves. In most Elizabethan histories, Jewel is considered only through his correspondence with various continental reformers in the 1560s, as published in *The Zurich Letters*. Jewel’s letters to reformers like Peter Martyr Vermigli and Heinrich Bullinger provide elegant and succinct summaries of various issues that arose with the establishment of the church, making them very useful to historians looking for primary sources. However, excluding Jewel’s other works misconstrues the position he actually held in the Elizabethan church.

The best example of this is the Jewel-Harding controversy. This controversy began in November 1559, after the Challenge Sermon which Jewel concluded by challenging the supporters of the Church of Rome to prove the Church of England’s doctrine wrong. Catholic controversialist Thomas Harding responded, and he was soon supported by other Catholic divines. Several leaders of the Elizabethan church were inspired to defend Jewel against them by publishing responses to their works. In total, twenty-one divines contributed to this polemical debate, publishing sixty-five works in approximately ten years. The response to this one sermon shows that Jewel had an active influence on church leadership, and could both persuade and inspire his audience. Reconsideration of this neglected debate is one of the key objectives of this thesis.

One of the few historians who considers the full significance of this controversy is Lucy Wooding, and this thesis picks up some of her ideas. She too

⁶ Bruce Gordon, ‘Introduction,’ in *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi (Michigan: Baker Academic, 2004), 28.

sees the importance of catholicity to Jewel's methodology, saying that Jewel 'placed the issue of catholicity at the centre of theological concerns'.⁷ She notes that the emergence of the Church of England 'as an entity with a distinctive ecclesiology' was partly the responsibility of Jewel, because the controversy he sparked through the Challenge Sermon gradually forced Catholic writers to change direction. They began their debate by arguing particular points of doctrine, but eventually shifted the focus of their discussion to the nature of the true church. To Wooding, this was due to the efforts of Jewel and his colleagues to provide a history of the Church of England, and prove that it was not an innovation but the inheritor of the primitive church.

Wooding's consideration of catholicity led her into an examination of confessionalization, where she argued that the reformation in England, from the reign of Henry VIII to approximately 1570, was a 'turbulent and confusing era when ideas were still being worked out, when English Catholics and Protestants alike were still groping for certainties to cling to in the fog of religious speculation and debate'.⁸ This thesis also studies the shifting and changing definitions of various major terms and ideas in this time period. However, where Wooding focuses on the self-identification of the Catholics and their gradual adherence to the papal supremacy, this thesis looks at the self-identification of English Protestants and their gradual adherence to the continental reformed churches. It extends the timeline past 1570, showing how the Protestant identity which English divines developed during the 1560s went on to influence religious debate for the next thirty years.

Significantly, Wooding does not discuss the Church of England in terms of a *via media*. The assumption that the doctrine of the 1559 settlement formed a 'middle way', by which is meant a compromise between Rome and continental reformation, was popular among many twentieth-century historians, such as John Neale, Lacey Baldwin Smith and Hugh Trevor-Roper. Since then, it has been questioned by many historians, including Anthony Milton, Nicholas Tyacke, and Torrance Kirby. Milton, for example, does not look at the *via media* as a compromise. He defines it as a manifestation of the Church of England characterized by a 'distaste for speculative theology, a strong concern with ceremonies and their value, a deep attachment to the prayer book, a reverence for patristic authority, and a strong sense

⁷ Lucy Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 228-229.

⁸ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 3.

of continuity with the medieval past’, and then notes that by that definition, the *via media* did not exist until the 1590s.⁹

Unfortunately, the perception of the Elizabethan Settlement as a middle-way compromise still has a hold over studies of the Elizabethan church. Theologian Lee W. Gibbs claims that the *via media* of the settlement was shaped by Richard Hooker and became a distinguishing feature ‘of what in later centuries became known as Anglicanism’.¹⁰ Diarmaid MacCulloch refers to the *via media* as a middle ground between Protestantism and Catholicism, and considers it a way of dealing with a need for continuity in the church.¹¹ This is similar to Patrick Collinson’s view that the Elizabethan *via media* was an attempt to steer between tradition for tradition’s sake and needless newfangledness.¹² In contrast, Wooding’s approach considers the Elizabethan church in terms of its moderation, rather than as a *via media* between confessions.

She claims that Jewel emphasized the rationality of the Church of England, and contrasted it with the ‘dogmatic, immoderate claims’ of the Roman Church. This enhanced its reputation for good order and good government, and thus provided religious authority.¹³ Wooding’s use of moderation in this way aligns with recent scholarship by Ethan Shagan, who suggested in 2010 that the *via media* of the Elizabethan church was not a middle way between Rome and Geneva, but a middle way between excess and deficiency. Moderation was the attempt to steer a course between binary opposites. Every virtue could be taken too far, and it required delicate negotiation to maintain the right balance.¹⁴

Shagan argued that moderation meant governance over the unruly passions to which people were prone. This governance ‘gave moderation its subtle violence’, because it involved the restraint of both self and others in order to ‘bring the commonwealth to a middle way’.¹⁵ He took this interpretation further in his *The Rule of Moderation* (2011), arguing that religious authorities not only claimed to represent

⁹ Anthony Milton, ‘Anglicanism by Stealth: the Career and Influence of John Overall,’ in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006), 159.

¹⁰ Lee W. Gibbs, ‘Life of Hooker,’ in *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by Torrance Kirby (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1.

¹¹ Diarmaid MacCulloch, ‘The Myth of the English Reformation,’ *The Journal of British Studies* vol 30, no 1 (1991), 1-2.

¹² Patrick Collinson, ‘Nicholas Bacon and the Elizabethan *Via Media*,’ *The Historical Journal* vol 23, no 2 (1980), 255, 256.

¹³ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 231, 233.

¹⁴ Ethan Shagan, ‘Beyond Good and Evil: Thinking with Moderates in Early Modern England,’ *The Journal of British Studies* vol 49 (2010), 490.

¹⁵ Shagan, ‘Beyond Good and Evil,’ 492.

the moderate way, but used moderation as a ‘coercive tool of social, religious, and political power’. Through claiming to represent the moderate centre, the authorities created the extremists at the margin.¹⁶ This interpretation can be supported through the earlier work of Claire Cross and Norman L. Jones, both of whom recognized the importance of moderation in Elizabeth’s style of government. Cross pointed out that Elizabeth often stood in the way of the reformers, keeping them back from reforming too much too quickly, maintaining a balance for the church through her control.¹⁷ Jones argued that Elizabeth valued stability both due to her religious beliefs and her naturally cautious personality, ‘so she devoted herself to maintaining the status quo, showing great reluctance to innovate’.¹⁸

Considering moderation as a tool of power adds further depth to Shagan’s treatment of confessional divides in his 2005 *Catholics and the Protestant Nation*, in which he claimed that confessionalization led to Catholics and Protestants defining ‘both their identities and their political positions in response to their ideological opponents’.¹⁹ This viewpoint strongly reflects the underlying tone and attitude of the Jewel-Harding controversy, which is why this thesis takes the same approach. Resistance to immoderate behaviour or beliefs became as important as the affirmation of moderate beliefs to both Jewel and Harding, and within that lay a dualistic attitude. Both men’s claim to moderation reflected an adversarial mentality. To them, particular doctrines and traditions were either orderly or disorderly, moderate or immoderate. There was no room for a middle way, if by middle way one meant compromise or toleration. There was only the maintenance of a delicate balance between right and wrong, using whatever tools were necessary.

Shagan, like Wooding, focuses on Catholic self-identity. Perhaps surprisingly, there is to date no equivalent body of work on the influence of moderation in the development of the Protestant self-identity. Feminist historian Ellen Macek applied the concept of moderation to Tudor polemic, but did not consider self-identity.²⁰ Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie approached the topic in their

¹⁶ Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 3, 7.

¹⁷ Claire Cross, *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1969), 59, 66.

¹⁸ Norman L. Jones, ‘Elizabeth’s First Year: The Conception and Birth of the Elizabethan Political World,’ in *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, edited by Christopher Haigh (London: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1984), 28.

¹⁹ Ethan Shagan, ‘English Catholic History in Context,’ in *Catholics and the Protestant Nation*, edited by Ethan Shagan (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 2.

²⁰ Ellen Macek, *The Loyal Opposition: Tudor Traditionalist Polemics* (New York: Peter Lang, 1996), 143.

Moderate Voices in the European Reformation, when they discussed groups of Protestants who argued amongst themselves but chose to stand united against the papacy. However, the focus of that book was continental reformation, so Racaut and Ryrie did not study its application in England.²¹

Perhaps the most detailed examination of English Protestant self-identity can be found in the work of Patrick Collinson, although he did not approach it from the point of view of moderation, but of election. In his *Birthpangs of Protestant England*, he looked at English self-identity in relation to the concept of the elect nation, and acknowledged the contribution of religion – specifically, religious myths – to the development of the nation as an idea.²² Collinson attributed the gestation of an English national identity to the early sixteenth century, but did not see an association with Protestantism until ‘after the accession of Elizabeth, some considerable time after’. He did not think that it could be found until well into the 1570s.

It is notable that Collinson did not examine the Jewel-Harding controversy in this work. Instead, he gave Foxe the seminal role in developing the Protestant nation, saying that the Protestant nation without Foxe is ‘*Hamlet* without the prince’. He attributed this to Foxe’s use of fifteen hundred years of church history to create a ‘coherent and meaningful plot’ that clearly displayed the division between the true and false churches.²³ Considering how Jewel employed many of these same strategies to motivate changes in the way people perceived both church and crown, one might say that the Protestant nation without Jewel is *Hamlet* without the ghost. This makes Collinson’s neglect of the Jewel-Harding controversy a surprising omission.

Arguably, each of these historians has provided a piece of the puzzle in their individual studies. Opposition to a common enemy, the connection between self-identity and national feeling, and the importance of polemic were all major factors in the development of a Protestant self-identity. Behind them lay the sort of violent moderation identified by Shagan.²⁴ These pieces can all be put together in this examination of the Jewel-Harding controversy, allowing a more complete picture to emerge. Jewel continually developed the connection between loyalty to the crown,

²¹ Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie, ‘Between Coercion and Persuasion,’ in *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, edited by Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 7-9.

²² Collinson, *Birthpangs of Protestant England*, ix, 1, 5, 11, 16.

²³ Collinson, *Birthpangs of Protestant England*, ix, 12.

²⁴ Shagan, ‘Beyond Good and Evil,’ 492.

loyalty to the national church, and faith in the universal church. This, combined with an intensely moderate point of view, influenced the development of a Protestant mindset. Jewel's opponents recognized this development, accepting, but not sanctioning, the English Church's alignment with the continental Protestant churches.

Cultural and ecclesiastical historian Andreas Mühling suggests that 'church history without reference to its political, social, and economic context runs the risk of turning into a simple history of ideas'. At the same time, 'church history which fails to acknowledge the theological motives of the protagonists and their impact can be little more than a poor version of generalized historical writing'.²⁵ In an attempt to avoid both of these problems, this thesis takes an approach that places the Jewel-Harding controversy in its context, and at the same time acknowledges the importance of the theology over which they argued. It employs the sixteenth-century concept of moderation rather than imposing a *via media* that did not truly exist, and considers the adversarial mentality that arose out of moderation, without using terminology that labels confessional divides before the labels can legitimately be applied.

This approach involves studying the various groups involved in the Jewel-Harding controversy as textual communities. This term was coined by Brian Stock in his book on reading practices of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, *The Implications of Literacy*. He studied literacy and textuality as separate concepts, and looked at how these concepts influenced other aspects of culture, basing his argument on the development in literary culture that took place after the year 1000. This was when 'oral discourse effectively began to function within a universe of communications governed by texts'.²⁶

As Stock notes, his chosen period was a time of church reform, which intersected with the rising culture of literacy and changed 'the means by which one established personal identity'. This influenced the development of controversy over the Eucharist and the sudden appearance of distinct groups of people who were labelled as heretics due to their different interpretive strategies, or 'parallel use of texts', to use Stock's term.²⁷ The same kind of developments occurred in the

²⁵ Andreas Mühling, 'Heinrich Bullinger as Church Politician,' in *Architect of the Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi (Michigan: Baker Academic, 2004), 246.

²⁶ Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 3.

²⁷ Stock, *The Implications of Literacy*, 4.

Elizabethan period. Church reform and changes in the process of developing self-identity inspired similar questions about the Eucharist and similar diversions in the interpretation of particular texts. Although it is necessary to be cautious when comparing such different time periods, the existence of such parallels does make the term suitable to describe the men who became involved in the Jewel-Harding controversy. They also shared a common language and a common method of interpreting patristic and Biblical sources.

Three other aspects of Stock's study of textual communities also emerge as particularly useful: the central role of a charismatic leader, the internalization of the texts, and the oral re-presentation of the texts. The centrality of a particular charismatic leader, who is often (though not always) the author of the texts that form the core of the group's method of interpretation, has been applied to several different figures of the medieval and early modern period. This can be seen in the work of Kirsty Campbell, Devorah Greenberg, Patrick Collinson and Christopher Highley. Campbell examines the self-awareness of textual communities, using the textual community that revolved around Reginald Pecock.²⁸ Devorah Greenberg and Patrick Collinson both look at John Foxe as the leader of a textual community. In Greenberg's examination of the first two editions of the *Acts and Monuments*, she downplays Foxe in order to emphasize the collaborative textual community that brought this important work together.²⁹ Similarly, Collinson also considers Foxe the leader of a textual community, rather than the sole author of the *Acts and Monuments*. However, Collinson focuses less on Foxe's leadership role than Greenberg does, and more on how Foxe was read. He notes how completely Foxe's stories were internalized, and how they show that the influence of written texts could extend 'far beyond those capable of reading them for themselves'.³⁰

More recently, Christopher Highley considers the role of the leader in textual communities in his *Catholics Writing the Nation*.³¹ Highley is unique in describing the divines who wrote in support of Thomas Harding as an active textual community, one which not only accepted Harding's interpretation and leadership but 'produced a steady stream of theological, ecclesiological and polemical works' to

²⁸ Kirsty Campbell, *The Call to Read: Reginald Pecock's Books and Textual Communities* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010), 18.

²⁹ Devorah Greenberg, 'Community of the Texts: Producing the First and Second Editions of the *Acts and Monuments*,' *The Sixteenth Century Journal* vol 36, no 3 (2005), 695, 706.

³⁰ Patrick Collinson, 'John Foxe and National Consciousness,' in *Foxe and His World*, edited by Christopher Highley and John N. King (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2002), 14, 19.

³¹ Christopher Highley, *Catholics Writing the Nation in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 4, 28.

support it.³² No one else has studied the collaboration of Harding's supporters in that way, and no one has yet treated the group of divines who were inspired to join the controversy by Jewel as a textual community at all. Highley's work provides both a precedent and an avenue of exploration for the study of Jewel's supporters.

In textual communities, a particular collection of texts defines the group of people involved in it, and these people internalize the text to the point where it becomes part of their culture. They can reference the texts in their lives and writings without feeling the need to explain them, because within their community everyone knows them.³³ After such an internalization of the texts, the community members can then apply the texts to circumstances that lay beyond the texts' original scope. This occurred both during and after the Jewel-Harding controversy, as various divines simply referred their challengers to Jewel's writings, rather than arguing with them in detail. They treated Jewel as the acknowledged authority, especially in matters relating to the early church.

Stock's community members also shared the texts with people who were not fully part of the community. This gave people who did not have the opportunity or the ability to read them a chance to participate in literate culture. The listeners were told to what text the preachers referred, and by applying it to their own knowledge and experience they could evaluate the preacher's interpretation of it.³⁴ This aspect of textual communities has real relevance for this study, because the writers of the Jewel-Harding controversy consistently acknowledged the importance of supporting their written works with preaching. Also, it will study the role of the audience in accepting the community's message, showing how influential the controversy was both during its active period and after it ended.

An interesting gap in the usual application of the concept of textual communities is in the area of the texts themselves. Often, historians put more weight on the communities than the sources that first brought the communities together. In this thesis, however, the texts are of central importance. They allow us to trace the development of the change in the nature of the church and the definition of 'catholic', which enhances the examination of the controversy's perceived audience and the audience's response to the texts. This provides a useful contrast to the communities identified in Stock's original study. Stock noted that those

³² Highley, *Catholics Writing the Nation*, 37.

³³ Stock, *The Implications of Literacy*, 91.

³⁴ Stock, *The Implications of Literacy*, 90-93.

communities looked upon the outside world as another universe, representative of a 'lower level of literacy and by implication of spirituality'.³⁵ Jewel, however, saw that world as his own family in Christ. He aimed to reach as many of them as possible, and his textual community followed his example.

It became one of Jewel's most oft-repeated arguments that the community of the faithful who made up the universal church in England needed to understand their faith. For that reason, he thought that liturgy, prayers, scripture readings and devotional works should all use the vernacular. Jewel extended that argument and wrote his own polemic in the vernacular, with the result that the entire corpus of the Jewel-Harding controversy was published in English. Only Jewel's *Apology* of 1562, which was meant to explain the core doctrine of the Church of England to a national and international audience, was published in both Latin and English. The rest of Jewel's works that involved the national universal church were published only in English.

Harding and his colleagues considered Latin the proper language for religious works. In contrast, both Jewel and the community that supported him made the use of English a point of pride. They continued a tradition of vernacular theology that had begun with the early reformers of the 1520s: as literature scholar Timothy Rosendale notes, it was 'an article of faith' from the beginning of the English Reformation that England and its language 'had to be elevated over Rome and its language'.³⁶ Brian Cummings takes a similar point of view, arguing that 'the English language became the carrier of a national religious culture'.³⁷ This was further embedded in the national mindset during the reign of Mary, when Protestantism began to be viewed as English, in contrast to the Spaniards' foreign religion.³⁸ As David Birch suggests, the shift in reforming ideas from wider Europe to England made those ideas more localized and hence more characteristic of England. Part of that shift was the change from religion in European Latin to religion in vernacular English.³⁹

³⁵ Stock, *The Implications of Literacy*, 90.

³⁶ Timothy Rosendale, *Liturgy and Literature in the Making of Protestant England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 62.

³⁷ Brian Cummings, *The Literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 187.

³⁸ David Loades, *Politics, Censorship, and the English Reformation* (London: Pinter Publishers, 1991), 7.

³⁹ David Birch, 'Early Reformation English Polemics,' *Elizabethan and Renaissance Studies* vol 92, no 7 (1983), 29-30.

For Jewel's textual community, the exclusive use of English also became a means of developing unity within the national universal church. It helped change the definition of the term 'catholic': no longer was the international use of Latin a legitimate sign of universality. Rather, involving everyone in the faith of the church by allowing them to experience the faith in their own language was a sign of universality. This argument, when combined with the community's promotion of the unique structure of the Church of England, resulted in a stronger bond with the national universal church. As Patrick Collinson said in his book *This England*, one of the most powerful means of creating a sense of nationhood is a shared language, especially when combined with a shared religious identity. Collinson pointed out that 'the pattern and paradigm' for the English nation in the sixteenth century involved frequent repetition of the phrase 'God is English', and this concept can be seen throughout the Jewel-Harding controversy.⁴⁰ Jewel fell in with this paradigm from the beginning. He often reminded his audience that God had special plans for England and its church.

Because Jewel chose to publish in the vernacular, this thesis also focuses on vernacular sources, such as the works and sermons of the Jewel-Harding controversy, and Jewel's other publications. This enables a fuller examination of the authors' arguments regarding the English definition of 'catholic', and how that definition changed over the years. It enhances the study of audience, because the sermons preached in support of the controversy were exclusively in English, and studying the preached and written works in tandem provides a unique opportunity to study the means of persuasion employed by Jewel and his supporters. Also, it allows for fuller consideration of the reception of that persuasion. In the final chapter, the sources include vernacular tracts, sermons, wills, letters and treatises that referred to Jewel, showing how widely his viewpoints were disseminated.

There have been only three modern studies of Jewel: two biographies in the 1960s, which celebrated the four hundredth anniversary of his famous work *The Apology of the Church of England*, and a recent biography by American theologian Gary Jenkins.⁴¹ All three books blended together Jewel's early years as a student and a fellow of an Oxford college, passing over those years quite quickly before they

⁴⁰ Patrick Collinson, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), 3, 5-6.

⁴¹ Wyndham Southgate, *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962); John Booty, *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (London: S.P.C.K., 1963); Gary Jenkins, *John Jewel and the English National Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).

began a slightly more detailed study of Jewel in exile as a preface to his role in the Elizabethan settlement. The chapters of this thesis are divided differently from these studies. The entire first chapter focuses on Jewel's early years in Oxford, examining the religious atmosphere in which he lived and the education he received, in order to see how these experiences influenced his later work. This chapter introduces the scholarly network which developed at that time, as well as Jewel's relationship with the man who would later become his nemesis, Thomas Harding. It also examines Jewel's study of rhetoric, because it was during his years at Oxford that Jewel learned the means by which to make his preaching so persuasive.

The second chapter begins in 1548, with the arrival of the reformer Peter Martyr Vermigli at Oxford. Jewel worked with Martyr there, and then followed him into exile during the reign of Mary and worked with him in Zurich and Strasburg. In 1559, Jewel left Martyr in exile and returned to England, which provides the end date for the chapter. It is essentially a study of Martyr's influence over Jewel, although it is important to point out that it does not take the usual approach of treating Jewel as Martyr's student. As the chapter will show, it is more accurate to describe Martyr and Jewel as colleagues than as teacher and student.

Jewel worked with Martyr on various projects, and gained a reputation that brought him fully into the community of reformers that circled around Martyr and his friend Archbishop Thomas Cranmer. Jewel accepted the adversarial mentality of Martyr and Cranmer, and developed that intensely moderate viewpoint that later informed so much of his work. As Patrick Collinson noted in his *Elizabethan Puritan Movement*, Jewel carefully nurtured his division between the appropriate traditions of the primitive church and the corrupted traditions of the Roman Church. This dualism, which Collinson thinks Jewel inherited from Cranmer, informed how Jewel defined religious authority.⁴² It was enhanced by the experience of exile, which also provided Jewel with practical experience in religious debate.

Chapter three focuses on the controversy between Jewel and Harding, tracing its development from the Challenge Sermon of 1559 to the last contribution to the debate, which was Jewel's second edition of the *Defence of the Apology* (1570). It focuses on the perceived audience of the texts of the controversy, and the means by which Jewel and Harding attempted to influence and convert them. Central to the argument is the difference between the two controversialists' definition of the universal church, and their treatment of its members. Jewel saw the universal church

⁴² Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967), 64.

as the community of the faithful; Harding saw it as the institution of the Roman Church.

This was the doctrine that influenced the development of clear demarcation lines between their confessions. At the beginning of the debate, the two men could both claim to belong to the 'catholic' church; by the end of it, Jewel had decided that the Church of England had separated from the Catholic Church, in order to join the true universal church. This developed through Harding's opposition: he continuously accused Jewel of desertion from the true church, forcing Jewel to examine the nature of the true church and how the Church of England could claim to be part of it. Jewel came to the paradoxical conclusion that in order for the English Church to be truly universal, it had to build boundaries around itself.

Chapter four expands the discussion to the textual communities that surrounded Jewel and Harding. Fourteen English divines, the majority of whom were in exile with Harding in Louvain, contributed to Harding's response to Jewel's challenge. Five divines in England defended Jewel in print, and several others provided means and opportunity for Jewel to defend himself. The exchange between these two textual communities lasted from Henry Cole's answer to Jewel's Challenge Sermon (1560), to Edward Dering's *A Sparing Restraint*, published in 1568. Collectively, these works contributed to the clarification of the confessional divide, and this chapter traces the slow acceptance of a Protestant self-identity for the Church of England that can be found in them. Both sides grew to recognize the distinctiveness of the English Church, and contributed to its self-portrayal as a national universal church.

Chapter five looks at the reception and significance of the Jewel-Harding controversy. It involves both the textual communities that reacted to the controversy while it was taking place, and those which formed after it ended. This includes the groups commonly known as puritans and separatists, as well as the defenders of the Church of England who continued to hold up Jewel as a champion of orthodoxy in the latter half of Elizabeth's reign. The years after Jewel's death in 1571 saw the Church of England splinter, and this forced an expansion of the definition of the national universal church. It was no longer so easy to find that delicate balance of moderation by finding one common enemy. However, various divines still attempted to form their ideologies in opposition to their adversaries, and often used the work of Jewel to do so, with mixed success.

The thesis concludes with a brief examination of Richard Hooker's use of Jewel, and the opposition Hooker endured in 1599 from Andrew Willet, another Jewel supporter. The purpose behind the choice of 1599 as an end date will be discussed in the final chapter; for the moment, it is enough to point out that Jewel's influence did not actually end in 1599. Further work is needed on Jewel's influence over the Jacobean and Restoration churches, because Jewel's work continued to be published and studied throughout the seventeenth century. However, that is beyond the scope of this current project. All it can do is begin.

Chapter One: Forming a Reformer

Much of the vast historiography of the Elizabethan settlement has focused on conflict rather than co-operation. Historians have thoroughly examined the divisive effects of the Marian exile, and thereby obscured the connection between the early Elizabethan Reformation and the Reformation of the 1530s and 1540s. However, this connection can still be traced through Elizabethan reformers such as John Jewel, who were once Edwardian or Henrican reformers. These men formed a network of scholars, which was involved in the re-definition of the term ‘catholic’ from the first ecclesiastical debates sparked by Henry VIII’s claim to be the Supreme Head of the church.

This chapter intends to re-connect the Elizabethan Reformation to its roots. Its purpose is to provide a background for the debates of the 1560s over catholicity, and a starting place for the re-assessment of Jewel’s work that will take place in later chapters. It will do this by studying Jewel’s first years as a member of the scholarly network which re-defined the ‘catholic’ church. He spent those years in the charged political and intellectual atmosphere of Oxford, and this had a long-lasting effect on his views of the church and its relationship with the crown. As this chapter will argue, it was during these years that Jewel developed his paradoxical vision of a universal church under the authority of a national leader. He carried this vision into exile, and then made it the foundation of his later work in defence of the Church of England.

This argument challenges the common portrayal of Jewel as a divine whose passion for reform was born in Marian exile, then lost to the siren call of ecclesiastical preferment, causing him to spend the final decade of his life supporting Elizabeth’s authority against his own better judgment. Political historians Marshall M. Knappen and Norman L. Jones, for example, made a direct connection between the loss of Jewel’s desire for further reform and his installation as bishop.⁴³ Patrick Collinson put Jewel in a ‘class of his own’ when it came to reforming zeal, but he did suggest that Jewel turned his back on the men who wanted further reformation, and proved a disappointment to them.⁴⁴ Henry Birt, who wrote a study of the

⁴³ Marshall M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism* (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1963), 178-180; Norman L. Jones, *Faith By Statute: Parliament and the Settlement of Religion* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1982), 169-170.

⁴⁴ Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967), 61.

Elizabethan settlement a hundred years ago, was more generous. He said only that Jewel's opinions 'toned down' once he wore the bishop's mitre.⁴⁵

This portrayal is the result of a frequent assumption in the historiography of the Elizabethan church that the men who experienced Marian exile, as Jewel did, emerged from it completely converted to the content and style of continental reform. In the drama of Elizabeth's first year, the Marian exiles are often cast as the Genevan opposition to the reformers who had managed to live out Mary's reign in England. It is suggested that much of the conflict that existed in the early Elizabethan church was due to the differing opinions that developed between these two groups. John Neale called the returning Marian exiles 'the pressure group of a revolutionary party', who complicated matters in Elizabeth's first Parliament.⁴⁶ Henry Primus, in the published version of his 1960 doctoral thesis about the Elizabethan vestments controversy, divided the bishops in the controversy based on whether or not they were Marian exiles. He suggested that the returning exiles were the more enthusiastic about reform, and that their enthusiasm was 'dampened' in parliament.⁴⁷

In a more recent study of the Elizabethan episcopate, Brett Usher claims that the returning exiles brought in the Calvinist ideas that favoured greater change, and soon found themselves restrained in Parliament by men advocating a slower pace.⁴⁸ He attributes what influence the exiles did have to Cecil's support, a support which was based on their loyalty to Elizabeth.⁴⁹ At the same time, Usher suggests that the loyalty was somewhat one-sided: he does not think that Elizabeth herself was particularly supportive of the Marian exiles. Instead, he thinks that Elizabeth had a 'forlorn vision of Catholic continuity within a Protestant polity', and that vision affected who she was willing to include on her episcopal bench. The experience of exile – or lack of it - was not part of her decision-making when she was choosing bishops.⁵⁰

It is only logical that the church leaders' differing experiences during the reign of Mary led to different perspectives and thus to clashes of opinion during the reign of Elizabeth. However, the division between exiles and non-exiles is often grossly oversimplified, and the varying beliefs of the returning exiles ignored by

⁴⁵ Henry Birt, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement: A Study of Contemporary Documents* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1907), 406.

⁴⁶ John Neale, *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1958), 58.

⁴⁷ John Henry Primus, *The Vestments Controversy* (Amsterdam: J.H. Kok N.V. Kampen, 1960), 74, 79.

⁴⁸ Brett Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy, 1559-1577* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2003), 4.

⁴⁹ Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy*, 15-17, 28, 40.

⁵⁰ Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy*, 17.

suggesting that they all thoroughly approved of continental reform. As this chapter will show, the experience of continental reform was not the only factor affecting the beliefs and actions of the Marian exiles. Many of them, including John Jewel, arrived in their positions under Elizabeth having not only endured the experience of losing their friends to the Marian burnings, but that of losing friends to the Henrican burnings. They worked out the complications of the royal supremacy under Elizabeth having already seen the royal supremacy established and negotiated under Henry VIII. They decided upon a particular structure for the Church of England having already felt the foundations of the Church *in* England tremble during the break with Rome.

For Jewel, his pre-Marian years affected his later work in defence of the Church of England in three ways, all of which are connected to his experience at Oxford. First, he was educated in a community of learners, which encouraged him to become part of the push for reform. The first section of this chapter will discuss the style of education that promoted such community, which was influenced by the development of the colleges and a new emphasis on humanist learning. Through this community, Jewel became part of the scholarly network that was involved in re-defining the church.

Second, during those years Jewel was exposed to the theological implications of the royal supremacy. This led to his consideration of the universality of faith as well as the universality of the institutional church. Jewel later proved to be one of the royal supremacy's most dedicated advocates, and he defended it with such dogged persistence that many historians question whether his faith was his or merely a reflection of crown policy. However, this chapter will show that Jewel was one of the first young men to know no other leader of the church than the king, which provides a context for his later defence of the royal supremacy and his views on the universal church.

Third, Jewel's Oxford education provided the training in rhetoric that made his polemic so effective. He gained in-depth knowledge of patristic and Biblical sources, and developed his signature speaking style through his study of Latin orators, such as Cicero. Discussing Jewel's rhetorical skill in this chapter will prove helpful for the examination of the Challenge Sermon and the resulting controversy in chapter three. It will also help explain the popular reaction to his sermons, which will be discussed in chapter five. Its only drawback is that it brings out more biographical details than is ideal in an intellectual history. However, such details are

necessary to provide a framework for the study of Jewel's later ideas, and their neglect has led to an inaccurate representation of Jewel's motivations during the reign of Elizabeth. For those reasons, we will begin with a study of the person of Jewel, using it as a gateway into his thought.

Birth of a Reformer

Elizabethan divine Laurence Humphrey published a biography of Jewel, *Johannes Iuelli...Vita et Mors*, in 1573. This source provides much of the information that is still extant of Jewel's early years, including his adherence to the cause of reform while still a student in Corpus Christi College. Humphrey claimed that the college president, Robert Morwen, once said: 'I would love you, Jewel, if you were not a Zwinglian; of a heretic faith but living the life of an angel at least, and you are of good character, but a Lutheran'.⁵¹ It was impossible to be both a Zwinglian and a Lutheran, so these labels were probably meant to be derogatory. Evidently, Morwen was not concerned with the subtle differences between the forms of continental Protestantism; he just considered them all heretical. However, the labels would not be an effective taunt if there was no chance that Jewel actually did adhere to some form of Lutheranism or Zwinglianism. Thus, it seems possible that Jewel was known to be a reformer from an early age.

Jewel left Merton College to join Corpus Christi College in 1539, so this conversation most likely took place after that year. Sources for this time are comparatively scant, and the definitions of different forms of Protestantism were still fluid, making identification of Jewel's beliefs more difficult. Also, Jewel may well have kept his particular beliefs to himself. To be either a Zwinglian or a Lutheran at this point was a dangerous decision. Zwinglianism was associated with sacramentarianism, and sacramentarians were sternly persecuted by Henry VIII. John Lambert, who adhered to sacramentarian beliefs, was killed in 1538, and in 1539 the Ten Articles accused sacramentarians of subverting and overturning both the sacraments and the authority of the crown.⁵² Lutheranism was similarly unpopular for much of Henry's reign. In 1528, what Richard Rex calls 'a nest of Lutherans' had been uncovered in Cardinal College and quickly scattered, and

⁵¹ Laurence Humphrey, *Ioannis Iuelli Angli, Episcopi Sarisburiensis vita & mors* (London, 1573), 25. (my translation).

⁵² G. W. Bernard, 'The Making of Religious Policy, 1533-1546: Henry VIII and the Search for the Middle Way,' *The Historical Journal* vol 41, no 2 (1998), 323, 332.

neither crown nor university were any more accepting of Lutheranism over a decade later. Although Henry flirted with an alliance with the Lutheran princes in 1538-1539, he consistently and firmly rejected justification by faith and the Confession of Augsburg.⁵³

If we were to speculate which form of continental Protestantism Jewel would have chosen to follow in the late 1530s, Zwinglianism seems more likely than Lutheranism. Jewel aligned with Peter Martyr Vermigli's Swiss-inspired Reformed beliefs very quickly when Martyr arrived in 1548, which suggests that there may have been a previous inclination towards them. It could have been fostered by Jewel's colleagues at Oxford, by his tutors, or indeed by the religious atmosphere in which he was raised. Susan Brigden suggests that the 'Lollard legacy of sacramentarianism' inclined England toward the Swiss Reformation, and this Lollard legacy may have influenced Jewel.⁵⁴

Regardless of his particular adherence, the way that Jewel was so clearly identified with the reformers so early in his life makes a study of his educational background very helpful in any examination of his later polemic. As the intellectual historian James McConica notes, educational purpose during this time shifted from a focus on scholastic logic to a focus on humanistic rhetoric, which trained men for 'public debate on public issues'.⁵⁵ This was a significant shift for a generation of men who would later become church leaders in the service of the crown, and yet it is often ignored in modern historiography. Educational historians Kenneth Charlton and Ian Green both focus their studies of early modern education on Elizabethan and Jacobean education, making few nods to the Henrican and Edwardian eras.⁵⁶ Literature scholar Peter Medine's study of Thomas Wilson's *Art of Rhetoric* (1560) is an excellent description of sixteenth-century rhetoric, but it too focuses on Elizabethan education.⁵⁷ In contrast to these studies, Roberto Weiss' work on

⁵³ Bernard, 'The Making of Religious Policy, 1533-1546,' 326.

⁵⁴ Susan Brigden, 'Popular Disturbance and the Fall of Thomas Cromwell and the Reformers, 1539-1540,' *The Historical Journal* vol 24, no 2 (1981), 260.

⁵⁵ James McConica, 'Humanism and Aristotle in Tudor Oxford,' *The English Historical Review* vol 94, no 371 (1979), 294.

⁵⁶ Kenneth Charlton, *Education in Renaissance England* (London: Routledge, 1965), xiv; Ian Green, *Humanism and Protestantism in Early Modern English Education* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 1-5.

⁵⁷ Peter Medine, ed, *Thomas Wilson The Art of Rhetoric (1560)* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1994), 8.

learning in England encompasses mainly the fifteenth century, ending with the accession of Henry VII.⁵⁸

Another complication for a study of education in the 1530s and 1540s is that the majority of it centres on the exercise of education in grammar schools, rather than in the universities. These studies tend to examine the social history of education, or try to apply sixteenth-century educational theories to present-day education systems. Social historian Rosemary O'Day's work on the foundations of education in Britain focused on the salaries and methods of the teachers, although she did make note of the connection between crown and university.⁵⁹ Similarly, Nicholas Orme took a social approach when he looked at the daily exercises that took place in grammar schools, and examined what these exercises can tell historians about daily life in Tudor England.⁶⁰

Studies of sixteenth-century universities show similar difficulties with timeline and focus. Renaissance historian Mark Curtis' work on Oxford and Cambridge in transition began in the year 1558.⁶¹ Many histories of Oxford and Cambridge, including the oft-referenced nineteenth-century works of Anthony à Wood, Thomas Fowler and James Ingram, restrict themselves to describing the founders of individual colleges and the colleges' physical environment. Only a few twentieth century works, such as those of Charles Mallet and James McConica, look at the role of the universities in the politics of the Tudor era, and the effect this had on the educational system of the universities itself. Charles Mallet examined how Oxford changed during the Reformation by examining its reactions to major events such as the dissolution of the monasteries, the royal visitations, and the controversy over the correct pronunciation of Greek. Mallet also studied Oxford's reaction to the accession of Mary, and contrasted it with the difficulties encountered when policy shifted on the accession of Elizabeth.⁶² The various essays in McConica's *The History of the University of Oxford* took a different approach, by studying particular faculties, what they taught, and how these faculties were affected by the break with

⁵⁸ Roberto Weiss, *Humanism in England During the Fifteenth Century*, second ed (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1957), 1.

⁵⁹ Rosemary O'Day, *Education and Society 1500-1800: The Social Foundations of Education in Early Modern Britain* (London: Longman Publishing, 1982), 78.

⁶⁰ Nicholas Orme, 'An Early-Tudor Oxford Schoolbook,' *Renaissance Quarterly* vol 34, no 1 (1981), 11.

⁶¹ Mark Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558-1642* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), 5.

⁶² Charles Edward Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford*, vol 2 (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1968), 1, 22, 105.

Rome.⁶³ However, neither study examined the effect the changes had on the individuals who were receiving their education during this time. This chapter intends to redress that, in a way that reflects Alec Ryrie's summary of current historiographical trends: 'rather than negotiated theological compromises, we are now more interested in the unheroic ways in which private individuals negotiated the murderous religious landscapes of the sixteenth century'.⁶⁴

John Jewel, the private individual with whom we are most concerned, negotiated many murderous religious landscapes during his time in Oxford. As James McConica pointed out, occurring at this time were 'powerful currents of social change and energy upon which the universities floated with little or no power of control'.⁶⁵ One of these currents was humanism, which profoundly influenced university education in Henrican England. This is a complicated current to study, made all the more difficult due to the problem of defining it.

Fred J. Levy noted the importance of classical methods and sources for English humanists, shown especially in the work of John Colet.⁶⁶ C.S. Lewis defined a humanist as 'one who taught, or learned, or at least strongly favoured, Greek and the new kind of Latin', and humanism itself as 'the critical principles and critical outlook which ordinarily went with these studies'.⁶⁷ For Lewis, humanism was linked with methodology. Historian Gregory Dodds and theologian Craig D'Alton both make a similar association: Dodds gives it several characteristics, including 'a devotion to classical scholarship, [and] a demand for new educational methods'. D'Alton also emphasizes the importance of method over ideology in his definition, while acknowledging that humanism was hugely diverse concept, encompassing both the literary and the historical.⁶⁸

Based on these definitions, it is possible to see how the humanist emphasis in education would affect the methods by which Jewel learned, as well as explain his vast experience with rhetoric and the classical tradition. It also provides some

⁶³ James McConica, 'Preface,' *The History of the University of Oxford* vol 3, edited by James McConica (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), X.

⁶⁴ Alec Ryrie, 'The European Reformations,' in *Palgrave Advances in the European Reformations*, edited by Alec Ryrie (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006), 4.

⁶⁵ James McConica, 'Social Relations of Tudor Oxford,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* vol 27 (1977), 115.

⁶⁶ Fred J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, 1967), 40-47.

⁶⁷ C.S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1968), 18.

⁶⁸ Gregory Dodds, *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmus Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 94-95; Craig D'Alton, 'Renaissance Humanism and the Reformation,' in *Palgrave Advances in the European Reformations*, edited by Alec Ryrie (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006), 150.

insight into his concern with the royal supremacy. Diarmaid MacCulloch argues that the various aspects of sixteenth-century humanism can be divided according to their focus. He labels one of these aspects ‘civic humanism’, claiming that civic humanists ‘paid particular attention to ancient society, in order to see how their own society and government might be restructured for the common good’. They often advocated republic as the best form of government, although some were what MacCulloch calls princely humanists, who felt that government was best led by one man.⁶⁹ Jewel’s steady support of Elizabeth was a form of princely humanism. It was based on the validity of government under one ruler, the ‘godly prince’, who in Jewel’s mind could be a woman.

Humanist methodology was only part of the changes in education which altered Jewel’s experience in Oxford from the time he began his studies in 1535. Colleges had changed greatly since the turn of the century; they were rapidly taking on the main tasks of education within the university. This meant that the old system whereby undergraduates were taught by regent masters had all but disappeared, and with them disappeared the halls.⁷⁰ Until the sixteenth century, the majority of undergraduates had lived in halls, or found lodging with townspeople or in hostels.⁷¹ Halls were temporary; they started when a master rented rooms to scholars and ended when the number of students dropped. Colleges, as Mark Curtis calls them, were self-perpetuating ‘chartered associations of persons’.⁷² They were prominent features of the university.

Joining a college instead of a hall meant that Jewel was educated in a permanent community of fellows, who both lived and learned together. In Merton College, which Jewel joined in 1535, it was expected that members would join the secular clergy. Its founder, Walter de Merton, wanted students’ studies to culminate in the study of theology. As college historian Bernard Henderson phrased it, Merton wanted the best of the college’s students to ‘go forth into the world for service in the church and state’. Of these, the most able would then study canon law so that they could become statesmen, since ‘no study was then more needful for those to be of service in the state than this’.⁷³

⁶⁹ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe’s House Divided* (London: Allen Lane, 2003), 74.

⁷⁰ James McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics Under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 76.

⁷¹ Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition*, 36.

⁷² Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition*, 39.

⁷³ Bernard Henderson, *Merton College* (London: F.E. Robinson, 1899), 30-31.

Jewel's tutor at Merton was John Parkhurst, a young man who identified with the cause of reform. He actually defended new doctrines in disputations and promoted the reading of 'profane' authors.⁷⁴ He also encouraged the use of the vernacular: Humphrey's *Iuelli... Vita et Mors* reported that Parkhurst gave Jewel the task of comparing Bible translations. Gary Jenkins, in his 2006 biography of Jewel, considers this a 'provocative' move, considering how Henry VIII felt about the Bible in the vernacular in the mid-1530s.⁷⁵ However, it is doubtful that Parkhurst intended any harm to Jewel by this, since he was part of a scholarly network of reformers that Jewel eventually joined. This network would later evolve into a textual community centred on Jewel's works, and Parkhurst continued to participate. In the 1560s, he heartily supported Jewel in his controversy with Harding, in part by promoting Jewel's work to continental reformers such as Rudolph Gwalter.⁷⁶

Jewel greatly appreciated Parkhurst's efforts on his behalf, and his appreciation lasted far longer than Jewel's time at Oxford. In 1555 Jewel wrote a letter to Parkhurst that expressed how much Parkhurst meant to him: 'No one should want less urging to write than a pupil to his tutor....I would rather appear impudent by [daring to] write than ungrateful by staying silent'.⁷⁷ For his part, Parkhurst subsequently made much of his connection to Jewel. After Jewel's death in 1571, Parkhurst said in a letter to Gwalter that he was going to help write Jewel's *Vita*. He claimed that he 'could tell more of Jewel than the whole of England', because Jewel had been one of his pupils.⁷⁸ Parkhurst and Jewel consistently referred to each other in terms of tutor and pupil, which contrasts with Jewel's later relationship with Peter Martyr.⁷⁹

In 1539, Jewel transferred to Corpus Christi College on a scholarship and continued studying divinity. Corpus Christi was founded on humanist principles, and reflected the different religious landscape that had developed since the foundation of Merton. As college historian Thomas Fowler put it, graduates of Corpus Christi were supposed to be 'trained to habits of study, regularity and piety, apt at dialectical fence, and competent to press all the secular learning of the time

⁷⁴ R.A. Houlbrooke, ed, *The Letter Book of John Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, Compiled During the Years 1571-1575* (Norfolk Record Society, 1974 and 1975), 20.

⁷⁵ Gary Jenkins, *Jewel and the English National Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 10.

⁷⁶ Houlbrooke, *The Letter Book of John Parkhurst*, 63.

⁷⁷ Houlbrooke, *The Letter Book of John Parkhurst*, 78.

⁷⁸ Houlbrooke, *The Letter Book of John Parkhurst*, 66.

⁷⁹ This will be discussed further in the second chapter.

into the service of the church'.⁸⁰ The study of canon law was not a major feature of this college, as it had been at Merton, and the college aimed to prepare students not to be statesmen but to be sixteenth-century clergymen. Its theology students had the opportunity to examine the church fathers, instead of the medieval scholastics.⁸¹ This proved beneficial for Jewel: an emphasis on the historical context of the church fathers would later become a distinguishing feature of his polemic and apologetics.

Corpus Christi was made up of a president, twenty fellows and approximately twenty undergraduates, and its size was limited in this way to create a close-knit community of learners. By living and working in such a community, Jewel and his contemporaries developed a network of friends and patrons. This network was equally as valuable as the education itself, and it had an effect beyond the opportunities it provided for the students. This is an aspect of scholarly networks that needs further study. For example, Kenneth Charlton noted that the main reason for the gentry to send their sons to university was not so much education as connection, which is a significant point. However, Charlton did not examine how these connections affected the religious and political atmosphere of the day.⁸² Nor did Lacey Baldwin Smith, who studied the Henrican leaders who had known each other during their time at Cambridge. He focused on the various religious developments that divided them after they graduated, rather than their efforts to work together or their influence on the Henrican church.⁸³

In contrast, church historian Winthrop Hudson emphasized the importance of scholarly networks in part because of their wider effect. In his book *The Cambridge Connection*, Hudson argued that the bond of friendship in early-Elizabethan church leaders, which was founded on their shared experience as a community of fellows at university, later enhanced their desire for unity and co-operation. Hudson claimed that the Cambridge connection revolved around John Cheke, which was a weak argument because Hudson's own work seemed to prove that William Cecil was the focal point. However, Hudson made a valid point when he said that 'the intimacy of... relationship to one another led to further joint concerns' in religion.⁸⁴ This

⁸⁰ Thomas Fowler, *The History of Corpus Christi College* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893), 55.

⁸¹ Wyndham Southgate, *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), 4-5.

⁸² Charlton, *Education in Renaissance England*, 149.

⁸³ Lacey Baldwin Smith, *Tudor Prelates and Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), 9.

⁸⁴ Winthrop Hudson, *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1980), 3.

suggests that scholarly networks not only helped determine who would be the later leaders of the church, but influenced their methods and their beliefs.

It is not only modern historians who see the importance of networks during this time. Jewel himself noted the value of collegial community in 1551, when he gave a Latin oration promoting the Oxford network of scholars and patrons. The event was made possible through the funding of Richard Chambers, an Oxford patron who consistently attempted to advance reformation in the university and later became one of Jewel's fellow exiles. Significantly, Jewel was asked to speak because the usual orator, the Regius Professor of Divinity, was in London working on the reform of the ecclesiastical laws. It was a great honour for Jewel to be asked to take his place, considering that he was not yet a well-known figure and did not hold a high position in the university.

Jewel acknowledged that fact in the beginning of the oration, then went on to tell the students that the 'light of our talents was kindled...by Almighty God', not for their own pleasure but for the sake of the learning itself. He also urged them to develop piety through study, and to use their learning to determine true faith from falsehood. Notably, he did not specify what made up true faith and what falsehood. This was a clever sidestep to avoid censure on religious grounds, made all the more clever because Jewel still managed to advocate reform. He called for the students to use their learning to speak against the errors of the faith, so that 'the enemies of the gospel should finally be ashamed of their treachery and arrogance'.

The overall purpose of Jewel's oration was to remind students of their position and responsibilities in an academic community. Jewel pointed out that the community took care of them, provided for them, and gave them excellent educational opportunities. He reminded the students that they were working together under the glare of public scrutiny, 'in this bastion of talents and the arts', to be worthy of the learning available to them. He also emphasized the importance of the scholars to the reputation of Oxford itself: 'the prestige and lustre of the university is based not on the size of its foundations and buildings but in the number of men devoted to study: we in the end are the colleges, we are the schools, we are the university entire!'⁸⁵ This stirring tribute to the importance of scholars, phrased as if they were a recognizable unit, suggests that Jewel was aware of their inter-

⁸⁵ John Ayre, ed, *Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury* vol 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1835), 1302-1303. Thanks to Paul Simpson for his help with the translation.

dependence, and their distinction as a unique group. He did not refer to it as a network of scholars, but he still treated it as one.

He also pushed the students beyond the limits of national borders. The first sign of Jewel's concern for the universal church, which later became so much a part of his polemic, can be found in this oration. Jewel charged his listeners not to be ashamed of pronouncing the gospel, because 'by this way will the powers of the devil be diminished, by this way will Christ's glory spread throughout the world'.⁸⁶ When Jewel gave this oration, his participation in the scholarly network had already exposed him to reformers such as Heinrich Bullinger, Martin Bucer, and Peter Martyr Vermigli. Thus, it is not surprising that he could see the potential of such a network for the advancement of reform.

The relationships that developed in the colleges could turn young men into lifelong friends, or lifelong enemies. Jewel met reformers such as Richard Cox, Laurence Humphrey, William Whittingham, John Proctor, and William Cecil through his Oxford connections, and these men proved to be consistent sources of support throughout his Elizabethan career. However, Jewel also met the man who would become his nemesis while attending Oxford: Thomas Harding. The two men's lives developed in a strange sort of parallel that culminated in their decade-long polemical battle known as the Jewel-Harding controversy. They were both born in Devon, and both went to Barnstaple school before advancing to Oxford. It is doubtful that the two men knew each other at grammar school, however. Harding was born in 1516 and Jewel in 1522, an age difference great enough to suggest that they would have been there at different times.⁸⁷

Both Jewel and Harding came in contact with the new learning at Oxford and developed humanistic and reforming beliefs. Harding was elected a fellow of New College in 1536, and became a bachelor of arts in 1537 and a master of arts in 1542. He also took the post of king's professor of Hebrew in 1542.⁸⁸ Jewel earned his BA three years after Harding, and his MA in 1545, three years after Harding.⁸⁹ In fact, Jewel trailed along behind Harding for every degree, until they started to work on their Bachelors of Divinity. Jewel earned his Bachelor of Divinity in 1551, and Harding was only admitted to the degree in 1552.⁹⁰ Jewel later pointed that out

⁸⁶ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, 1303.

⁸⁷ Orme, *Education in the West of England* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1976), 112.

⁸⁸ Henri de Vocht, 'Thomas Harding,' *The English Historical Review* vol 35, no 138 (1920), 233.

⁸⁹ Southgate, *Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*, 10.

⁹⁰ de Vocht, 'Thomas Harding,' 234.

when Harding questioned his learning: ‘for it is well known that I...proceeded Bachelor in Divinity in the University of Oxford one whole year and more before Mr Harding’.⁹¹

On the accession of Mary, Jewel maintained his reforming faith, while Harding recanted and returned to Catholicism. These decisions could have been influenced by the differences in the religious atmosphere of their colleges. The founder of New College was William of Wykeham, and the college statutes reflect Wykeham’s firm belief that the way to advancement was through the institution of the Catholic Church.⁹² College historian Hastings Rashdall noted that New College was an ecclesiastical foundation, designed by a cleric to produce more clerics, ones who could best make a stand ‘against the heretics who were on every side catching the ear of the religious-minded laity’.⁹³ Henri de Vocht’s biographical article of Harding also suggested that Harding was influenced by his college fellows. He pointed out that Harding’s education at the college took place at the same time as several others ‘who were to be among the most learned of the Romanists under Mary and Elizabeth’, and may have helped Harding return to Catholicism.⁹⁴ This included four of the men who would later support Harding in his controversy against Jewel: Nicholas Sander, John Martial, Thomas Stapleton and John Rastell. This suggests that it was not only Jewel who developed a network of scholars during his years at Oxford. The foundation of his opposition was laid at the same time.

Reformations of the Universal Church (1530-1547)

The previous section discussed how Jewel was personally affected by the changes in the educational system of the early 1500s, and how these changes brought him into a network of scholars that would provide useful support and important contacts for him throughout his career. This section will withdraw from Jewel himself somewhat, and look at the changing concept of the Catholic Church during the Henrican reformation. The religious and political events of Henry’s later years as king began the examination of catholicity that would continue and expand during the Elizabethan Reformation, and this section will show that Jewel’s later definition

⁹¹ John Jewel, *Replie Unto Mr Harding’s Answer* (London, 1565), 6v.

⁹² Hastings Rashdall and Robert Rait, *New College* (London: F.E. Robinson and Co, 1901), 39.

⁹³ Rashdall and Rait, *New College*, 18, 20.

⁹⁴ de Vocht, ‘Thomas Harding,’ 233-234.

of the universal church, as well as his advocacy of the episcopacy and the royal supremacy, reflected many Henrican ideas.

Oxford was heavily involved in the changes in religion that took place in the 1530s. The first major royal visitation took place in 1535, and Jewel may have been attending Merton by the time it began. As Donald Logan points out, this visitation was a crucial point: ‘not only in university history, because it effected significant internal educational changes, but also in general English history, because it redefined the relationship of the state to the academy’. Logan offers two reasons why the universities were visited at this point: first, to secure their acceptance of the royal supremacy, and second, to enforce curriculum changes.⁹⁵ The royal visitors managed to accomplish this, and also calmed some major issues that were causing a rupture between Oxford town and Oxford university. Thus, Jewel’s first experience with crown control was with the royal visitors calming the tensions and establishing a curriculum with which he was already familiar.

Jewel also saw the universities acquiesce in the visitations remarkably easily, considering how much they had to lose. As Charles Mallet pointed out, ‘no institutions depended more than the universities upon the church. None owed more to the special jurisdiction, the privileged immunities, which the clergy had secured’.⁹⁶ To fall in line with changes that asserted crown control lessened the power of the clergy, and put these privileges at risk. However, not to fall in line with the crown was perhaps the greater risk. Mark Curtis and Donald Logan both saw acquiescence as a means of survival: Curtis pointed out the amount of change occurring, which made the universities seek assistance from the crown.⁹⁷ Logan was more specific, connecting Oxford’s bid for crown assistance to their troubles with the town by suggesting that the university needed a powerful patron to keep the peace between them.⁹⁸

The men of the new learning at the university, such as Jewel’s tutor Parkhurst and some of the fellows at Corpus, were more likely to support the royal supremacy than were the conservatives. As Alec Ryrie puts it, ‘royal power was undoubtedly legitimate, so any argument between church and state had the potential to damage

⁹⁵ Donald Logan, ‘The First Royal Visitation of the English Universities,’ *The English Historical Review* vol 106, no 421 (1991), 861.

⁹⁶ Charles Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford* vol 2 (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1968), 60.

⁹⁷ Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition*, 6-7.

⁹⁸ Logan, ‘The First Royal Visitation,’ 869-870.

Catholic legitimacy...the reformers could [then] gain legitimacy for themselves'.⁹⁹ Aligning with the power of the crown increased the possibility of success for the reformers, and they needed that support to negotiate the murderous landscape of a university divided. The reformers were constantly challenged by the question of 'where was your church before Luther?', and the only answer they had come up with was Lollardy. This offered only a very limited legitimacy. As Rylie argues, 'a church of 150 years' standing, was, of course, preferable to one of fifteen years, but it was still hardly a universal church'.¹⁰⁰ Both the reformers and the monarch needed to establish a universal church: one that could be legitimately catholic and yet led by an English king. The term 'catholic' began to take on a different cast, and so begins the examination of catholicity that is one of the principal concerns of this thesis.

Historian of religion Peter Marshall has studied how the term 'catholic', which was once a word that was synonymous with 'Christian', began to represent a particular version of Christianity in the 1530s. While virtually everyone agreed that 'catholic' Christianity was correct, in contrast with the other variations that were not, everyone had a different definition of what constituted 'catholic' Christianity. For some, it meant the opposite of heresy; for others, it meant the religion that agreed with the royal policy.¹⁰¹ Lucy Wooding reinforces Marshall's analysis, arguing that after the King's Great Matter 'anyone who wished to perpetuate their Catholic faith had henceforth to accept the king's redefinition of that faith'.¹⁰²

From the first stirrings of reform in the 1520s, conservatives and reformers both fought to claim the title of 'catholic'. Use of the term changed as polemicists argued about the nature of the church, and some of the same arguments can be found in Elizabethan debates. In the late 1520s, the reformer Robert Barnes was quite explicit about his redefinition of the role of the Catholic Church, in a way that was typical of Henrican reformers but at the same time showed some elements that would become characteristic of later arguments. He gave the pope a greater role than any Elizabethan reformer would have allowed when he claimed that 'the pope is but the vicar of Christ and not the very head of the church'. However, he also said that 'the

⁹⁹ Alec Rylie, 'The Problems of Legitimacy and Precedent in English Protestantism 1539-47,' *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth Century Europe* vol 1, edited by Bruce Gordon (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1996), 81-82.

¹⁰⁰ Rylie, 'The Problems of Legitimacy and Precedent,' 80.

¹⁰¹ Peter Marshall, 'Is the Pope Catholic? Henry VIII and the Semantics of Schism,' *Catholics and the Protestant Nation: Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*, edited by Ethan Shagan (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 24-28.

¹⁰² Lucy Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 9.

universal church standeth the election of all faithful men, and all faithful men of the world would make that universal church', which shows a concern for election that would preoccupy late-Elizabethan disputes over the nature of the church.¹⁰³ Barnes went on to set apart the universal church from the Catholic Church, claiming that 'you have always made yourself the holy church, yea and without any holiness. Now have I declared unto you, what is the holy church, that is, the congregation of faithful men throughout all the world'.¹⁰⁴ This emphasis on the importance of faith to gaining membership in the universal church would later become a major part of Jewel's arguments.

Barnes was forced to recant his beliefs regarding the universal church in the 1520s. However, after the break with Rome, more and more reformers developed a definition of the universal church that aligned with his. In his preface to his 1534 English New Testament, William Tyndale declared 'before the universal congregation that believes in [Christ]...[that] I believe according to the open and manifest Scriptures and Catholic faith'. Tyndale spoke to the universal congregation, which suggests that he was not referring to the institution of the church, and he made faith a criteria for membership in that universal congregation. Significantly, he did not use the word 'church'.

The use of 'congregation' rather than 'church' came up in Tyndale's debate with Thomas More as well, as shown in Jan James' recent research into accusations of malice in early sixteenth-century debate. James clearly contrasts the viewpoints of each of these men over the use of those terms. To More, the traditional church had authority because of its longevity. It had inherited its faith from the earliest church, and Christ had promised that its faith would not fail.¹⁰⁵ Tyndale and his contemporaries did not agree; they believed that their church had authority because it had spiritual and theological continuity.¹⁰⁶ This debate led to a question over what defined the church: More said that while every church was a congregation, not every congregation was a church. Tyndale countered that the word 'church' could refer to the place, the body of the clergy, or the gathering of people, and he felt that the original word actually meant the gathering of people, specifically faithful people.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ John Foxe, *The whole workes of W. Tyndall, Iohn Frith, and Doct. Barnes, three worthy martyrs, and principal teachers of this Churche of England* (London, 1573), 248.

¹⁰⁴ Foxe, *The whole workes*, 249.

¹⁰⁵ Jan James, 'Establishing an English Bible in Henry VIII's England: Translation, Vernacular Theology, and William Tyndale' (Ph.D. Thesis, University of York, 2011), 38.

¹⁰⁶ James, 'Establishing an English Bible,' 76, 78.

¹⁰⁷ James, 'Establishing an English Bible,' 182-183.

Separating the institution from the faith continued after this debate. In 1537, the *Institution of the Christian Man* (commonly known as the Bishops' Book) was published, with the purpose of providing Christians with all they needed 'either to believe or to do', by explaining the creed, the sacraments, the Ten Commandments, and the Paternoster.¹⁰⁸ In its explanations, the Bishops' Book presented an exact definition of the Catholic Church. The ninth article said that 'I believe...that there is and has been ever from the beginning of the world...one certain number, society, communion, or company of the elect and faithful people of God', under Christ and including all the faithful people of God who had already died. It went on to say that 'I believe that this congregation...[is] the holy catholic church...the very mystical body of Christ'.¹⁰⁹

The 'holy catholic church' as described in the Bishops' Book lived within the visible church on earth. It was 'catholic' in the sense that it was not limited to one geographical area, but 'dispersed and spread universally throughout the whole world'.¹¹⁰ The size of the congregation did not matter; all that mattered was that the members of it believed in the Trinity, used the sacraments rightly, and correctly interpreted scripture. Jewel later used the same criteria to define the true church during his controversy with Harding, although he never dwelled upon the necessity of belief in the Trinity. To him, that blended in with the correct interpretation of the Bible.

The Bishops' Book defined the universal church not only in terms of what it was, but in terms of what it was not, which can be seen as one of the first examples of the 'violent moderation' through governance discussed by Ethan Shagan. It denied that the Church of Rome could be called the Catholic Church: instead, it was 'only a particular member thereof, and cannot challenge or vindicate of right, and by word of God, to...have any superiority over the other churches of Christ which be in England, France, Spain or any other realm'. This foreshadowed the arguments over the visible and invisible churches of the later Elizabethan era, such as the work of religious controversialist Thomas Cartwright and the future archbishop John Whitgift. It also rejected legitimacy through physical universality, an argument that formed a major part of the Roman Church's self-defence throughout the sixteenth century. The Bishops' Book insisted that Christ was the head of the universal

¹⁰⁸ Charles Lloyd, ed, *Formularies of Faith Put Forth By Authority During the Reign of Henry VIII* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1825), 23-24.

¹⁰⁹ Lloyd, *Formularies of Faith*, 52.

¹¹⁰ Lloyd, *Formularies of Faith*, 54.

church, in whatever country it was found, and its unity was ‘a mere spiritual unity’, not a physical one.¹¹¹ Thirty years later, Harding and his fellows were still claiming legitimacy for the Roman Church based on its physical universality, and Jewel maintained a stance very similar to that in the Bishops’ Book, insisting that the universal church was a matter of spiritual connection rather than physical.

After the Bishops’ Book, reformers further clarified the layers of meaning involved in the term ‘catholic’, both in how it could be applied to the political events taking place, and its religious context. In 1538, the Scots theologian Alexander Alesius declared in a treatise against the pope and the general councils that no one should say ‘that the bishop of Rome is head of the universal church of Christ: it is not only untrue, but it is also heresy, and is directly against scripture’, because the universal church is the ‘congregation of all faithful people’.¹¹² Alesius was a strong supporter of the power of the monarchy, which influenced how he saw the headship of the church.¹¹³ Other reformers were less concerned with the political implications, and more concerned with the individuals involved.

For example, four years after Alesius’ treatise the Bible translator Miles Coverdale published a vehement refutation of the bishop and friar Henry Standish. Coverdale said that the ‘catholic or universal church’ was a congregation of the faithful who accepted salvation solely through Christ and his promises as revealed in Scripture.¹¹⁴ In 1543 George Joye, who like Coverdale had worked with William Tyndale, took his definition further by including what was required on a daily basis. His idea of the ‘catholic’ church involved ‘the religion and true worship of God in spirit and in no outward ceremonies of men’.¹¹⁵ This can be paralleled in Jewel’s later work: he also emphasized the spiritual standards of the true universal church, and rejected ‘outward ceremonies’ as a necessary part of the church.

The next official definition of the term ‘catholic’ came in *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition For Any Christian Man* (1543), commonly called the King’s Book. The King’s Book claimed to contain ‘a perfect and sufficient doctrine’ that

¹¹¹ Lloyd, *Formularies of Faith*, 56-57.

¹¹² Alexander Alesius, *A treatise concernynge generall councilles, the byshoppes of Rome, and the clergy* (London, 1538), C3v - C5.

¹¹³ Gotthelf Wiedermann, “Alesius [Allane or Alan], Alexander (1500–1565),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, May 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/320> (accessed February 1, 2012).

¹¹⁴ Miles Coverdale, *A confutation of that treatise, which one Iohn Standish made agaynst the protestacion of D. Barnes* (London, 1541), I7-I8.

¹¹⁵ George Joye, *Our sauour Iesus Christ hath not ouercharged his chirche with many ceremonies* (London, 1543), B7v-B8.

would help people know God and learn how to live in a way which was grounded on scripture. It gave two definitions for the word ‘church’: ‘an assembly of people called out...to one faith and confession in the name of Christ’, and ‘the place wherein the word of God is commonly preached and the sacraments administered’. The two definitions were distinguished by calling the building ‘the church’ and the assembly of God ‘the holy church’, a division first begun by Barnes in the 1520s. This careful distinction was made for the same reason as the two churches were distinguished in the Bishops’ Book: because there were some people in the building of the church who did not belong to the holy church.¹¹⁶ The holy church was ‘also catholic, that is to say, not limited to any one place or region of the world, but is in every place universally through the world’. It was subject to many governors and rulers, but it was all governed by one Holy Spirit, and had no obligation to acknowledge the universal authority of the pope.¹¹⁷

The King’s Book represented Henry VIII’s withdrawal from reform, and he continued this withdrawal through a limitation on Bible reading after its publication.¹¹⁸ However - not surprisingly - Henry did not draw back from the rejection of papal authority. The letter to his subjects that prefaced the King’s Book ended with the hope that all of his subjects would ‘after this life...reign in joy everlasting with the only head of the universal catholic church, our saviour and redeemer Jesus Christ’.¹¹⁹ The use of ‘universal catholic church’ rather than simply ‘catholic church’ is repeated in the articles, where it specifies that the universal catholic church is Christ’s mystical body.¹²⁰ This suggests that the two terms are juxtaposed in an attempt to clarify what was meant by ‘catholic’: no longer was the term considered self-explanatory.

After the publication of the King’s Book, the religious landscape grew more dangerous for the reformers, as some of them found themselves persecuted for their resistance to the Six Articles.¹²¹ One of these reformers was Anne Askew. John Bale recorded that she managed to evade martyrdom in 1545 by qualifying her recantation with the words: ‘I Anne Askew do believe all manner of things

¹¹⁶ Lloyd, *Formularies of Faith*, 244.

¹¹⁷ Lloyd, *Formularies of Faith*, 245-246.

¹¹⁸ Diarmaid MacCulloch, “Cranmer, Thomas (1489–1556),” in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, May 2011, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/6615> (accessed December 18, 2011).

¹¹⁹ Henry VIII, *A necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christen man* (London, 1543), A4.

¹²⁰ Henry VIII, *A necessary doctrine*, D4v.

¹²¹ Ryrie, ‘The Problems of Legitimacy and Precedent,’ 89.

contained in the faith of the catholic church'. Bishop Bonner 'flung into his chamber in a great fury' after he read that, and Bale paused in his commentary to make note of this reaction.

Was not this... a sore matter to be so grievously taken of this prelate? ... This word catholic was not wont to offend them: how becomes it now a name so odious? Peradventure through this only occasion. They knew not til now of late years... the true signification thereof. As that it is so much to say in the English as the universal or whole. Aforetime, they took it to mean their oiled congregation alone.¹²²

This incident shows how completely the use of the term 'catholic' had changed since the early 1520s. Bale suggested that Catholics such as Bonner had not known that 'catholic' meant 'universal', but perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the definition of 'catholic' had gone through a transition. Traditionally, as shown in More and Tyndale's arguments, 'catholic' meant physically and concretely universal, as represented by the institution of the church throughout the world. With the reformers insisting that the 'catholic' church was actually spiritual, it started to refer more and more to an abstract congregation of the faithful, living under various rulers and members of various churches. 'Universal' came to be used to distinguish the two definitions, and further emphasize what 'catholic' actually meant.

For Jewel, this shift in meaning became part of his re-definition of the universal church. He later used the term 'catholic' in a way that clearly echoes the Henrican reformers both in tone and content. In his 1562 *Apology*, Jewel declared that 'there is one church of God', and it is 'catholic and universal'. This is a form of rhetorical repetition for Jewel, since he used the terms interchangeably. It is followed by a further emphasis of this point, when he said that the catholic and universal church was dispersed throughout the world. 'So that there is now no nation which can truly complain that they be shut forth and may not be of the church and people of God: and that this church is the kingdom, the body and the spouse of Christ: and that Christ alone is the prince of this kingdom.'

In this Jewel acknowledged that different nations can all be part of the one church, and make up a kingdom that is separate from any physical kingdom wherein the church dwells. He then connected the universality of the church to the episcopal structure:

¹²² John Bale, *The first examinacyon of Anne Askewe lately martyred in Smythfelde, by the Romysh popes vpholders* (London, 1546), 38-39.

...Furthermore that there be diverse degrees of ministers in the church...to whom is committed the office to instruct the people, and the whole charge and setting forth of religion, yet notwithstanding we say that there neither is nor can be any one man which may have the whole superiority in this universal state, for that Christ is ever present to assist his church, and needs not any man to supply his room.¹²³

This passage does not reflect the sort of Genevan-style reform one might expect from a Marian exile, if the common portrayal of Marian exiles is accepted. It supports a complex ecclesiastical structure, and charges the clergy with the responsibility to 'set forth' religion. It also makes it very clear that there is one leader for this church, Christ alone, and firmly rejects the papacy. None of these ideas were specific to the later years of reformation under Elizabeth, nor do they show the sort of drastic change advocated by some of the more Genevan-inspired Marian exiles. Thus, in 1562, Jewel presented a moderate picture of the Church of England, and used the term 'universal church' in a way that reflected many of the statements about the universal church made by reformers in the 1530s and 1540s.

Training a Reformer

The concept of the universal church which Jewel developed during the reign of Henry VIII would be further strengthened during Edward's reign, when he started working with Peter Martyr Vermigli. In 1554, when he left England for exile, Jewel carried these ideas with him. As will be discussed further in chapter two, Jewel was part of a group of exiles on the continent who worked to preserve the English church in its Edwardian form. The significance of these exiles' efforts has been lost in much of the historiography of the Marian exile. Focus has centred on the group of exiles who wanted to make the English church reflect a more continental style of worship. This is in part due to the popularity of puritan studies, which often treat those exiles as puritan forerunners.

Jewel, like many of his fellow scholars, maintained his adherence to the Edwardian church and the royal supremacy. As historian Wyndham Southgate noted, Jewel represented a tradition of 'unity and moderation, for which Cranmer and Bucer and Martyr had laboured'.¹²⁴ Modern historians often class Jewel with Thomas Cranmer in this way. Horton Davies, a scholar of religious history, suggests

¹²³ John Jewel, *An apologie or answeere in defence of the Churche of Englande* (London, 1564), C1-C2.

¹²⁴ Southgate, *Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*, 19.

that Jewel echoed Cranmer's Eucharistic doctrine. Torrance Kirby and Patrick Collinson see a similarity between Jewel and Cranmer's methods for reforming the church, and both William Haugaard and Jean-Louis Quantin note that Jewel and Cranmer used the church fathers as authorities to defend their doctrine.¹²⁵ These comparisons provide a context for Jewel's efforts to unify and maintain the moderate stance of the church, and suggest that his views on reform can be traced back to the years before Elizabeth even took the throne. This further challenges the image of Jewel as a reformer who lost his zeal once he became a bishop in 1560.

Jewel was similar to Cranmer in another way: he spent a significant portion of his life arguing against the authority of the pope and for the legitimacy of the universal Church of England. This section will discuss the training which Jewel received for this task during his years in Oxford. Learning the skills of rhetoric, defined by the scholar of Renaissance humanism Paul Kristeller as 'the art of persuasion, of the probable argument', was a major part of the Oxford curriculum.¹²⁶ Cultural historian Walter Ong made note of the deeper effect of the teaching of rhetoric: it gave students 'no training whatsoever in uncommitted, objective, neutral exposition or narrative. ... Rhetoric is the art of persuasion, and the orator who exemplifies its training is a committed man, one who speaks for a side'.¹²⁷ Jewel was certainly a committed man for the reformed church, and, as the next chapter will discuss further, he developed an adversarial mentality during the reign of Edward. Thus, he did indeed speak for one 'side', and he contributed greatly to the definition and defence of it.

The rhetoric lectures at Corpus Christi commenced daily at eight in the morning. Three days a week, the lectures were based on Cicero, Quintilian, Sallust, and Suetonius. On the remaining three days, the lectures were based on Virgil, Ovid, Lucian, Juvenal, or Terence. On feast days the lecturer would 'read and explain' Horace or Persius.¹²⁸ Jewel read Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Cicero's orations and *De*

¹²⁵ Torrance Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 5; Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: the Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 6; Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England From Cranmer to Hooker* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), 120; Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967), 64; William Haugaard, *Elizabeth and the English Reformation: The Struggle for a Stable Settlement of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 245.

¹²⁶ Paul Kristeller, 'Rhetoric in Medieval and Renaissance Culture,' in *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, edited by James J. Murphy (Berkeley, University of California, 1983), 1.

¹²⁷ Walter Ong, 'Tudor Writings on Rhetoric,' *Studies in the Renaissance* vol 15 (1968), 50.

¹²⁸ James McConica, 'The Rise of the Undergraduate College,' 21-22.

Oratore, and the speeches of Demosthenes. He spent a lot of his time working on the style and content of his rhetoric. In his 1573 Latin biography, Laurence Humphrey reported that Jewel would walk in the woods at Shotover for hours reciting Cicero and Demosthenes.¹²⁹ By doing this, Jewel undoubtedly absorbed more than the style of the orators. Cicero's orations would have shown him something of the role of a magistrate, and Demosthenes has been described by the scholar of rhetoric Harry Caplan as 'spokesman of the highest sincerity for the ideals of democracy', so they would have exposed Jewel to various forms of government.¹³⁰ Perhaps this is where Jewel developed a philosophy that could be called civic or princely humanism.

Also, learning out of all these authors had one common purpose: as Caplan says, 'the classical authors were fully searched and carefully excerpted for the specific use of preachers'.¹³¹ Although there were many kinds of rhetoric, designed for many occasions, the major purpose for learning rhetoric at this time was to train men to give sermons. Literature scholar Marion Trousdale associates Renaissance persuasive speech with that of Greece, and claims that Renaissance rhetoric was 'a means of influencing those in power, of winning arguments, of controlling other minds'. Most importantly, it gave the orator 'enormous power...the power through speech to move others to action'.¹³² During the sixteenth century, the desire to move people to action was manifested in the desire for conversion. Sermons were vital for several reasons, not the least of which was that England at this time was still very much an oral culture, despite the importance of print. Patrick Collinson and Reformation historian Andrew Pettegree have both written about the importance of oral communication at this time, especially in sermon form. Collinson claimed that many Protestants insisted that it was only through hearing the word preached that faith could be developed.¹³³ Pettegree notes that sermons were a means of disseminating information, a way of capturing attention, and perhaps most importantly a opportunity for engagement between clergy and laity.¹³⁴

¹²⁹ Southgate, *Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*, 5.

¹³⁰ Robert W. Cape, 'The Rhetoric of Politics in Cicero's Fourth Catilinarian,' *The American Journal of Philology* vol 16, no 2 (1995), 263-264; Harry Caplan, 'The Classical Tradition: Rhetoric and Oratory,' *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* vol 27, no 2 (1997), 15.

¹³¹ Caplan, 'The Classical Tradition,' 15, 27.

¹³² Marian Trousdale, 'Rhetoric,' in *English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, edited by Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), 623-625.

¹³³ Patrick Collinson, 'English Reformations,' in *English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, edited by Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000), 28.

¹³⁴ Andrew Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 8-12.

This engagement had been part of late-medieval preaching as well. Paul Kristeller claimed that the sermons of the sixteenth century were actually ‘heavily dependent on a strong and prolific medieval tradition’.¹³⁵ Pettegree takes this further, stating that the reformers were aware of both the effectiveness of medieval preaching and the need to transform it if they were to transform society. Therefore, they kept only the aspects of medieval preaching that were effective in persuading their audience, such as ‘a sense of the sermon as performance; a belief that preaching could transform the lives of those who stood before them; and a belief that the spirit of God was embodied in the preacher’.¹³⁶ Jewel was representative of this new form of preaching; he used his skills in rhetoric to dramatic effect, and portrayed himself as a messenger for God, preaching what he had first been told.

Jewel was well known for his skill in speech that moved others to action by the time he began to work toward a Bachelor of Divinity. According to Humphrey, Jewel’s tutors at Corpus Christi were always pleased with Jewel’s early orations, and allowed him to read them to his fellows at the dinner hour. One of these orations praised President Morwen’s dog, which apparently was a source of great amusement and gave Jewel a reputation for wit.¹³⁷ Later in his academic career, Jewel’s skill in rhetoric made him a popular lecturer, and he was named Reader in Humanity and Rhetoric in 1548, which was a public lectureship open to all the university students.

One of the few of these early orations that is still extant is his *Oratio Contra Rhetoricam*. It was an eloquent condemnation of rhetoric presented in grand rhetorical style, and thus it was most likely meant to be ironic. Still, it skilfully argued the opposite of what one might expect the Reader in Rhetoric to argue – so skilfully that C.S. Lewis thought that it had great literary merit. He mourned that this work was not seriously intended, since ‘we should have to salute a man who stood almost alone in maintaining that rhetorical study is a total waste of time, [and] that rhetoricians are neither better understood nor more believed than natural speakers’.¹³⁸

Although this was an oration, not a sermon, it did show an aspect of Jewel that later appeared in his preaching style. Ecclesiastical historian and theologian John Booty, in his 1963 biography of Jewel, found evidence of Jewel’s early

¹³⁵ Kristeller, ‘Rhetoric in Medieval and Renaissance Culture,’ 13.

¹³⁶ Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, 17.

¹³⁷ Humphrey, *Iuelli... Vita et Mors*, 22-23. See also Charles LeBas, *The Life of Bishop Jewel* (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1835), 5-6.

¹³⁸ Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century*, 306.

reforming tendencies in this oration. He considered Jewel's apparent rejection of Cicero to be a sly show of support for reformation. Jewel seemed to be saying 'that none would attack the new Ciceronianism unless he were a papist and a scholastic'.¹³⁹ This interpretation disagreed with that of Wyndham Southgate, who suggested that the *Oratio* was not a religious or reforming work in any way.¹⁴⁰ Southgate did not fully discuss what the *Oratio* was, however, and neither did Gary Jenkins.

All three may well have missed the actual purpose of the oration. The *Oratio* follows a very precise structure, displays the Renaissance humanists' emphasis on choosing the right word, and summarizes and demonstrates most, if not all, of the skills that make up effective rhetoric. Thus, it can be viewed as a very clever and effective model for students to imitate. In one section, Jewel launched into a passionate expression of regret for the 'waste of time' that is rhetoric:

Why do they strive for so many verbal fancies, so many shadows and follies? Why in free prose do they devise rhythms and restrictions? Why do they use suspicions, conjectures, opinions, tales and rumours as their weapons? Why do they lay so many traps to ensnare our ears? What is the purpose of these figures of speech, those forms and devices which they call illuminations...the metonomies, apostrophes..allegories... exclamations, pauses, justifications, understatements and hyperboles? ...What is the purpose of those facial expressions, the grand posturing, the cringing? Why the outstretched hands, the thigh-slapping and stamping of the foot?¹⁴¹

One can imagine with what 'outstretched arms, thigh-slapping and stamping of the foot' this was spoken, which would have further emphasized the irony of his point and the effectiveness of his style. Thus, considering his audience, it could be argued that the purpose of this oration was to teach, to move young men to study, to work, to develop their wit and their skills in rhetoric. In this way, it brings to mind Jewel's 1551 oration and foreshadows his famous sermons of the 1560s, which reflected much the same passion for educating people as this oration did, even though his reason for educating them changed. Jewel used the same style, the same tricks of figurative language, and the same precise selection of words in his sermons, and later in his polemical works and apologetics.

¹³⁹ John E. Booty, *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (London: S.P.C.K., 1963), 9.

¹⁴⁰ Southgate, *Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*, 7.

¹⁴¹ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, 1286. Thanks to Paul Simpson for his help with the translation.

Conclusion

The very foundations of society were under attack during Jewel's early years at Oxford. During those years, the definition of the term 'catholic' began to change, due to a new emphasis on the spiritual congregation of faithful people that made up the true universal church. Many of the arguments against the Roman Church that Jewel later used to such effect in his controversy with Thomas Harding first appeared during this time. While there is no concrete evidence that Jewel read such publications as the Bishops' Book or the King's Book, it is highly likely that he did, considering his interest in reform, his study of divinity, and the official nature of these publications.

It is also likely that Jewel was aware of alterations in the concept of catholicity due to the scholarly network in which he was involved. This network included his tutor John Parkhurst, his patron Richard Chambers, and reformers such as Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli. It also brought him into contact with many other men who aimed to defend the English Church, who first became his fellow exiles and then his fellow workers in the cause of reform. The long-standing connection between these men created a sense of unity and purpose that survived the Marian exile and helped them establish the Church of England under Elizabeth in a way that reflected its recent past under Edward and Henry.

While it cannot be denied that the exile created new fissures in the definition of the catholic church in England, this chapter has shown that there was still some continuity of thought that needs to be considered in studies of the Elizabethan settlement. It has also challenged the view of Jewel as a reformer who lost his passion for reform by showing that Jewel's vision for the doctrine and structure of the Church of England pre-dated the Marian exile. It began when Jewel was a young man earning his degrees, and grew during the dangerous and exciting years of the Edwardian Reformation, which will be the focus of the next chapter.

Chapter Two: John Jewel and the Community of Reformers

In the years between 1547 and 1558, John Jewel was drawn into the adversarial atmosphere of sixteenth-century theological debate through his relationship with Peter Martyr Vermigli. Peter Martyr, as he was commonly known in England, was a reformer who left Italy for exile in 1542 and arrived in Oxford in 1548. He brought Jewel into the circle of foreign and domestic reformers in England whose similar views on doctrine created a collaborative reforming community. This community, which evolved through the scholarly network discussed in chapter one, further defined the nature of the true universal church during the Edwardian reformation (1547-1553). Then, the experience of exile during the reign of Mary (1553-1558) gave its members practical experience in defending their definition, which created in them a new self-awareness and sense of purpose.

This new self-identity had an effect on the way that the returning exiles, including Jewel, defined the church in 1559. The Elizabethan settlement has traditionally been associated with a *via media*, by which is meant a ‘middle way’ between Rome and Geneva that attempted to compromise between those two opposing forces. This chapter will argue that there was no room for such a *via media* in this community. The adversarial mentality of Martyr and other reformers meant that they looked on particular beliefs as either right or wrong, and did not consider compromise. Rather, their goal was moderation – to be correctly balanced in their faith, in contrast with the extremes they saw around them.

This chapter will develop the argument from chapter one that challenged the portrayal of the Marian exiles as the radical element that caused much of the conflict in 1559. It will also further the premise of this thesis that an examination of Jewel’s early years is necessary to fully understand Jewel’s work for the Elizabethan church, by showing the twofold effect that the decade preceding Elizabeth’s accession had on him. First, these years influenced his views on catholicity: Jewel developed an adversarial concept of the universal church and aimed for balance through moderation, as his fellow members of the reforming community did. Far from trying to form a middle-way religious compromise, he believed that the universal church was the true church whose members stood in firm opposition to the false church. To him, this false church was not only the Church of Rome, as historians frequently claim. It was any church that did not promote pure doctrine, which to Jewel and the

reforming community included Arians, Anabaptists, certain Lutherans who held ubiquitarian beliefs, and freewillers.

Second, the experience of exile altered other people's perception of Jewel. It was during this time that Jewel was fully recognized amongst his colleagues for his abilities as a scholar and a preacher, as well as for his pastoring skills that provided emotional and intellectual support for the exiles. Through his experience working with members of the reforming community at Frankfurt and his association with the work of Peter Martyr, Jewel gained a reputation as a competent reformer. This reputation encouraged his fellow members of the reforming community to involve him in the settlement of religion as soon as he arrived back in England in 1559. It also gave weight to his later work in defence of the legitimacy of the church, which influenced the development of a Protestant self-identity for the Church of England. This self-identity assisted in the development of demarcation lines between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, as will be discussed further in the following chapters.

Jewel's years of exile have not been examined since Christina Garrett's *Marian Exiles* of 1938. This is despite scholars' recent interest in the experience of exile and how it affected the Reformation, examples of which can be found in the work of Torrance Kirby, Jane Dawson, and Peter Marshall. Kirby calls the Marian exile a 'crucible' that led to the Elizabethan settlement in its eventual form.¹ Reformation historian Jane Dawson considers the Marian exile a determining factor in the English reformers' development of apocalyptic thought.² Marshall argues that the Marian exile has pulled the focus of exile studies unjustly, and sees greater value in studying the wider phenomenon of exile in the sixteenth century. However, Marshall also acknowledges the importance of the Marian exiles. They were unique, because virtually all of them went back to England.³ This implies that the effects of their exile would also be unique, since they would have had a chance not many religious exiles have: to return, and influence the faith of their home nation. How they took advantage of this will soon be discussed in more detail. First, the exile itself must be examined.

¹ Torrance Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 25.

² Jane Dawson, 'The Apocalyptic Thinking of the Marian Exiles,' *Prophecy and Eschatology: Studies in Church History* vol 10 (1994), 75.

³ Peter Marshall, 'Religious Exiles and the Tudor State,' in *Discipline and Diversity*, edited by Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory (Chippenham: Boydell and Brewer, 2007), 263, 267-268.

This chapter begins with a discussion of the historiography, and then it is divided into two parts, which both take a chronological approach. The first part will study how some of the major controversies that arose in the church during the Edwardian Reformation affected both the members and the enemies of the reforming community. It will address the distortion of the relationship between Jewel and Martyr in the historiography, and the resulting portrayal of Jewel as a simple assistant rather than a reformer in his own right. It is true that Jewel was still building his reputation during these years, and that he is often not singled out in records of major events. However, an investigation of Peter Martyr's work from this period reveals that Jewel had a greater role than is usually acknowledged. Significantly, he presented a vision of the Church of England that was similar to his later work, providing further evidence that he did not change his views after the accession of Elizabeth.

The second part of this chapter will further that investigation by extending it into the years of the Marian exile (1553-1558). It will challenge the dominant view in the historiography that Jewel worked *for* Martyr as his secretary between 1555-1558, arguing instead that it is more accurate to say that Jewel worked *with* Martyr in a position as Martyr's secretary, since in his later writings Martyr himself portrayed their working relationship as an interactive one. This may seem like a minor point, but it is actually quite important to establish Jewel in his proper place in the work of continental reform during the Marian exile. He was an active participant in the exile community, not merely a foil for Martyr, and gained skills, experience and contacts that helped him rise rapidly to prominence in the early Elizabethan church.

Foreign Influence and Domestic Faith

The experience of exile is important for this chapter, in part because of the effect that foreign reformers had on the English Reformation. As Torrance Kirby points out, the Marian exiles and other contemporaries acknowledged the contributions of men like Bullinger and Martyr to the development of English doctrine and beliefs, considering them 'determiners of theological opinion on many of the crucial questions of the day'.⁴ However, acknowledging the connection between the continental and English reformations as Kirby does is a relatively recent development in the historiography of English ecclesiastical history. The attitude that

⁴ Kirby, *The Zurich Connection*, 7.

the English Reformation was exceptional or isolated from the continent was dominant throughout the nineteenth century, and the early part of the twentieth century. It can be found in works by historians as different in approach as Sydney Carter, A.G. Dickens, T.H.L. Parker and G.R. Elton.

In his 1925 work *The English Church and the Reformation*, Sydney Carter focused exclusively on English reformers like Colet, Wycliffe, Cranmer, and Latimer. He limited Luther's influence by arguing that 'even before the writings of the celebrated Wittenberg monk had reached England, three young Cambridge scholars, Tyndale, Bilney and Frith, were earnestly engaged in studying Erasmus' Greek New Testament, and in imparting its precious truths to others'.⁵ This portrayed England as independent from the continent, and fully capable of forming and reforming its own faith. Forty years later, A.G. Dickens' influential *English Reformation* also set England apart from the continental reformation by attributing the success of Lutheranism (such as it was) to the 'reception areas' of faith that allowed it to take hold, which had been created by the English proto-reformer John Wycliffe.⁶

Similarly, T.H.L. Parker's study of the English reformers implied that no outside influence was needed for England to develop a new living faith in the sixteenth century. He discarded the connections between England and the continent, claiming that any connections were merely part of the politics of reformation, not part of their faith.⁷ Elton also took a political bent, but applied it differently: he saw the entire Reformation as primarily political, a 'Cromwellian Revolution' that was focused on increasing royal power through religion. Being not primarily about the reform of the faith, it did not need the influence of the continental reformers.⁸

In more recent historiography, scholars have begun to place the English Reformation in its continental context, acknowledging that it did not develop in isolation. Reformation historian Gervaise Duffield has examined why scholars attempted to portray it so, noting that some scholars use the continental reformation as a scapegoat for the 'wilder excesses' of the English Reformation, rather than

⁵ C Sydney Carter, *The English Church and the Reformation*, second ed (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1925), 63.

⁶ A.G. Dickens, *English Reformation*, second ed (London: BT Batsford, 1989), 13-14.

⁷ T.H.L. Parker, *English Reformers* (London: SCM Press, 1966), xvi.

⁸ See G.R. Elton, *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).

examining its place in the full spectrum of Reformation learning in England.⁹ Cultural and intellectual historian Carrie Euler suggests that Reformation historians have actually been ‘vaguely aware’ of the connection between England and the continent for years, ‘but the details and significance of the connection have never been researched thoroughly or absorbed into the larger narratives of either the English or Swiss Reformations’. She attributes this to a tendency to emphasize the influence of Calvinism, at the expense of ignoring the other reformed traditions on the continent.¹⁰ It could also be attributed to historians’ tendency to look for what Luc Racaut calls ‘clear-cut contests that produce winners and losers’.¹¹ Once the complexity and the interrelationships of the various reformed traditions is acknowledged, it becomes much more difficult to categorize Reformation ideologies, and much more difficult to separate the reformers.

Significantly, even in this recent historiography, few historians explore how the English reformers placed their church and their faith within the greater context of Christendom and the concept of the true church. Thus they miss an important aspect of the continental connection: how it allowed the reformers to make the Church of England both unique and universal. This is a paradox that was central to reformers of the Edwardian Reformation. They formed a universal church out of the community of the faithful, and then methodically separated certain believers from that universal church. That the reformers would create a paradox of this sort does not surprise early-modern historian Mark Greengrass, who considers such contradictory concepts ‘the stuff of sixteenth-century life’. He suggests that the men who did not avow extreme theological positions were the most likely to use paradox, ‘as a way of understanding their world and defining themselves in relation to commonly held...opinions’, which is another way of expressing the reformers’ determination to hold a properly balanced view in a world of extremes.¹²

It was not an easy balance to maintain. Thomas Betteridge, who studies early modern literature and history, used the chronicles written by sixteenth and seventeenth-century historians to show that Protestantism at this time was a

⁹ Joseph McLelland and Gervaise Duffield, *The Life, Early Letters and Eucharistic Writings of Peter Martyr* (Abingdon: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1989), Preface.

¹⁰ Carrie Euler, *Couriers of the Gospel: England and Zurich 1531-1558* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 2006), 2-3.

¹¹ Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie, ‘Between Coercion and Persuasion,’ in *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, edited by Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 1.

¹² Mark Greengrass, ‘Moderate Voices, Mixed Messages,’ in *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, edited by Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 207.

movement that ‘obsessively claimed an inherent exclusivity and integrity, while in the process of making this claim revealing its fractured and culturally antagonistic basis’. He argued that these historians attempted to provide a stable social identity, and remove the conflict and anxiety about what it meant to be Protestant in the sixteenth century.¹³ This desire for a Protestant social identity connected to a need to legitimize the monarch’s headship of the church, and Betteridge claimed that part of the historians’ role was to provide this legitimacy. ‘In mid-Tudor texts a godly monarch always seems to need a *veritas*-producing historian, a person whose texts reflect and enact this very claim to cultural authority.’¹⁴

Betteridge’s work did not explore the connections between legitimizing the monarch’s headship of the church and the development of a national identity for the English, because he focused on the development of social identity. However, the legitimization of the godly prince did help form a national identity as well. The authority of the godly monarch and the monarch’s control over the process of Reformation made a significant difference. To say with Maurice Powicke that the English Reformation was definitely an act of state might well be an overstatement, but the role of the state in the English Reformation cannot be ignored.¹⁵ Ethan Shagan makes the crown’s determination to maintain moderation a defining characteristic of the English Reformation, arguing that governance was about moderation in England more than anywhere else.¹⁶ Scholarship such as this makes both the temporal and the ecclesiastical leaders of the Reformation the architects of an English Reformation that was simultaneously spiritual and political. This formula has many unstable elements, but it does put the role of continental reformers in the English Church back into the mix. It also gives the reformers a unique place within it, as political as well as spiritual leaders.

Peter Martyr makes a good example of this sort of reformer. Marven Anderson suggests that Martyr was not just an influential developer of theology, but an active worker in changing the role and structure of the Tudor Church.¹⁷ This led to a new understanding of the royal supremacy: as Torrance Kirby notes, Martyr was involved in public affairs from the beginning of his time in England, and his

¹³ Thomas Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530-1583* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1999), 17.

¹⁴ Betteridge, *Tudor Histories*, 150.

¹⁵ Maurice Powicke, *The Reformation in England* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 1.

¹⁶ Ethan Shagan, ‘Beyond Good and Evil: Thinking with Moderates in Early Modern England,’ *Journal of British Studies* vol 49 (2010), 501.

¹⁷ Marven Anderson, ‘Rhetoric and Reality: Peter Martyr and the English Reformation,’ *Sixteenth Century Journal* vol 19, no 3 (1988), 454.

work on defining the duties and privileges of the godly magistrate helped develop and define the role of the prince in the church.¹⁸ Like Kirby, Robert Kingdon thinks Martyr had an impact on politics in England, but he takes it further by pointing out that English politics had an equal impact on Martyr. Martyr's later political thought did not reflect the needs of the government of free cities, such as those in which he lived. Instead, it mainly reflected the needs of a monarchy, which Kingdon attributes to Martyr's time spent in England.¹⁹ However, it also could have been due to the interaction Martyr had with English scholars on the continent. Perhaps Martyr's concern for monarchical forms of government derived from the time he spent studying with English scholars such as Jewel. This would support the idea of their relationship as an interactive one, in which influence and scholarship went both ways. The next section will provide further evidence for that possibility.

The Myth of Martyr

Many historians, such as Torrance Kirby and Anne Overell, as well as theologians such as Andreas Löwe, G.W. Bromily and Gary Jenkins, all describe Jewel as an admirer or a disciple of Martyr. This implies that he had very few thoughts of his own, and the resulting images are not flattering.²⁰ Löwe, for example, uses the teacher-student relationship to make Martyr and Jewel seem like a pair of malicious gossips, spreading rumours about the private life of Catholic controversialist Richard Smyth to anyone who would listen.²¹ Ironically, this portrayal was initiated by one of Jewel's close friends: Laurence Humphrey, his first biographer. Humphrey called Jewel Martyr's 'disciple' but did not mean it to detract from Jewel's reputation as a theologian. His intention was probably far simpler: to enhance Jewel's reputation as reformer by connecting him to a prominent figure of the continental reformation.

However, many historians call this into question. Marshall M. Knappen, John Booty and Wyndham Southgate have all used Humphrey's description to give

¹⁸ Kirby, *The Zurich Connection*, 19, 22.

¹⁹ Robert Kingdon, *The Political Thought of Peter Martyr Vermigli* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980), iv; McLelland, *Life, Early Letters and Eucharistic Writings*, iv.

²⁰ G.W. Bromily, *John Jewel*. Published by Church Book Room Press in 1960.

<http://www.churchsociety.org/index.asp>. Accessed Nov 21, 2010; Kirby, *The Zurich Connection*, 4; William Haller, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963), 39; Gary Jenkins, *John Jewel and the English National Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 13, 23; Gary Jenkins, 'Peter Martyr and the Church of England after 1558,' in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank James III (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 69; M.A. Overell, *Italian Reform and English Reformations, c 1535-1585* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 115.

²¹ Andreas Löwe, *Richard Smyth and the Language of Orthodoxy* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 75.

his portrayal of Jewel a hidden agenda. They suggested that Humphrey was promoting Jewel's secret puritan beliefs in his *Iuelli... Vita et Mors* by calling Jewel Martyr's 'disciple', because Peter Martyr was also often portrayed as sympathetic to puritan beliefs. The result, as summarized by Southgate, is that 'the conventional characterization [of Jewel] with which we are presented is that of a churchman deeply sympathetic to Puritanism but forced by the pressure of administrative responsibility and political reality to a half-hearted acceptance of [the established church]'.²² Essentially, Humphrey's portrayal of Jewel as Martyr's disciple has been used to contribute both to the viewpoint that Jewel lost his reforming zeal after becoming bishop, and to a distortion of Jewel and Martyr's relationship.

Evidence from letters between Martyr, Jewel and other English reformers, as well as other contemporary accounts of Jewel, do not put Martyr and Jewel's relationship in that light. It would be far more accurate to describe Martyr and Jewel's relationship as one of close friends, or even family. Martyr's biographer, Josiah Simler, dedicated his 1563 *Oratio* of Martyr's life to Jewel, and in his Latin dedication said: 'for you [Jewel] accounted him [Martyr] in the place of a father, and he in like manner most willingly confessed you to be unto him in age a son and in dignity a father'.²³ This suggests that neither party felt that Jewel was inferior, which would suit their history together. After all, they had begun their relationship as near equals: as Anne Overell points out, in 1547 Martyr was not yet a well-respected giant of theological debate.²⁴ Similarly, Salvatore Corda pointed out that Martyr was neither famous nor innovative in his theology before he came to England.²⁵ Martyr's later reputation as a reformer is often projected backwards to this time in Oxford, and it is easy to forget that in 1547 Martyr had only published two short works, and that he had only left the Catholic Church five years before.

Although we know that Jewel began to appreciate Martyr's teaching very quickly, there is no evidence that Jewel was, as Gary Jenkins suggests, in thrall to Martyr. Jewel was not a youth when Martyr arrived; he had already established a reputation as a scholar through his studies in Oxford and his position as a teacher. It

²² John E. Booty, *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (London: S.P.C.K, 1963), 13; Marshall M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism* (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1963), 178-180; Wyndham Southgate, *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), ix.

²³ McLelland, *Life, Early Letters and Eucharistic Writings*, 23.

²⁴ M.A. Overell, 'Peter Martyr in England 1547-1553: An Alternative View,' *The Sixteenth Century Journal* vol 15, no 1 (1984), 88, 90-93.

²⁵ Salvatore Corda, *Veritas Sacramenti: A Study in Vermigli's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975), 57.

is easy to find evidence of Jewel's work with Martyr in Jewel's later works and assume that it means that Martyr completely changed Jewel's doctrinal beliefs and made him a sort of miniature version of himself. This does not consider the way Martyr and the reformers worked, which was in a community that shared ideas and aimed for unity and truth.

As the theologian and ecumenist Paul Avis argues, the reformers believed that 'unity must be in verity', so they 'pitted an apostolic succession of true doctrine against an apostolic succession of unworthy prelates'.²⁶ They chose to align their beliefs as much as possible, so that they could stand united against the arguments of the Roman Church. Within such a community, it is not surprising to find similar ideas shared between contemporaries. Patrick Collinson points out that these reformers 'were all reading the same Bible, the same St Paul, [so] we need to be ultra-cautious in asserting that B was influenced by A'.²⁷ It is far more likely that influence moved horizontally, as ideas and interpretations were exchanged freely between fellow members of the reforming community.

It is important to make a brief note about sources at this point, before the chapter divides into its two main sections. There are few published works of Jewel from this era. Mostly, this chapter relies on Jewel's earliest sermon, his correspondence in *The Zurich Letters*, and some of Martyr's published works which Jewel helped to prepare. These include the commentaries on Romans, 1 Corinthians, and Judges, the *Treatise on the Sacrament*, the *Disputation on the Sacrament*, and *The Dialogue of the Two Natures in Christ*. This chapter also makes use of some of Martyr's unpublished works, such as his sermons and letters. In this a debt is owed to the recent translations of Peter Martyr's letters, sermons and treatises that were provided by the Peter Martyr Library.

These sources are discussed in the context in which they were written or presented, not when they were printed. For example, the commentary on 1 Corinthians was probably written before Martyr arrived in Oxford and then adapted as he presented it during lectures in 1548-9, but it was not published until 1550.²⁸ Much of Martyr's work against ubiquitarianism, with which Jewel assisted, took place during the late 1550s, but a lot of it was not published until 1561, after Jewel

²⁶ Paul Avis, 'Article Review: John Jewel: Anglicanism's Bane or Blessing?', *Ecclesiology* vol 4 (2008), 349-350.

²⁷ Patrick Collinson, 'The Fog in the Channel Clears,' in *The Reception of the Continental Reformation in Britain*, edited by Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), XXXVI.

²⁸ Anderson, 'Rhetoric and Reality,' 455.

had taken up his position as a bishop enforcing the Elizabethan settlement. Thus, Jewel's involvement in countering this heresy is often forgotten. Also, Martyr had a tendency to delay publication in order to perfect his work, so many of his commentaries and treatises were collected and published after his death in 1563. This delay in publication creates another difficulty: some of Martyr's works were so heavily edited that it is difficult to find Martyr's voice within them.²⁹ Therefore, as much as possible, the editions published by Martyr himself are used in this chapter.

Part One: Conflict and Communion in Oxford

The relationship between Jewel and Martyr began early in 1548, soon after Martyr arrived in Oxford. They probably met through Jewel's tutor John Parkhurst, and the two men developed a friendship that might well have been based on their common interest in education.³⁰ Both were popular lecturers, and both combined their scholarly writings with their teaching. Martyr valued education highly; he preached on the importance of studying theology at least three times while in England, a theme which also frequently appeared in Jewel's sermons. This reflected their shared belief in the importance of educated preachers in the business of promoting a balanced, reformed faith. Jewel continued to preach about this even after his return from exile, and once presented that message to the queen herself.³¹

Jewel joined the small group of men who gathered at Martyr's house for private study and lectures, later described by Josiah Simler as all of Martyr's friends who 'loved the pure and true doctrine'.³² This group was part of the wider community of reformers, and Simler's description shows its adversarial nature: they all had similar ideas of what was 'pure and true' doctrine, which implies rejection of flawed doctrine. They also had a clear purpose: during their meetings, members discussed the major religious texts of the day, which were often used to promote the cause of reform. An example can be seen in their work on the *Saying of the Sacrament of Thanksgiving*, a document on the Eucharist written by Martyr, which the group discussed and adapted to prepare it for distribution. According to Marven

²⁹ Robert Kingdon, 'Peter Martyr Vermigli and the Marks of the True Church,' in *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History*, edited by F Forrester Church and Timothy George (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 203.

³⁰ John Strype, *Ecclesiastical memorials; relating chiefly to religion, and the reformation of it, and the emergencies of the Church of England, under King Henry vol 2* (London, 1721), 208.

³¹ See John Booty, 'The Bishop Confronts the Queen,' in *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History*, edited by F. Forrester Church and Timothy George (Leiden: Brill, 1979).

³² Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* vol 2, 207; McLelland, *Life, Early Letters and Eucharistic Writings*, 63.

Anderson, it was then dedicated to the Duke of Somerset, and later used by Cranmer to ‘guide the Prayer Book through Parliament’.³³

Thomas Harding was a member of this group, although he was never at its core. As he said in his 1566 *Rejoinder to John Jewel*, ‘you know M[aster] Jewel, no man better, how far I was from [Martyr’s] inward familiarity whereunto you were admitted’.³⁴ Although it is difficult to tell whether Harding was actually excluded or just perceived himself as such, there is certainly a possibility that the group’s adversarial mentality made enemies out of people whose views did not entirely align with their own. However, Jewel seemed to remember Harding as a member of the reforming community at this point. He later marvelled how Harding’s conversion back to the Roman Church coincided perfectly with the death of Edward and the accession of Mary.³⁵

The wider community of reformers to which this study group belonged included Hugh Latimer, Nicholas Ridley, John Ponet, Anthony Cooke, and John Cheke, all of whom Josiah Simler claimed as Martyr’s friends.³⁶ Other members were Jan A Lasco and Martin Bucer, who were leading reforming communities outside of Oxford. Bucer held much the same position in Cambridge as Martyr did in Oxford, and Martyr’s correspondence with him shows his awareness of the community’s distinctiveness. Martyr did not want Bucer to think that he was diverting from Bucer’s teachings or offended by what he wrote.³⁷ He also wanted to maintain unity with Bucer: in 1551, he said that he agreed with what Bucer and Calvin had decided about the Eucharist and intended to support them completely. This was despite any difficulties that might cause for him and his friends, although ‘you would not, however, believe with what bitterness, obstinacy, perverseness and inflexibility of mind we are resisted by our adversaries, and on this very subject’.³⁸ Martyr’s phrasing here is typical of the adversarial mentality which characterised the reforming community; they thought in terms of friend and foe and often referred to those who resisted reform as ‘our adversaries’.³⁹

³³ Marven Anderson, ‘Vista Tigurina: Peter Martyr and European Reform (1556-1562),’ *The Harvard Theological Review* vol 83, no 2 (1990), 192.

³⁴ Thomas Harding, *A rejoindre to M. Jewels replie* (London, 1566), CCCiir-CCCiiv.

³⁵ John Jewel, *A replie vnto M. Hardinges answered by perusing whereof the discrete, and diligent reader may easily see, the weake, and unstable grounds of the Romaine religion* (London, 1565), *1.

³⁶ McLelland, *Life, Early Letters and Eucharistic Writings*, 63.

³⁷ McLelland, *Life, Early Letters, and Eucharistic Writings*, 338.

³⁸ McLelland, *Life, Early Letters, and Eucharistic Writings*, 341.

³⁹ Euler, *Couriers of the Gospel*, 47.

Such a mentality brought new intensity to the religious landscape in which Martyr, Jewel and their fellow reformers found themselves. Simler, in his *Oratio* on Martyr's life, observed that Martyr's relationships with those who were not part of the reforming community were often strained. This took the form of physical attacks, heckling, and passive aggression. Some of the heads of houses at Oxford denied their scholars access to his lectures.⁴⁰ Abbot John Feckenham accused Martyr of changing his religious views to suit the monarchy who supported him.⁴¹ The priest William Tresham debated against Martyr regarding the real presence in the Eucharist, and published a book full of 'slandorous remarks' about the disputation. John White, the headmaster of Winchester College, also published a tract against Martyr's views of the Eucharist.⁴²

Martyr's most vocal opponent was Richard Smyth, who had held the position of Regius Professor of Divinity from 1536 until it was transferred to Martyr in 1548. Not surprisingly, Smyth fought against Martyr's presence at Oxford from the beginning. Smyth attended Martyr's lectures so he could challenge him, speaking out during the actual lectures and also arguing against Martyr in a series of polemical works.⁴³ The conflict came to a head when Smyth and a crowd of his followers showed up at one of Martyr's lectures and demanded that Martyr debate with Smyth. Martyr refused until he had government permission, which was duly granted soon after.

Their disputation was set for 4 May, 1549, but on the night before it began, Smyth fled the country. Two of his friends took up the challenge, so Martyr rescheduled, and it took place from 28 to 31 May instead. Three articles were set up for debate, which show that the central issues were transubstantiation and the real presence.⁴⁴ Martyr acquitted himself well over the four days of the debate, and the moderator Richard Cox acknowledged that Martyr had fully answered the Romanists' arguments. However, Cox did not grant victory to either side, tactfully suspending rather than ending the debate by claiming that such major issues for the church would have to be decided by the king and the leaders of the church.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ McLelland, *Life, Early Letters and Eucharistic Writings*, 58.

⁴¹ Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* vol 2, 121.

⁴² Corda, *Veritas Sacramenti*, 74.

⁴³ Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* vol 2, 41-45.

⁴⁴ Joseph C. McLelland, trans and ed., *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation, Peter Martyr Library* vol 56 (Kirkville: Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 2000), xxvii-xxviii.

⁴⁵ M.A. Overell, *Italian Reform and English Reformations, c 1535-1585* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008), 109.

This disputation became famous beyond the walls of the university, as a masterpiece of the reformed view of the Eucharist. Historian and theologian Joseph McLelland, who has become a leading expert on Martyr, noted that it had two far-reaching effects. First, it broke down barriers and made room for the positive teaching of Bucer, who had just arrived when the disputation was taking place and began teaching in the autumn of that year. Second, it meant that ‘Martyr’s doctrine, as defended in the disputation and set forth the same year in print...was now the recognized doctrine of the church’. His work influenced the development of the 1552 Prayer Book and the 42 Articles.⁴⁶

Significantly, Jewel participated in this important disputation. He acted as a notary for Martyr, which meant that he was tasked to write down what was being said while people were speaking, and to act as a legal witness that what was written down was a true representation of what had occurred. Martyr acknowledged a debt to him in the published version of the debate: in the preface, he praised Jewel’s work and expressed gratitude for Jewel’s help in preparing the manuscript for publication.⁴⁷ Being Martyr’s notary for this disputation put Jewel at the forefront of developments in the reformation of the church. It showed him how to apply scriptural knowledge to real-life issues, and how to argue from a historical context. It also gave Jewel experience in polemic and in publishing, which would later help him fulfil his tasks as defender of the Elizabethan church.

The 1549 disputation greatly enhanced Martyr’s reputation as a reformer, and he was involved in even more projects from 1550 to the death of Edward in 1553. Perhaps the most significant of these was the re-writing of the ecclesiastical laws.⁴⁸ This project brought Martyr into closer contact with other members of the reforming community: it was probably then that he met the prominent reformer Walter Haddon, the future martyr Rowland Taylor, and William Cecil, who would become Elizabeth’s Secretary of State.⁴⁹ These connections proved beneficial not only to Martyr, but also to Jewel. Jewel had the opportunity to go to court with Martyr during this time, and gained his first preferment as a rector in Sunningwell, a parish approximately four miles south of Oxford. He was also shown favour in the

⁴⁶ Joseph McLelland, *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), 22-23.

⁴⁷ McLelland, *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation*, 4.

⁴⁸ Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* vol 2, 365.

⁴⁹ Overell, *Italian Reform*, 117.

university.⁵⁰ While Martyr was away from Oxford, Jewel was chosen to speak in his stead. There, he presented the oration discussed in chapter one.⁵¹

The most notable result of Jewel's new involvement with the wider reforming community occurred in 1552. Dr Morwen, the president of Corpus Christi College, was taken in for questioning by the Council on the charge of using a service other than the prayer book. He was imprisoned and fined £200 before he was allowed to return. While he was gone, the Council appointed Jewel as the president of the college.⁵² Remarkably, this incident has been passed over by many of Jewel's biographers. The clergyman and controversialist Daniel Featley did not mention it in the biographical sketch he attached to his 1609 collection of Jewel's works. Neither did John Ayre in the sketch he attached to the fourth volume of his 1835 collection of Jewel's works, and it was also missing from John Craig's article on Jewel in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.⁵³

Nor does there seem to be any documentary evidence of the event in college records.⁵⁴ Even in the history of the college, written by Thomas Fowler in 1893, it is barely mentioned. Fowler claimed that Morwen and several other fellows were 'secret adherents' of the Roman religion, which is why they were committed to the Fleet and a letter was sent to the college appointing Jewel as president.⁵⁵ Fowler seemed torn between his regard for college presidents and his admiration for Jewel in his account. He attempted to put everyone in the best light possible, including 'secret adherents' such as Morwen, and did not dwell on the means of Jewel's appointment.

Charles LeBas, the nineteenth-century clergyman who wrote several biographies of major Reformation figures, seems to be one of the few scholars who recognize the significance of this event, and even his recognition is limited. He saw the significance of the position, not the appointment. As LeBas said, being a college president 'demanded incessant exertion and self-devotion, being among the most active and distinguished promoters of sound literature, and of religion pure and undefiled'. He acknowledged that Jewel had shown academic and administrative

⁵⁰ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, ix; Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* vol 2, 70-71.

⁵¹ Charles LeBas, *The Life of Bishop Jewel* (London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1835), 18.

⁵² John Ayre, ed, *Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury* vol 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1835), ix. See also Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* vol 2, 386.

⁵³ John Craig, "Jewel, John (1522–1571)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14810> (accessed August 6, 2011).

⁵⁴ Thanks are due to the college archivist, Julian Reid, who helped determine this.

⁵⁵ Thomas Fowler, *A History of Corpus Christi College* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1893), 97.

skills that made him an eligible candidate to lead a college, and decided that Jewel's reputation as a 'faithful servant and champion of the truth' may well have had something to do with his appointment.

However, LeBas did not discuss how Jewel's reputation had managed to reach the world outside of Oxford, nor the significance of the involvement of the Council.⁵⁶ This seems to be a great oversight, since the involvement of the Council in the decision shows that Jewel's reputation had grown beyond the confines of the university. When the leaders of reform in London needed someone they could trust, they chose Jewel, despite his relative inexperience. This suggests that the reforming community had recognized Jewel as fellow-fighter against their adversaries. It foreshadows Jewel's later reputation as a champion of the church against both external and internal threats.

This recognition occurred a few months after Jewel preached a sermon that showed the development of his adversarial mentality. The sermon was based on the premise that there was a clear and simple division between the true and false churches, which would be the foundation of his 1560s sermons as well. Before an audience of other members of clergy, he began with an exhortation to fight for *our* church and stand against *our* enemies, lest they lose all that they had gained. Jewel referred to his listeners and the godly people of England as 'the church of God'; the church which stood in opposition to the devil that constantly brought in vices and ignorance to confuse the flock of Christ.⁵⁷ This church was meant to do as the apostles did and live, not only speak, their faith. In that way 'as oft as we speak, we may seem to speak the words of God'.⁵⁸

Jewel considered this church of God to be the true universal church, and he considered the English Church to be part of it: 'I commend unto your devotion the universal church of Christ, dispersed throughout the whole world, and now...in many places miserably afflicted, and namely this our Church of England'.⁵⁹ To refer to the English Church as part of the universal church of Christ was a recent formulation, and reflected the change in the term 'catholic' which had been taking place over the last two decades. By using it, Jewel gave distinction to the English Church, as part of the true church that was fighting against various enemies. Significantly, Rome was not the only 'false church' targeted in this sermon. Jewel

⁵⁶ LeBas, *Life of Jewel*, 18-19.

⁵⁷ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 2, 952-953.

⁵⁸ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 2, 962.

⁵⁹ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 2, 951-952.

also refuted the ubiquitarian belief in corporeal presence, using Acts 3:20-21 to argue against it: ‘And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heavens must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began’.⁶⁰

This verse refers to Christ’s human, physical body. To Jewel, if the heavens had received Christ, then Christ was not on earth. To think otherwise was to violate the sacrament. As Jewel said, ‘Christ hath commanded the sacrament to be delivered whole: men have torn the same after a miserable manner. Christ willed that nothing should be added to his law: men do not only add many things, but the same they prefer before the word of God’.⁶¹ Through this argument, Jewel protested against both transubstantiation and ubiquitarianism. Both fell outside the realm of ‘our’ beliefs, making them part of the beliefs of ‘them’, the people who were not part of the true universal church. This was not an attempt to walk a middle way between two extremes; it was an attempt to maintain the right position in opposition to others, who were out of balance.

Martyr fought against the ubiquitarians in terms similar to Jewel’s, and also challenged other sects. In his Romans commentary, which Jewel helped to prepare for publication, Martyr spoke against people he considered Pelagians and Arians, and against the Anabaptists. To those he called Pelagians, he said that despite their claim that the promises of God were general, they were in fact given as seals to the faithful.⁶² Martyr also rejected what he saw as Arian views of the Holy Ghost and of prayer, and protested rather tartly against the Anabaptist views that infant baptism was useless because it is impossible to know whether infants are members of the elect.⁶³ From the similar messages presented in their work, it is evident that Jewel and Martyr were both engaged in the business of reform during the reign of Edward, working together with the wider reforming community to correct old false ideas and prevent new ones from taking hold.

Communion and Reform

This work helped continue the re-definition of the ‘catholic’ church that had begun during the reign of Henry VIII. Individual people became very important in

⁶⁰ Acts 3:20-21 KJV.

⁶¹ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 2, 959.

⁶² Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Most Learned and Fruitfull Commentaries of D. Peter Martir Vermilius Florentine... vpon the Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes* (London, 1568), 222.

⁶³ Vermigli, *Most Learned and Fruitfull Commentaries...to the Romanes*, 192v, 223v.

the argument against the catholicity of the Romanists: to the reformers, individuals made up the true universal church. In his commentary on 1 Corinthians, Martyr made this very point, claiming that it was an error to consider only the Roman Church to be the church.

We deny not but that there is an order among churches, but we grant it not to be the same which depends on the wealth and dignities of this world. Wherefore among churches, that must be taken for the better, which does most flourish in spirit, doctrine and holiness. ...Let the church be catholic, for places do not separate believers, even as the place in like manner though it be one, does not join them together.⁶⁴

This passage shows that Martyr made faith the criterion for the true ‘catholic’ church, not the institution of the church - or its status, wealth, and size. As Paul Avis phrases it, ‘the reformers could not permit size to matter when it came to truth’.⁶⁵ Rather, there had to be right doctrine and the right spirit. Robert Kingdon suggests that Martyr’s beliefs on this issue followed that of many reformers at the time: that any group of people who maintained correct doctrine represented the true church, no matter how old, how big, or how widespread that group was.⁶⁶ This is a fair assessment of Martyr’s beliefs, although Martyr did later put a unique twist on it:

And Paul in the first to the Corinthians the first chapter, after he had saluted the church of God, added by exposition: ‘unto them that are sanctified by Christ Jesus, being called saints’, that we may understand that the wicked appertain not in very deed unto the church, although they be always conversant therein, and that...we may confess that to be the church which we call the communion of saints.⁶⁷

Here Martyr calls the universal church, by which he means the congregations of the truly faithful, the communion of saints. This is a somewhat controversial term in modern historiography, which tends to use ‘communion’ more often in connection with the Eucharist than in any descriptions of the members of the universal church, and shies away from using the word ‘saints’ in this context. Diarmaid MacCulloch briefly discusses the term ‘communion’ in his biography of Cranmer, when he talks about the development of Eucharistic theology in 1548. He observes that it was in 1548 that the mass was first called the ‘Holy Communion’, and that this was also the

⁶⁴ Peter Martyr Vermigli, *The common places of the most famous and renowned diuine Doctor Peter Martyr* Part 4, (London, 1583), 1, 2.

⁶⁵ Avis, ‘John Jewel: Anglicanism’s Bane or Blessing,’ 349.

⁶⁶ Robert Kingdon, ‘Ecclesiology: Exegesis and Discipline,’ in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by Torrance Kirby (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 376.

⁶⁷ Vermigli, *Commonplaces* Part 4, 1.

first time that the people were invited to be partakers of it.⁶⁸ Paul Avis, while challenging Gary Jenkins' description of Jewel's Eucharistic thought, calls the Eucharist a 'communion of love between the faithful', but denies that it is merely that.⁶⁹ He too considers communion part of the sacraments, not part of the gathering of people.

Herman Selderhuis, in his study of Peter Martyr's prayers that were based on the Psalms, discusses Martyr's use of the term somewhat differently. He acknowledges that for Martyr, the term 'communion' meant not only the sacrament, but the fellowship of the members of the universal church. The sacrament allowed people to connect with God and have communion with each other as well as with Him.⁷⁰ To Martyr, the community of the faithful was the body of Christ, and the communion of these people through faith and through the sacraments was a basic criterion for their inclusion in the universal church. This concept of catholicity can be seen in a 1555 letter Martyr sent to John Calvin, where Martyr used 'communion' to refer to the connection between Christ and the members of his church, and described three levels or forms of communion that take place over the course of a Christian's spiritual life.⁷¹ Thus, Martyr used the term communion to refer to both the community of believers and the sacrament itself.

This aspect of catholicity can also be found in Jewel's work. Jewel helped Martyr prepare the commentary on Corinthians for publication, which suggests that he agreed with the definition of the 'catholic' church that Martyr set out. His later work also shows a similar connection to the term 'communion'. In his discussion of the private mass in his controversy with Harding, Jewel described two aspects of communion, as a sacrament and as a gathering. Interestingly, he placed both within the context of the Lord's Supper. First, communion was so called because of the effect it worked on the receiver, because 'by the same we are joined unto God'. Second, communion was so called because its other purpose was 'to join us all together'.⁷²

Jewel always emphasized the importance of each member of the church, and in 1551 he exhorted his fellow clergy to strive to be 'the light of the world, salt,

⁶⁸ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 384-5.

⁶⁹ Avis, 'John Jewel: Anglicanism's Bane or Blessing,' 351.

⁷⁰ Herman Selderhuis, 'Expounding Psalms: Preces Sacrae,' in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by Torrance Kirby et al (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 262-263.

⁷¹ McLelland, *Life, Early Letters and Eucharistic Writings*, 347.

⁷² Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 1, 131.

[and] angels', since they were all appointed to govern 'the flock of the Lord...the sons of God...the brethren of Christ'.⁷³ To Jewel, the faith of these brethren was the vital component for a true universal church, and his task as a clergyman was to develop that faith both through his work and his life. The next part of this chapter will show that he did not always succeed in leading by example. However, his conviction remained the same, and also developed in new directions as he worked with the reformers in exile.

Part Two: Conflict and Crisis in Exile

After Mary took the throne, Peter Martyr's influence in the upper echelons of government vanished. He went into exile almost immediately, while Jewel remained in Oxford. He still had a reputation as a scholar and a lecturer, but once Martyr was disgraced, that very reputation became a liability. It was, after all, built on an association with the reforming community. As William Haller observes, Jewel had been 'the moment before at the threshold of what promised to be a brilliant career in the university and the church', and suddenly found himself without any supporters, patrons or friends.⁷⁴

Jewel was almost immediately expelled from Corpus Christi, and it is perhaps significant that Robert Morwen, the president who had been temporarily replaced by Jewel, orchestrated this expulsion.⁷⁵ However, Jewel did not actually leave Oxford: he was accepted into Broadgates Hall (now Pembroke College). Significantly, he was named Public Orator either immediately before or after this change, and in this capacity one of his first tasks was to write a letter of congratulation to Queen Mary on her accession. John Ayre describes the message of this letter briefly, suggesting that the Oxonians, through Jewel, quietly but zealously 'did...congratulate the state for her and her for the state'.⁷⁶

As only a brief summary of the letter is extant, in Humphrey's *Iuelli... Vita et Mors*, it is difficult to determine whether or not this was sincere. Ayre and Booty suggest that there was no reason to doubt that Jewel was sincere at this time, since Mary had not yet shown herself an enemy to the community of reformers. However, it does seem that Jewel attempted to instruct the queen through praise, as Alexander Nowell would later attempt to do with Elizabeth: he expressed hope that Mary

⁷³ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 2, 954.

⁷⁴ Haller, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation*, 39.

⁷⁵ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, ix.

⁷⁶ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, x.

would tolerate the views of the reformers, and allow them some small advancements.⁷⁷ This reflects both his loyalty to the royal supremacy, and the value Jewel placed on the reformation which he had been working to promote.

Jewel managed to continue working at Broadgates without open conflict until 1554, when Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley were compelled to participate in the Oxford disputation. Jewel acted as notary for Cranmer and Ridley, a task which was made more difficult by the constant violation of the rules of disputation.⁷⁸ Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer were not given the courtesy of being allowed to speak freely, and frequently had to answer several people at once. Also, the disputation continually changed from English to Latin, and no one corrected this.⁷⁹ In this chaotic atmosphere, the adversarial mentality of the reforming community was very much in evidence, and that could not be construed as anything but a challenge. Cranmer separated the Roman Church from the true church, and Latimer cried for mercy from God for his sin of saying the mass, which greatly angered the authorities.⁸⁰ Ridley denied the real presence in the Eucharist, in a way that John Foxe later described as ‘sharp, witty and very learned’.⁸¹

Foxe also reported that the prolocutor, Hugh Weston, charged the notaries for Cranmer and Ridley ‘that they were more diligent in writing of the other part than of his’ after the disputations had ended. Notably, the notaries could not agree amongst themselves, even though they had conferred ‘twice or thrice’ about the day’s work.⁸² This suggests that there was some disagreement about what the disputants had said, and it could be inferred that some notaries wanted to change what others had recorded. Perhaps Jewel, as one of Cranmer and Ridley’s notaries, had attempted to ensure that their arguments were presented accurately. This may have alerted the representatives of the crown that Jewel was not as conformable as he had seemed.

This possibility is supported by the reaction of the royal visitors to Jewel later that same year. Jewel was among the first to be presented with articles to sign that supported the Roman Church. According to LeBas and Ayre, Jewel was given no time to deliberate or consult with his friends. He was told to sign them or be

⁷⁷ Booty, *Jewel as Apologist*, 12.

⁷⁸ LeBas, *Life of Jewel*, 31; Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, xi; Southgate, *Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*, 13.

⁷⁹ John Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online* or *TAMO* (1563 edition) (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed: 12.06.2013], 1001.

⁸⁰ Foxe 1563, 1003, 1012.

⁸¹ Foxe 1563, 1001.

⁸² Foxe 1563, 1046.

immediately killed by fire.⁸³ This might have been an empty threat, since the Marian burnings had not yet begun in 1554, but Jewel may have believed it. He gave in and signed the articles. Ironically, his subscription seems to have provided him with the impetus to make a stand for his faith. Just a few months after he signed, Jewel fled Oxford and ended up in London. It seems surprising that Jewel would choose Bishop Bonner's London as a safer place than Oxford, but the choice was only partially his. He collapsed on the road mid-flight and was found there unconscious by Augustine Bernherus, Latimer's servant. Bernherus took him to London, which may or may not have been Jewel's original destination. If it had been, he may have chosen London because he expected to find help there due to the presence of what John Strype later called the 'sustainers of the gospel': members of the reforming community, labelled as Nicodemites, who were actually working subversively to continue the Protestant cause in England.

Strype listed eighteen people as 'sustainers of the gospel', and said that there were many more whose names were 'studiously concealed, for their safety in those times'.⁸⁴ One of these secret sustainers may have been Jewel's friend William Cecil, whom he had met through his association with Martyr. At this point, Cecil was working for the exiles through his defence of their property in Parliament.⁸⁵ Also, he owned the land in Lincolnshire on which the reformer John Day had set up his printing press.⁸⁶ If Jewel had known of Cecil's subversive support of the Protestants, he may have been hoping for help from him.

Marven Anderson takes the story of the sustainers further than most other historians, and posits that the Marian exile was not a flight into exile at all, but a 'pre-planned, well-organized and funded exodus' meant to ensure that the Church of England could be restored some time in the future. He suggests that it was William Cecil's idea (which supports the suggestion made by historians Stephen Alford and Conyers Read that Cecil was a secret sustainer), and that Cecil gained the assistance of such wealthy men as the Duke of Suffolk and William Parr. According to Anderson, Suffolk and Parr then organized the group of sustainers to support the exiles.

⁸³ Jenkins, *Jewel and the English National Church*, 38 ; LeBas, *Life of Jewel*, 30; Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, xi.

⁸⁴ John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* vol 3 (London, 1721), 142-143.

⁸⁵ Conyers Read, *Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1957), 111.

⁸⁶ Stephen Alford, *Burghley: William Cecil at the Court of Elizabeth I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 67.

Anderson's evidence for this is that many men left England before the persecutions really started, that there was a 'predominance of teachers and students' among the refugees, and that the exiles hesitated to seek employment and citizenship, suggesting that they considered their stay on the continent to be a temporary one.⁸⁷ It is an intriguing theory, but it does seem to be beyond the organizational skills even of someone with Cecil's talents. It can certainly be said that the exiles did seem hopeful that Mary's reign would be short and its end would usher in a better day for the Church of England, but that may well have been the extent of their plans. As for Jewel, it is hard to tell what his plans were at all.

Troubles in Frankfurt

Jewel escaped from England early in 1555, and soon after he found himself in Frankfurt, embroiled in a conflict over liturgy in the English exiles' church. It was during this conflict that Richard Cox famously insisted that the exile congregation would 'have the face of an English Church' and use Cranmer's liturgy.⁸⁸ This determination to maintain the standards of later Edwardian reform shows that there was already a nationalistic element to the reformed faith in England. As the theologian John New suggested, this was reflected in the bitterness of the struggle. There were larger issues at stake than the format of the service: the core of the debate lay in the 'contrary notions of the true nature of the church' that were held by different participants.⁸⁹ Jewel's views aligned with those of Martyr, Cox, and other members of the reforming community with whom he had worked during the Edwardian Reformation, and he maintained those views throughout the crisis in Frankfurt.

Jewel's role in the controversy is recorded in *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles Begun in Frankfurt*, which was written by William Whittingham in 1575 and published in 1908 by Edward Arber. Whittingham simply described Jewel's actions during his stay in Frankfurt, but Arber emphasized Jewel's participation.⁹⁰ It seems that Jewel's later prominence in the defence of the Elizabethan church inspired Arber to inflate his importance in the Frankfurt conflict. However, this is

⁸⁷ Anderson, *Reformer in Exile*, 167.

⁸⁸ Edward Arber, ed, *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles Begun in Frankfurt* (London : Eliot Stock, 1908), 54.

⁸⁹ John F.H. New, *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of their Opposition, 1558-1640* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1964), 38.

⁹⁰ Arber, *A Brief Discourse*, 73, xii; cf Southgate, *Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*, 17-18.

not to say that Jewel's participation was insignificant. It was a time in which Jewel applied his theories about royal and ecclesiastical authority to the reality of church conflict, an important step in the development of his support of the supremacy.

It also allowed other reformers to see him in a different light. While in Frankfurt, Jewel took the opportunity to withdraw his recantation. He preached a sermon in which he confessed that he had subscribed to Roman articles, and publicly repented.⁹¹ This was well received by reformers such as Thomas Sampson and Richard Chambers. It also gave Jewel new status in the congregation by making him appear more trustworthy, which allowed him to participate fully in the mediation process.⁹²

One of the most significant aspects of this struggle in Frankfurt is how clearly the adversarial mentality that was so prevalent in the reforming community at the time shows through. It all began in July of 1554, when the Frankfurt exiles set up a community in the Church of the White Ladies. At that point, there were two groups within the congregation: Arber used the terms 'Calvinist' and 'Anglican' to differentiate them, although he acknowledged that these labels did not yet apply to people in an English Church. Knox led the 'Calvinist' group, and Thomas Lever served the 'Anglicans', who were in a minority.⁹³ Thus, for the sake of using more historically accurate terms, the two groups will be referred to as the Leverians and the Knoxians.

In August 1554, the congregation sent out a general letter, referring to themselves as the body of Christ which was forming a church in exile to stop their adversaries from taking advantage of their dispersion. They invited other exiles to join them, but this call to unity was not well received.⁹⁴ Other churches said they would join the Frankfurt congregation only if they adopted the liturgy used in Geneva, which was considered more reformed than the English liturgy. This was unacceptable to the Leverians, and led to open conflict in the church. It was at this point that the English reforming community in Strasburg sent Cox and his group of learned men to Frankfurt to mediate.⁹⁵

Jewel's task was to work with the church leaders and the magistrate in an attempt to find a resolution. The basic problem was the lack of an obvious source of

⁹¹ Arber, *A Brief Discourse*, 55.

⁹² Arber, *A Brief Discourse*, 73; Ayre *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, xii.

⁹³ Arber, *A Brief Discourse*, xiii.

⁹⁴ Arber, *A Brief Discourse*, 26-30.

⁹⁵ Arber, *A Brief Discourse*, xiii-xv.

authority, and the conflict between Knox and Cox brought the question to a head: should the church have power over the pastor, or the pastor over the church – and what should be the role of the magistrate?⁹⁶ These same issues later came up in Elizabethan polemic as the divines fought to prove the legitimacy and authority of the Church of England. This led to Jewel's claims to apostolic precedent and doctrinal alignment with the primitive church. It also led to further clarification of the role of the monarch in the church, because Jewel insisted that in the early church the emperor had had more authority than the bishops.

Gillian R. Evans, a historian of theology, points out that the problem of authority loomed in the background of many such reformation debates, arguing that 'throughout the debates runs a preoccupation with power, understood by both sides as primarily a...dominion'. A few people in the church exercised power over the faithful, and it was a usurped power that the faithful people justifiably strained against. 'The result was a power struggle, a confrontation of claims to authority which made it impossible in the end for both sides to sit down together and work out a resolution.'⁹⁷ This describes the situation in the Frankfurt church very well. Jewel and his group decided that to restore peace they first had to rid the church of Knox, so they charged him with high treason against Queen Mary.⁹⁸ Their evidence for this accusation came from the vehement polemic that Knox had spewed out against Mary in a book called *Admonitions of Christians Concerning The Present Troubles in England*. This decision meant that they were upholding Queen Mary's temporal authority over Knox's spiritual authority, even though they considered this particular temporal magistrate to be unjust and ungodly. This placed the magistrate in a superior position to the preacher, which applied the royal supremacy in a new and ruthless way. Their action could be construed as denying Knox the right to rebel, even against such a queen and in such a manner.

This viewpoint is supported in Jewel's later writings. In the second *Book of Homilies*, which he edited, as well as his best-known works in defence of the English Church, the *Apology of the Church of England* and *The Defence of the Apology*, Jewel consistently presented the message that subjects did not ever have the right to disobey. He emphasized repeatedly that disobedience and rebellion were wrong, and did not allow any possible exceptions. This was partly to support his main argument

⁹⁶ Arber, *A Brief Discourse*, xvii.

⁹⁷ Gillian R. Evans, *Problems of Authority in the Reformation Debates* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), ix.

⁹⁸ Arber, *A Brief Discourse*, 67.

regarding resistance to rulers, which was that the reformers were neither rebellious nor seditious. Harding claimed more than once that the reformers advocated the overthrow of governments; he used the reformers' lack of obedience as evidence that their religion was false. Jewel then promoted their obedience, to prove the opposite point.

Whether or not subjects had the right to resist was one issue on which Jewel and Martyr did not agree. In contrast to Jewel's insistence on obedience, Martyr's resistance theory allowed for disobedience in the spiritual realm. He said that people had to resist being drawn back into the Roman Church, and that was never acceptable to go to Mass, because 'the mass is a pledge... a token and sign, whereby papists know theirs from others'.⁹⁹ To Martyr papal authority was tyranny, which tried to legitimize its usurped power through the doctrine of the two swords.

This doctrine placed spiritual authority above temporal authority, and supported the papal supremacy.¹⁰⁰ Martyr supported temporal authority over the church, but he did strictly limit that authority, arguing that 'kings and magistrates when they are godly, in my judgment ought to have the chief place in the church, and to them it pertains, if religion be ill administered, to correct the defaults'. However, they could not take the role of head of the church.¹⁰¹ By this argument Martyr gave the godly magistrate the power represented by the temporal sword, but only part of the power of the spiritual sword. It is significant that he limited this authority to situations where the magistrates and kings were godly. This too reflects back to his call for people to resist any rulers who tried to draw them back to Rome.

Jewel never openly disagreed with Martyr over the right to rebel in the spiritual realm; he just delicately passed over the issue and did not make that distinction. He also did not engage with much of the resistance theory to which he would have been exposed while on the continent, even though some of the men involved were part of his reforming community. Reformers Christopher Goodman and John Ponet both published works during Mary's reign that showed their growing radicalism by advocating the right of resistance to ungodly rulers.¹⁰² As Anne Overell notes, both of these men involved Martyr in their arguments: Ponet used Martyr's work to defend his own in his famous tract *A Short Treatise on Political*

⁹⁹ Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Most Learned and Fruitful Commentaries [on Judges]* (London, 1564), 53v.

¹⁰⁰ Emidio Campi, 'Zurich: Professor in the Schola Tigurina,' in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by Torrance Kirby et al (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 106.

¹⁰¹ Vermigli, *Commentaries [on Judges]*, 148v.

¹⁰² Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought* vol 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 224.

Power, and Goodman tried to draw Martyr into the argument.¹⁰³ Martyr did not rise to the bait. Neither did Jewel: as the ecclesiastical historian Clifford W. Dugmore argues, ‘such a strong-minded man as Jewel [was] not likely to...cast away all that he learned from Cranmer and Ridley in two and a half years’ sojourn on the continent’.¹⁰⁴ Jewel’s views on the powers of the magistrate over the church had been firmly settled before the Marian exile, which perhaps explains his willingness to charge Knox with treason against Queen Mary.

Jewel did not remember his participation in the Frankfurt conflict fondly. A year after he left that congregation, he wrote to William Whittingham and Christopher Goodman, hoping that their enmity could be either ‘extinguished by Christian principle or at least laid to rest by lapse of time’.¹⁰⁵ Jewel knew both men from his years in Oxford: they had been at Brasenose at the same time as Jewel himself had been at Corpus Christi, and Goodman had been involved in the same study group with Martyr as Jewel had.¹⁰⁶ Notably, Jewel did not apologize for the coup itself in his letter, saying openly that he still believed in what the Leverians had done. He only apologized for any injury he may have caused when ‘carried away with zeal and the heat of contention’.¹⁰⁷

This shows both Jewel’s adversarial mentality, which would not allow him to compromise even to save a friendship, and his efforts to maintain relationships with other English exiles. The reforming community was under stress by its experience of exile, and he did not want to see it splinter. He wanted them all to stay unified in the cause of reform, and not let current circumstances destroy their past achievements. Fortunately, Goodman at least seemed to feel the same way. He wrote a letter to Martyr a year later which was meant to heal old wounds from Frankfurt, and in it offered a warm salutation to Jewel.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰³ Overell, *Italian Reform*, 140.

¹⁰⁴ Clifford W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformers* (London: McMillan and Co, 1958), 228.

¹⁰⁵ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, 1193.

¹⁰⁶ “Goodman, Christopher (1521/2–1603),” Jane E. A. Dawson in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/10975> (accessed June 11, 2013).

¹⁰⁷ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, 1193.

¹⁰⁸ Robinson, *Original Letters* second portion, 768-771.

Community in Exile

After he left Frankfurt, Jewel joined Martyr in Strasburg, and became his constant support and companion. He even travelled with him to Zurich once Martyr found a position in the university there. Later correspondence shows how close the two men became: Jewel was not afraid to tell Martyr when he was annoyed with him, which he certainly was when Martyr dared to suggest that he was procrastinating. His tone to Martyr also sometimes took on a note of authority that is never seen in other letters sent to Martyr from prominent Englishmen, such as Edwin Sandys, Thomas Sampson or Richard Cox.¹⁰⁹ In a letter written soon after he arrived in England, Jewel told Martyr about some of the people they knew who had assisted with the renewal of the Catholic faith during the Marian years, then said: ‘I write nothing about [Richard] Marshall for fear of defiling my paper. But why, say you, do you make mention of such persons? Simply, that you may learn by what judges it was thought fit that Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer should be condemned’.¹¹⁰ Jewel’s disgust is clear in this letter, and he did not mince words. This is not the deferent tone of a student to a teacher. Rather, the tone reflects Jewel’s familiarity with Martyr’s experience and beliefs, along with their scholarly interaction. This can also be seen in a later letter, when Jewel asked for clarification on a lecture Martyr had given in Strasburg ‘respecting the power that sovereigns have over bishops’. He remembered that Sylverius and Vigilius ‘were removed from their office [of patriarch] by the emperor Justinian’, and wanted Martyr to help him find the source of that information. Thus, he asked: ‘when you next write, I will thank you briefly to point out the place where this circumstance is recorded’.¹¹¹

In contrast, Thomas Sampson’s letters to Martyr during the same time period show an almost servile attitude. In one letter, Sampson was asking for advice about whether or not to take a bishopric. He wrote: ‘I entreat you for Christ’s sake my excellent father, not to refuse me an answer for this few inquires, as soon as possible. ... I implore you, for Christ’s sake, to write to me with what haste you can’.¹¹² Martyr’s response took a different tone than did his letters to Jewel. He patiently

¹⁰⁹ Hastings Robinson, ed and trans, *The Zurich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others with some of the Helvetian Reformers, During...The Reign of Queen Elizabeth* first series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842), 19, 66, 72.

¹¹⁰ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 12. Richard Marshall was the priest who tried to catch Jewel when he escaped from England. He was responsible for digging up Martyr’s wife’s grave.

¹¹¹ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 18-19.

¹¹² Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 1.

made an attempt to give advice, but without the warmth or appreciation that can be found in his responses to Jewel.¹¹³

Jewel and Martyr fought together against all opponents of reform, and indeed against those who seemed to be for it and yet did not maintain acceptable beliefs. During the Marian exile, the controversy over ubiquitarianism intensified, which caused part of the problem in Frankfurt. Some of the English exiles were allowing Lutheran ministers to baptize their children, prompting Martyr to write a letter in an attempt to stop them. He disagreed with this practice because, as he said, ‘the Lutherans and our people have a different faith’.¹¹⁴ Marven Anderson observes that Martyr did not deny the ecclesiastical validity of Lutheranism in his letter. He did, however, say that through baptism a person was sealed to the church in which they were baptized, and that it was not acceptable to have English children baptized into a faith that had an incorrect view of the Eucharist.¹¹⁵

Martyr’s adversarial mentality is clear in this letter. He saw Lutheran baptism as a tipping point, so to speak, in a properly balanced, moderate faith. At the same time, he did not attack the Lutherans as a group nor employ any of the harsher methods of sixteenth-century polemic. This reflects an attitude not many members of the reforming community had, but it was typical of Martyr. He reserved his vehement attacks for people whom he placed outside the true universal church. Those whom he considered part of the universal church and yet not quite balanced in their faith were treated more gently. Jewel would later show the same restraint in his polemic against Harding, reserving his harshest words for the pope and the tradition of transubstantiation.

In 1556, the German theologian Johannes Brenz published *De Personali Unione Duarum Naturarum In Cristo* in support of the doctrine of ubiquitarianism. Martyr started working to counteract it, and the result was *The Dialogue of the Two Natures in Christ*. The *Dialogue* was not published until 1562, but the work itself occurred while Jewel was with Martyr in exile. Martyr dedicated the work to Jewel, and the two men discussed it in their letters. This has led to an interesting fiction in the historiography: scholars such as Gary Jenkins, Brown Patterson, and Joseph McLelland have claimed that Jewel was a character in the dialogue, the moderator

¹¹³ Hastings Robinson, ed and trans, *The Zurich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others with some of the Helvetian Reformers, During...The Reign of Queen Elizabeth* second series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842), 25.

¹¹⁴ John Patrick Donnelly, ed, *Life, Letters and Sermons: Peter Martyr Vermigli*, Peter Martyr Library vol 42 (Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 1999), 130.

¹¹⁵ Anderson, *Reformer in Exile*, 182.

named Palaemon.¹¹⁶ However, after reading the *Dialogue* it is clear that it takes place solely between a character that represents Martyr, Orothetes (which means ‘boundary setter’ in Greek), and the character that represents Brenz, Pantachus (which means ‘everywhere’).¹¹⁷ Palaemon is not part of the dialogue.

The suggestion that Palaemon was part of it comes from a letter Martyr sent to Jewel when he sent Jewel the *Dialogue* to examine. In it, Martyr referred to Jewel as Palaemon, making a classical allusion to the judge in Virgil’s Third Eclogue. Martyr used this allusion humorously, because he was asking Jewel to judge the *Dialogue*’s worth.

Since you enjoy such a masterly knowledge of things human and divine, ignorance can in no way cloud your mind. So it seemed good to me to submit these two men for examination by your searching judgement. I do so the more willingly because of your command of the matter in dispute.¹¹⁸

Martyr knew that Jewel was knowledgeable about this topic because of the work they had done together in Zurich. In the same letter, he reminded Jewel about how they had ‘conversed pleasantly...and worked together’ every day, which is why Martyr felt that that he had more right than any others to judge Jewel’s ‘sincere faith, upright behaviour, straightforward spirit and open heart’. Based on that knowledge, Martyr felt that Jewel could read and correct the *Dialogue*, and ‘return it complete and perfect in every respect’.¹¹⁹

This suggests a sort of collective authorship for this work, which fits with the claims of Heather Hirschfield and Stephen Greenblatt regarding the construct of authorship in the early modern era. They have long promoted the idea that writers of the time shaped themselves so that they fit into philosophical and religious contexts and gave themselves literary opponents. This shaping involved collecting works from many people, and presenting it as a whole but not necessarily as an individual accomplishment.¹²⁰ Whether or not this theory has weight, it can be concluded that Jewel may well have had more to do with Martyr’s work than has traditionally been

¹¹⁶ Jenkins, ‘Peter Martyr and the Church of England after 1558,’ 68; Brown Patterson, ‘The Anglican Reaction,’ in *Discord, Dialogue and Concord*, edited by Lewis W Spitz and Wenzel Lohff (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973), 151; McLelland, *The Visible Words of God*, 206fn.

¹¹⁷ John Patrick Donnelly, *Dialogue on the Two Natures in Christ*, Peter Martyr Library vol 2 (Missouri: Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 1995), xvii.

¹¹⁸ Donnelly, *Dialogue on the Two Natures*, 3.

¹¹⁹ Donnelly, *Dialogue on the Two Natures*, 8, 9.

¹²⁰ Heather Hirschfield, ‘Early Modern Collaboration and Theories of Authorship,’ *PMLA* vol 116, no 3 (2001), 611.

thought. Jewel did read and return the *Dialogue*, with a letter that wryly referred to himself as Martyr's Palaemon, which perpetuates the story that he was a character.¹²¹

The work for the *Dialogue* occurred while Jewel was in Zurich with Martyr, working with him and some of the members of the Edwardian community of reformers. A study group that was mostly made up of English exiles gathered at Martyr's house, just as a group once had in Oxford. It began in Strasburg, when Martyr arrived there accompanied by several English students who believed in reform.¹²² Winthrop Hudson calls this group, which was made up of both Oxford and Cambridge men, a 'petty college for English theological students', one which developed with the aid of John Ponet and John Cheke.¹²³ Not all of the members of the group were students, however: some had been reformist clergy during the reign of Edward, such as Edmund Grindal and Edwin Sandys.

Many of the students followed Martyr to Zurich in 1556, an area with a strong but transient population of English exiles. Thomas Lever, Robert Horne, Richard Chambers and others all stopped there at one point or another, although most of them did not stay long. Members of the Zurich community who were more settled, such as John Parkhurst and James Pilkington, became part of Martyr's group. They discussed and contributed to Martyr's work, just as the group in Oxford had assisted with Martyr's *Saying of the Sacrament of Thanksgiving*. After the martyrdom of Cranmer, who had been a friend and patron to most of them, these men encouraged Martyr to take up Cranmer's work against Bishop Stephen Gardiner regarding the Eucharist. They both funded the project and assisted him in the writing of it, which resulted in the *Defensio Doctrinae de Sancrosancto*, published in 1559.¹²⁴

By that point, many of the men in that group had already returned to England, including Jewel. Martyr sent him a copy of it, which is still extant in the Magdalen College library in Oxford, in the collection of books that once made up Jewel's personal library. Martyr's appreciation of Jewel is shown in the inscription on the title page: 'amico suo et hospiti charissimo d[omino] jo. juell A.M. petrus

¹²¹ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 100-101.

¹²² Kingdon, *The Political Thought of Peter Martyr Vermigli*, V.

¹²³ Winthrop Hudson, *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1980), 88.

¹²⁴ McLelland, *The Visible Words of God*, 47.

martyr d.d.’.¹²⁵ Jewel’s appreciation of Martyr is shown in his detailed examination of the book itself: he underlined passages arguing against ubiquitarianism, indexed particular arguments using a numbering system, and starred key points. Both the inscription and Jewel’s use of the book further supports the image of Jewel and Martyr as scholarly colleagues and friends who were constantly engaged in exchanging knowledge.

Through this community in Zurich, Jewel developed closer relationships with English reformers who would later be fellow clerics of the Elizabethan Church of England. These reformers developed a mutual self-identity that was based on their exile experience. As Philip Hughes notes, the majority of the reformers who had lived in Strasburg and Zurich emerged from exile ‘very conscious that they [were] one in faith with those continental theologians who, in Cranmer’s time, had filled the chairs of divinity at Oxford and Cambridge’. Part of this awareness was of their unique definition of what constituted the church of Christ, and how important it was to convince the Romanists to accept it.¹²⁶ Like Hughes, Diarmaid MacCulloch and Joseph McLelland also note how completely the experience at Zurich and Strasburg was absorbed into some of the English reformers’ basic outlooks. MacCulloch suggests that the prominence of men who had lived in Zurich and Strasburg prevented Genevan Calvinism from having a great influence on the direction of English reform for several years, and McLelland uses the connection to explain the reformers’ resistance to ubiquitarianism, as can be seen in their adaptation of the 42 Articles.¹²⁷

Significantly, the exiles had an influence on their hosts as well. Robert Kingdon suggests that Martyr chose to lecture about the book of Judges on his arrival in Strasburg because its political context suited the needs of the English exiles.¹²⁸ Similarly, Richard Bauckham finds it significant that this was the time Heinrich Bullinger chose to lecture on the book of Revelation. He suggests that Bullinger’s contact with the English exiles ‘led him to a consideration of the divine purpose in the depressing trend of religious affairs in England’, and that he was truly concerned for the exiles. This concern arose because he thought that they ‘clearly

¹²⁵ ‘To his friend and dearest guest, Lord [Bishop] John Jewel Master of Arts, Peter Martyr gave this as a gift.’ See Peter Martyr, *Defensio Doctrinae de sacrosancto eucharisti* [Magdalen College Oxford Library, Shelfmark T.12.44]. Thanks to William Grant for his help with the translation.

¹²⁶ Philip Hughes, *Reformation in England, Part Three: ‘True Religion Now Established’* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1954), 69, 71.

¹²⁷ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England 1547-1603* (London: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1990), 70-71; McLelland, *The Visible Words of God*, 41-42.

¹²⁸ Kingdon, *The Political Thought of Peter Martyr Vermigli*, v.

embodied the Protestant hope for England', something which Bauckham associates with Bullinger's concern for the universal flock of Christ.¹²⁹

Jewel's reputation as a reformer grew through his interaction with this community. Laurence Humphrey recorded that Jewel was known for his habit of consoling people who were finding exile difficult. When people fretted about the state of religion in Marian England, he would often repeat a 'sweet sentiment' that 'these things will not last an age', which suggested an imminent end to exile that many people found comforting.¹³⁰ This shows that Jewel had a pastoring role amongst the exiles, and provides further evidence that his experience on the continent was not limited to secretarial work for Martyr.

Jewel's actual status can also be seen in the level of esteem in which he was held. The Earl of Bedford commended Jewel's 'godly diligence', and the Italian reformer Girolamo Zanchi later said that Jewel's advancement to bishop was recognition for the 'singular piety and virtue' which he showed in Strasburg.¹³¹ Martyr also commented on Jewel's reputation in his last letter to Jewel, sent a few months before his death in 1563. He told Jewel that 'all learned men and friends salute you', including Bullinger and Rudolph Gwalter, who thoroughly approved of Jewel's *Apology of the Church of England*.¹³² Bullinger later reiterated how much he valued the friendships of men like Jewel in his 1572 *A Confutation of the Pope's Bull*, which will be discussed in more detail in chapter five.

The experience of exile thus reinforced Jewel's sense of community and expanded his scholarly network. It cemented his relationships with the men he had worked with at Oxford, and gave him opportunities to develop new relationships with both English and continental reformers. This had the overall effect of aligning him more firmly with the Swiss Reformation: as he told Martyr in 1562, the doctrine of the church that he and his fellow reformers had established in 1559 did not differ from theirs 'by a nail's breadth', because they had 'pared everything [Roman] away to the very quick'.¹³³ From a scholarly network a community of reformers had developed, and Jewel must be viewed as an equal participant in it.

¹²⁹ Richard Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse* (Oxford: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978), 45-48.

¹³⁰ Laurence Humphrey, *Ioannis Iuelli Angli, Episcopi Sarisburiensis vita & mors* (London, 1573), 81. Thanks to Marian Wernham and Bianca Brajuha for their help with the translation.

¹³¹ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* second series, 37, 178-9, 185.

¹³² Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 339-341.

¹³³ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 100.

Conclusion

In the early months of 1559, John Jewel wrote a letter to Martyr, the English translation of which has been frequently quoted in studies of the Elizabethan Settlement. This letter was written soon after the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity had been passed in Parliament, and just a few months before Jewel was one of the men who visited the dioceses of England to rid the churches of relics, shrines, and images. The most commonly used passage reads as follows: ‘Others are seeking after a golden, or as it rather seems to me, a leaden mediocrity, and are crying out that the half is better than the whole’. Historians often use this quotation as evidence that Jewel, as a passionate reformer trained under Martyr in Zurich, was unhappy with the moderation represented in the religious settlement. However, this quotation belongs in the following paragraph:

As to religion, it has been effected, I hope, under good auspices, that it shall be restored to the same state as it was during your latest residence among us, under Edward. But, as far as I can perceive at present, there is not the same alacrity among our friends, as there lately was amongst the papists. So miserably is it ordered, that falsehood is armed, while truth is not only unarmed, but also frequently offensive. The scenic apparatus of divine worship is now under agitation, and those very things which you and I have so often laughed at, are now seriously and solemnly entertained by certain persons...as if the Christian religion could not exist without something tawdry. Our minds indeed are not sufficiently disengaged to make these fooleries of much importance. Others are seeking after a golden, or as it rather seems to me, a leaden mediocrity, and are crying out that the half is better than the whole.¹³⁴

Placing the quotation in context shifts its meaning significantly. Jewel seems to be referring to several groups of people, and the ‘others’ seeking after a leaden mediocrity are only one source of conflict, not the entire problem. Jewel appears concerned with both the truth of the religion they are establishing, and with the appearance and unity of the church itself. Judging by the tone and content of this passage, Jewel preferred a proper balance between the extremes of those who made fooleries out to be important and those who sought after a leaden mediocrity.

Jewel does not appear dissatisfied with the religious settlement itself, but content with the idea that religion will be restored to the form it took during Edward VI’s reign, when the ‘scenic apparatus’ of religion was rapidly being removed and the truth as the reformers saw it was officially crown policy. This begs the question

¹³⁴ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 23.

of exactly what state that might be. He could have been referring to the simple changes in the communion service in 1548 that allowed communion in both kinds, or the more drastic changes in 1552 that are represented in the Prayer Book of that year, or any point in between.

Considering that the letter was sent to Peter Martyr, and the significant role that Martyr had played in the changes of the later years of Edward's reign, it is more likely that Jewel meant a time closer to 1552 than 1549. Martyr was not the only reformer who had advocated such changes as the promotion of spiritual presence in the Eucharist, the rejection of vestments, and the removal of images in the Edwardian church, but he definitely contributed to their acceptance. It was logical, then, for Jewel to assume that Martyr would approve of the new religious settlement because of its parallels with the Edwardian reformation. It was also why he himself approved of it.

Significantly, Jewel hoped that religion would be 'restored', not reformed. This suggests that Jewel aimed to return to a religion he had helped establish during the reign of Edward, not develop a new one. It shows a continuity in Jewel's views on reform, which suggests that his support of the religious settlement in 1559 was not due to any loss of reforming zeal, but a deliberate decision that he made before he even became bishop. If that is the case, then Jewel's background before the exile had as great an impact on his reforming beliefs as his time in exile.

Considering Jewel's position as a secretary to a theologian who worked constantly with a variety of reformers in different communities and dealt with issues as wide-ranging as the Eucharist, clerical celibacy and the godly magistrate, it is not surprising that Jewel emerged from exile with a skill set that enabled him to take a leading role in the new religious settlement. He returned to England in 1559 with a vast knowledge of the writings of the church fathers, a clear sense of the value of the primitive church, a firm view of the divisions between temporal and ecclesiastical authority, and skills in polemical writing. This, combined with the training in rhetoric that he had gained during his years in Oxford, meant that Jewel was in the perfect position to take up a leading role in defending the true universal Church of England against its enemies.

Jewel soon showed that he had also accepted the adversarial mentality of many of the members of the reforming community. His work with Martyr in Oxford had first drawn him into it, since it was through Martyr that Jewel had observed or participated in many of the major political and religious events of the Edwardian

Reformation. His experience in exile, both through the difficulties in Frankfurt and the years of study in Strasburg and Zurich, helped it take root. Jewel's concept of the universal church became equally adversarial during these years: he developed a belief that the universal church was the true church whose members stood in firm opposition to the false church. This belief was based on his exposure to arguments against various heresies, and his in-depth study of the duty of obedience to the godly magistrate. Jewel returned to England in March of 1559, and he immediately became a major player in the controversy surrounding the settlement of religion. The next chapter will examine how he responded to that challenge.

Chapter Three: Thundering and Enlightening

After six years and many pages of polemic spent disputing the twenty-six articles that made up the challenge John Jewel presented to his adversaries in 1559, his main opponent Thomas Harding said: ‘It were a shorter and a plainer way to convert all our disputations unto this issue: ...where the catholic church is, and which it is, where it began, and by what succession it has continued’.¹ By that point in the great controversy between them, it was obvious that the core of their debate could be found in their differing definitions of the universal church. Harding maintained that the universal church was the institution of the Catholic Church, which he sometimes called the Roman Church.² This Catholic Church absorbed each member into its multitude, and advocated faith in the Church and its traditions over individual reason.³

In contrast, Jewel defined the universal church as the people who followed the doctrine of the primitive catholic church, and emphasized the responsibility of each individual to contribute actively to his or her own spiritual development and education. Through his treatment of the role of the godly magistrate, Jewel then connected this responsibility to the expectation of loyalty and obedience to the English monarch. Thus, he made the Church of England both part of the universal church and yet distinct and unique. This chapter will argue that by defining the catholic church in this way, Jewel was among the first to infuse catholicity with allegiance successfully, creating what was essentially a national universal church.

A national universal church is, of course, a paradox, one which Jewel approached with a certain amount of caution in his responses to Harding. As the first two chapters have shown, Jewel had been developing his arguments throughout his early years, through his study and his work as a reformer. He first began to associate the Church of England with the universal church during Edward’s reign, and he had also been part of the party in Frankfurt that had fought to maintain ‘the face of an English church’ in exile, which shows early loyalty to the national church. However,

¹ Thomas Harding, *A rejoindre to M. Iewels replie By perusing wherof the discrete and diligent reader may easily see, the answer to parte of his insolent chalenge iustified* (Antwerp, 1566), A3v-A4r. Please note: modern rules of spelling and capitalization have been applied to titles in the text of this chapter, but the titles are presented in their original form in the footnotes, to facilitate retrieval.

² Thomas Harding, *A confutation of a booke intituled An apologie of the Church of England* (Antwerp, 1565), 195-196; Thomas Harding, *A detection of sundrie foule errours, lies, sclaunders, corruptions, and other false dealinges* (Louvain, 1568), 8v.

³ Harding, *Rejoindre*, 312-313.

despite these years of extensive preparation and experience, the potential was always there that re-defining the universal church in this way would weaken Jewel's argument rather than defend it.

This difficulty arose because of the centrality of the term 'catholic' to sixteenth-century faith. Virtually everyone, both those who remained with the Roman Church and those who accepted reform, still claimed to be 'catholic'. To use Peter Marshall's phrase, it was 'too valuable a piece of ideological currency to be lightly given away'.⁴ Thus, Jewel's claim to be 'catholic' involved re-defining a central concept of the faith, and opened him up to a wider challenge. Alexandra Walsham notes that the very use of the term 'involved entering a sphere of theological tension and controversy', because it meant claiming to be the true church.⁵

It was also something that many theologians before Jewel had already attempted to do, with varying degrees of success. As political historians Stephen Chavura and Philip Benedict both recognize, there was an awareness of the contradiction between the Protestant concepts of state leadership and a universal church independent of Rome.⁶ Gillian R. Evans notes that both Luther and Calvin attempted to reconcile the definitions of a 'catholic' church through their writings regarding the visible and invisible church. They made some progress, but did not manage to completely resolve the issues of state and priestly power that lay at the heart of the debate.⁷ Jewel attempted to resolve these issues through a strategy that was rather more subtle than the strategies of most sixteenth-century polemic. He carefully blended open exploitation of his opponents' weaknesses with support for his own position, and he often allowed that support to be implied more than demonstrated. This created the illusion that his readers could come to their own conclusions, which was a large part of how he presented the concept of the national universal church.

He also put the Church of England on the offensive. In his Challenge Sermon of 1559, which began the Jewel-Harding controversy, Jewel set the Church

⁴ Peter Marshall, 'Is the Pope Catholic? Henry VIII and the Semantics of Schism,' in *Catholics and the Protestant Nation: Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*, edited by Ethan Shagan (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 25, 29.

⁵ Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (New York: The Boydell Press, 1993), 8.

⁶ Philip Benedict, *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 50, 299; Stephen Chavura, *Tudor Protestant Political Thought 1547-1603* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 3, 5.

⁷ Gillian R. Evans, *Problems of Authority in the Reformation Debates* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 203.

of England up as a judge of the traditions and doctrine of the Roman Church. This has been called Jewel's 'negative method', because Jewel challenged his opponents to prove him wrong instead of claiming to be right. He repeated this challenge from the pulpit three times, preaching it first at Paul's Cross in November 1559, then at court on 17 March 1560, and finally once again at Paul's Cross on 31 March 1560.

The sermon then became the first Elizabethan court sermon to be published, and it was printed by John Day, who also printed Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*.⁸ Day was strongly connected to the Elizabethan court, and he could claim the queen's favourite Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, as his protector.⁹ Thus, it is evident that Jewel had a degree of royal approval from the beginning. This lent all the more weight to his claim to authority, and made his attack on the Roman Church all the more effective.

The Path of the Controversy

When Jewel arrived back in England, his friends within the community of reformers immediately drew him into the mammoth task of changing the nation's religion. He participated in disputations, helped with the editing of the prayer book, and travelled a large area of England as a Royal Visitor, enforcing the settlement. His appointment as Bishop of Salisbury occurred in July 1559, and soon after Thomas Harding lost his preferment in Salisbury cathedral and decided to go into exile. By then Jewel had already started defending the settlement, through the preaching and polemic which will be the focus of this and the next chapter. Chapter four will study the wider textual community that got involved in the debate, while this chapter will concern itself primarily with Jewel and Harding.

There are nine major works in the exchange between these two men, which can be divided into two distinct threads based on their inspiration. The first thread began with a negative, in the form of the fourteen articles in Jewel's original Challenge Sermon, which were later expanded to twenty-six articles in the published version of the sermon. All of the articles demanded evidence to prove that various practices of the Roman Church had been part of the church that had existed in the first six hundred years after Christ. Jewel questioned the validity of the private mass,

⁸ Peter McCullough, *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 94.

⁹ "Day, John (1521/2–1584)," Andrew Pettegree in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/7367> (accessed May 15, 2012).

reserving and adoring the sacrament, the use of images, conducting common prayers in a strange tongue, denying a vernacular Bible, and calling the pope a universal bishop. Harding responded to these articles in great detail with *An Answer to Master Jewel's Challenge* in 1564. Jewel responded to that with *A Reply Unto Mr Harding's Answer* in 1565, which led to Harding's 1566 *A Rejoinder to M Jewel's Reply*.

The twenty-six articles of the Challenge Sermon did not openly deal with the major issues that were dividing sixteenth-century Christendom, such as the powers of church and state and the nature of the Eucharist. Instead, Jewel questioned very specific traditions, making it seem like he was focused on minor issues. This helped him draw his opponents out onto uncertain theological grounds, which gave him an advantage. For example, Jewel did not attack the concept of transubstantiation directly. Instead, he questioned the tradition of hanging up of the sacrament under a canopy. This led Harding to say that Jewel was arguing 'certain small questions of light importance', to which Jewel replied: 'nothing ought to be taken for small, wherewith so great multitudes of God's people may be deceived. ... Though these matters [are] small, yet the untruths and errors that thereof have risen, are not small. Remove the same, and your great religion will fall to nothing'.¹⁰ In this way, Jewel often set up his opponents to prove his own point.

The second thread of the Jewel-Harding debate began with a positive: Jewel's *Apology of the Church of England* (1562). In it, Jewel summarized the doctrine of the Church of England regarding the Trinity, the incarnation, the resurrection and ascension, and the Holy Spirit. He continually emphasized that the Church of England had incorporated no new doctrine, but maintained the faith of the primitive church. He also denied papal supremacy and rejected the Catholic claim to apostolic succession, stating that apostolic succession came through maintaining the apostles' doctrine, not through maintaining their status as church leaders. This provided Jewel with a foundation of authority on which to build his implied claim that the Church of England was a national and yet universal church.

He did this in part through suggesting that the Church of England's history of persecution provided evidence that it was a true universal church, arguing that the supporters of the truth were always persecuted and misrepresented. He also openly

¹⁰ John Jewel, *A replie vnto M. Hardinges ansveare by perusinge whereof the discrete, and diligent reader may easily see, the weake, and vnstable groundes of the Romaine religion* (London, 1565), 4-6.

denied the legitimacy of the Roman Church and its recent councils. Trent, for example, could not represent all Christians, because ‘no creature [had] power to give his voice or declare his opinion’ unless he accepted the authority of the pope, and many members of the true church did not accept that authority.¹¹ Jewel developed this argument in great detail in the final section of the *Apology*, and this had a very specific purpose. Elizabeth had not sent delegates to the council despite being invited to do so, and the *Apology* was used to defend this decision.

Harding responded to the *Apology* with *A Confutation of a Book Entitled an Apology of the Church of England* in 1565, and Jewel answered that with his *Defence of the Apology* in 1567. Since the *Apology* was written to present the doctrine of the Church of England, it did not set up particular terms for debate, and did not limit opponents’ sources to those that were written within the first six hundred years of the church. Harding exploited that throughout this thread of the debate, even when the two threads blended, which happened in the last work by Harding, *A Detection of Sundry Foul Errors* (1568). The *Detection* resisted both the Challenge Sermon and the *Apology*, and Jewel answered its arguments in his second edition of the *Defence of the Apology*, which was published in 1570.

Over the course of the debate, it became clear that Jewel and Harding were deeply divided over the issues of authority and the role of individuals in the church. The negative thread that started with the Challenge Sermon dealt with the authority of the clergy, in relation to the authority held by the congregations of the universal church. The positive thread, which started with the *Apology*, dealt with the authority of the crown in relation to the pope, and how crown authority fit into the concept of the universal church. Both threads involved the role of the individual, and the right response of individuals to legitimate authority. On each of these issues, Jewel and Harding were polar opposites.

Their mindsets can be best described with terms that were first used in an article on the Tyndale-More controversy by David Ginsberg. Ginsberg wrote about the ‘society of individuals’ that developed in England due to the vernacular liturgy, and his description could apply here. He distinguished this society as ‘a federation of individual worshippers’ rather than ‘a unit mass of indistinguishable souls’.¹² This reflects the attitudes of Jewel and Harding well. Jewel tended to think of his

¹¹ John Jewel, *An apologie or answere in defence of the Churche of Englande* (London, 1564), B2.

¹² David Ginsberg, ‘Ploughboys versus Prelates: Tyndale and More and the Politics of Biblical Translation,’ *The Sixteenth Century Journal* vol 19, no 1 (1988), 51, 56.

audience as a federation of individual worshippers, while Harding thought of his audience as a mass of souls. These opposing points of view encouraged the clarification of particular theological points on which they could not agree, including church legitimacy and history, the importance of the Bible in the development of faith, and the role of the church in the end of the world. They provided the background for each man's definition of 'catholic', and indeed for each man's definition of 'church'. The result was the development of demarcation lines between their respective confessions. Over the course of the 1560s, the Church of England removed itself entirely from the Church of Rome.

These mindsets also affected who they included in their audience, and how this audience was treated. The 'dear Christian reader' who was continually addressed throughout the controversy had a role to play in it, and thus the reader both influenced and was influenced by this polemic. The following chapter will examine this interplay of influence through a discussion of the audience and the means by which Jewel created a national universal church. First, however, it will discuss the historiography of the controversy, and its significance both for modern scholars and for its time.

Historiography of the Jewel-Harding Controversy

The Jewel-Harding controversy represents an important development in sixteenth-century ecclesiastical history. It has significance both for studies of the specific doctrines of the Church of England and for the wider world of Elizabethan studies, and yet it is remarkably neglected in both of these fields. Historians tend to focus on another controversy of the 1560s – the vestarian controversy – even though it is smaller in both scale and depth. The Jewel-Harding controversy involved twenty-one people, who produced sixty-five different works over ten years. The Elizabethan vestarian controversy involved ten tracts and fewer than ten combatants, and lasted less than five years.¹³ It focused on the ecclesiastical garments that were of liturgical importance in the medieval church, and whether or not Church of England clergy could legitimately wear them.¹⁴

The two controversies dealt with the same major problem for the early Elizabethan church: the division of power between church and state. They were both

¹³ John Henry Primus, *The Vestments Controversy* (Amsterdam: J.H. Kok N.V. Kampen, 1960), 107-148.

¹⁴ Primus, *The Vestments Controversy*, xii-xiii.

flash points for debate, and both offer insight for modern scholars into the means and methods of enforcing the 1559 religious settlement. However, it could be argued that the Jewel-Harding controversy had a wider scope and represented a greater segment of the leadership of the church. This would make it the more valuable of the two debates for the purpose of historical research, so it is not clear why scholarly interest in the vestarian controversy so greatly outweighs interest in the Jewel-Harding controversy.

The vestarian controversy takes precedence even in studies where it would seem logical that Jewel and Harding's debate would be more important. In Millar Maclure's *The Paul's Cross Sermons*, for example, one would expect the on-going series of sermons inspired by the Challenge Sermon to merit some attention, but Jewel was discussed only in connection to the 1559 Challenge Sermon and then in connection to the 1569 sermon he preached after the Northern Rebellion.¹⁵ The vestarian controversy, however, received a full treatment. John New, in his 1964 book *Anglicans and Puritans*, included the Marian exile and the issue of the vestments, and yet did not consider the Jewel-Harding controversy.¹⁶ Patrick McGrath, in his *From Papists to Puritans* (1967), mentioned how Jewel worked with Archbishop Parker to 'put flesh and blood on the skeleton framework of the new church set up in 1559', but did not discuss one of Jewel's major contributions to that framework in the form of the controversy. McGrath did, however, discuss the vestarian controversy.¹⁷

The trend to pass over this major debate does not seem to change over the decades. Collinson's 1982 *The Religion of Protestants* did not mention the Jewel-Harding controversy, but did briefly discuss Elizabeth's desire for clerical vestments and the partial victory of the prelates in restricting their use.¹⁸ In Doreen Rosman's 1996 contribution to an 'Introductions to History Series', there is no mention of the Jewel-Harding controversy, nor of any other efforts on the part of the early Elizabethan clerics to establish and support the Church of England. Instead, Rosman skips immediately from the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity (1559) to the

¹⁵ Millar Maclure, *The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), 60-62.

¹⁶ John New, *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of their Opposition, 1558-1640* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1964), 4.

¹⁷ Philip McGrath, *Papists and Puritans Under Elizabeth I* (London: Blandford Press, 1967), 51-53, 90-96.

¹⁸ Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 31-32.

disagreements over further reform and how they came to a head in a ‘bitter dispute’ over vestments in 1565.¹⁹

More recently, Peter Mack stated that his basic intention was to examine the authority of the Elizabethan church and state in his *Elizabethan Rhetoric*, using sermons and controversies as his sources. This seems like a prime opportunity to discuss Jewel and Harding, but Mack never mentioned them.²⁰ In a 2011 book about Tudor political thought, Stephen Chavura studies the vestarian controversy as part of the puritan push for reform and as a catalyst for discussion about the scope of government authority. The Jewel-Harding controversy is mentioned as one of the ‘most substantial’ of all of the defences of the Elizabethan church, and then the topic is dropped in favour of a discussion of Thomas Bilson and Laurence Humphrey.²¹

Studies which examine Elizabethan Catholics speak less of the vestarian controversy, but still do not afford the appropriate attention to Jewel and Harding. William Trimble’s book about the Catholic laity of Elizabethan England, for example, acknowledged Thomas Harding as a leading writer and pointed out the significance of Harding’s loyalty to Elizabeth, but did not study any of Harding’s works.²² Another study of Catholic laity, Adrian Morey’s work on the Catholic subjects of Elizabeth I, also talked about the Louvain exile and mentioned Harding as a ‘chief protagonist’ against Jewel. He said that theirs was a ‘great controversy which was still rumbling in 1580’, but did not expand on that. Instead, he diverted into a study of the later Douai writers, such as Cardinal Allen and Robert Parsons.²³

Significantly, while modern historiography pays greater attention to the vestarian controversy than the Jewel-Harding controversy, Jewel’s contemporaries did the opposite. Although the vestarian controversy was a long-lasting debate that began during Edward’s reign, it was not considered nearly as significant. Peter Martyr told the clergyman and reformer Thomas Sampson not to ‘contend more than is necessary’ on the issue, since it was not particularly important to the faith.²⁴

¹⁹ Doreen Rosman, *From Catholic to Protestant: Religion and the People in Tudor England* (London: Gower Press, 1996), 59.

²⁰ Peter Mack, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 254.

²¹ Chavura, *Tudor Protestant Political Thought*, 33, 174.

²² William Trimble, *The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England* (Massachusetts: The Belknap Press, 1964), 60.

²³ Adrian Morey, *The Catholic Subjects of Elizabeth I* (New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1978), 100-101.

²⁴ Hastings Robinson, ed and trans, *The Zurich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others with some of the Helvetian Reformers, During...The Reign of Queen Elizabeth* second series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842), 32.

Italian reformer Girolamo Zanchi asked Jewel to use his influence with other bishops to make them give in to the queen's wishes over vestments, since the issue was not worth resigning their posts over.²⁵ Jewel himself referred to the vestarian controversy with gently mocking humour in a letter to Heinrich Bullinger, telling him that 'some of our brethren are contending about this matter as if the whole of our religion were contained in this single point'. Jewel found this attitude frustrating, but noted wryly that it could be worse. 'We thank God that he does not suffer us at this time to be disquieted among ourselves by questions of more importance.'²⁶

In contrast, Jewel and his contemporaries were much more affected by the issues of the Jewel-Harding controversy. It had a huge impact in its time, causing what Torrance Kirby calls an 'unprecedented commotion'.²⁷ Literature scholar Mary Morrissey notes that the clerical vestments were not the main topic of the Paul's Cross sermons during the 1560s. Rather, the majority of preachers campaigned against 'the corruption of the Roman Church ...and the need for moral reformation'. Using that evidence, she suggests that the Jewel-Harding controversy was 'of greater significance than the internal debates over clerical vestments' to the leaders of the early Elizabethan church.²⁸

This seems to be supported by Peter Martyr's attitude toward the controversy. He did not overly concern himself with the issue of the vestments, but he reacted to Jewel's writings by saying that they had significance for the entire faith. As Martyr put it, 'the truth of the gospel' would not be successfully attacked by its enemies as long as Jewel was writing. Martyr also praised the *Apology* and said that many of the continental reformers 'make no end of commending it, and think that nothing in these days has been set forth more perfectly'.²⁹ Even when factoring in the close relationship between Jewel and Martyr, which would predispose him to appreciate Jewel's work, the difference in Martyr's reaction to these two issues is notable. It seems that Jewel's polemical efforts were far more significant to him than the issue of the vestments. This chapter will follow Martyr's example, and attempt to address this imbalance in the historiography.

²⁵ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* second series, 186.

²⁶ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 185.

²⁷ Torrance Kirby, 'The Public Sermon: Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England,' *Renaissance and Reformation* vol 30, no 4 (2006), 13.

²⁸ Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 197.

²⁹ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 339.

The Challenge in Context

In 1593, the poet and scholar Gabriel Harvey referred to Harding and Jewel as great adversaries whose battle had no equal for many years, calling them ‘our Eschines and Demosthenes...two thundering and lightning orators in divinity’.³⁰ Eschines and Demosthenes were both skilled orators in ancient Greece, whose frequent political opposition came to its head in their debate over the crown, which Ctesiphon wanted to give to Demosthenes.³¹ Thus, Harvey’s analogy was appropriate on several levels: not only were Harding and Jewel highly trained and well-matched orators, but the crown was a frequent source of animosity between them. Also, when compared to other polemic of the time, the debate between them is notable for its war-like intensity. Catholic historian A.C. Southern has identified eight separate Elizabethan ecclesiastical controversies, including that of Jewel and Harding. None of them had its scope in content, scale or ferocity. The closest was the debate between the Catholic Edmund Campion and his challengers: it involved seven people and thirteen separate works, making it less than one-third the size of the Jewel-Harding controversy.³²

These eight controversies followed such great examples of Reformation polemic as the debate between Tyndale and More over the nature of the church and the sacraments (1529-1532), and the debate between Cranmer and Gardiner over the nature of the Eucharist in the early 1550s. All of them reflected the blend of old and new that characterized early sixteenth century education, because they managed to incorporate both the methods that are commonly associated with medieval scholasticism, and the ideas of early sixteenth-century humanism. In their structure, these controversies showed elements of the medieval method of disputation in a written form. In their content, they reflected humanist methodology in their concern with languages, their determination to use original documents, and their spirit of investigation.

To parallel the controversy between Harding and Jewel with such different and complex examples of religious debate raises the question of how to define ‘polemic’ in a way that includes them all. The answer is decidedly unclear in modern historiography. Adam Francisco, in his study of Martin Luther and Islam,

³⁰ G. Gregory Smith, ed, *Elizabethan Critical Essays* vol 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1904), 247-248.

³¹ J.T. Champlin, ‘Review: The Oration of Demosthenes on the Crown,’ *The North American Review* vol 58, no 122 (Jan, 1844), 241.

³² A.C. Southern, *Elizabethan Recusant Prose (1559-1582)* (London: Sands and Co, 1950), 59.

suggests that polemic is simply a religious debate, but does not specify what he means by this.³³ Ellen Macek, in her *The Loyal Opposition: Tudor Traditionalist Polemic*, never defined what she meant by ‘polemic’, except to suggest what it was not. She did not think that reformation polemicists were ‘labouring to construct a systematic theology’ but answering points of controversy, which explained the rambling construction of the polemicists’ work and their confusing welter of examples.³⁴

Peter Marshall suggests that polemic can be defined based on its purpose, because of what it meant for particular religious groups: ‘early modern religion was not only about formal beliefs and practices, but also about the ways those beliefs and practices were glossed’. Catholics, for example, ‘spent much of their polemical energy trying to define and even isolate themselves as a community’.³⁵ This suggests that polemic involved determining what was and was not part of a particular set of beliefs, which is the most useful definition for the purposes of this chapter. It reflects both the adversarial mentality of the combatants, and their tendency to define themselves in terms of their opposites.

Furthermore, polemic in this definition was designed to provoke a response from its readers, and that also well suits the Jewel-Harding controversy. As literature scholar Jesse Lander explains, polemic can be distinguished from earlier forms of controversial writing because it did not aim to create a unified body of readers, but ‘to divide its readers into friends and enemies’. Through this division, a new community was forged.³⁶ Lander considers this in a way which is similar to Peter Matheson’s study of the German pamphlet polemic of the 1520s: Matheson also emphasizes the goal of provoking a reaction through printed works. He argues that ‘words were minted...to sharpen issues, alert minds, awaken emotions, and to motivate the hesitant to action. ...It had a heuristic function as well as an instrumental one. Its aim was to let truth emerge from the clash of competing views’.³⁷ This is the reason why textual communities will soon come into the argument: in textual communities, printed texts were essential. Truth emerged through the interpretation of a particular set of texts, and the controversy between

³³ Adam S. Francisco, *Martin Luther and Islam: A Study in Sixteenth Century Polemic and Apologetics* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 13, 19.

³⁴ Ellen Macek, *The Loyal Opposition: Tudor Traditionalist Polemic* (New York: Peter Lang, 1996), 63.

³⁵ Marshall, ‘Is the Pope Catholic?’, 13.

³⁶ Jesse M. Lander, *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print and Literary Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 14, 16.

³⁷ Peter Matheson, *The Rhetoric of the Reformation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 1-2.

Jewel and Harding provided the necessary texts for the communities that revolved around them.

Sixteenth-century polemic was different from its predecessors not only in its printed format, but in its evidence. Anna Seregina notes that polemic changed over the course of the reformation, due to the changes in the basic topoi. During the Reformation, English polemicists were interested ‘in the origins of the Christian church in Britain, especially the story of Christian conversion, the relationship between church and crown, and, lastly, the problem of succession’. Thus, where medieval polemic based its arguments on natural and divine law, Reformation polemicists focused on historical arguments because they were interested ‘in the quality and the authenticity of their proofs’.³⁸

Over the course of the sixteenth century, these proofs became more and more important. Even a cursory comparison of Tyndale’s restrained use of Biblical characters and scripture references in the 1530s shows a marked difference to the overwhelming cascade of Bible verses and quotations from the church fathers in Jewel’s treatises of the 1560s. This may be merely a difference in style, but at the same time it shows a difference in emphasis, especially since the two men’s styles seem similar in other ways. They used many of the same polemical strategies, and each valued the contributions of the church fathers to the faith. As Jan James notes, Tyndale promoted the use of the church fathers and accused his opponents of neglecting their evidence.³⁹ Jewel would later do the same, but to a far greater extent and in far greater detail, suggesting that this strategy had become more important to later polemics.

Jewel was actually one of the first Elizabethan polemicists to effectively focus on historical arguments, and part of the reason why this strategy was so effective was his extensive examination of not only his own sources but the sources of his adversaries. As an example, in the collection of Jewel’s books in Magdalen College Oxford can be found Reginald Pole’s *Pro Ecclesiasticae Unitatis Defensione*. From the margin notes that Jewel made, it is evident that he studied it closely enough that he could pinpoint what he saw as Pole’s errors. In one passage that used the work of St Chrysostom, he underlined a section and wrote ‘non sunt

³⁸ Anna Seregina, ‘Religious Controversies and History Writing in Sixteenth Century England,’ in *The Medieval Chronicle VII*, edited by Erik Kooper (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011), 223.

³⁹ Jan James, ‘Establishing an English Bible in Henry VIII’s England: Translation, Vernacular Theology, and William Tyndale’ (Ph.D Thesis, University of York, 2011), 139-140.

ista verba chrysostomi'.⁴⁰ In another passage, he rejected Pole's interpretation because 'plus ecclesiae, quam scripturis'.⁴¹

Jewel's insistence on placing Biblical and patristic sources in their historical context influenced not only his allies but his adversaries, who were forced to meet him on his terms due to his negative method. This method required the Romanists to prove that the practices of the Roman Church had existed in the first six hundred years of the faith. This time limitation was new, and it unsettled some people who thought that Jewel may have made the challenge too broad. One member of his textual community, Alexander Nowell, was not sure that Jewel's stance was entirely defensible.⁴² Jewel himself noted wryly in a letter to the Earl of Leicester that his own friends were concerned, telling him that 'I was overseen to lay out the matter in such a generality, and to give the adversary so great a scope'.⁴³ Even later historians were not sure of the wisdom of Jewel's structure; John Strype said that Jewel raised up enemies for himself by not limiting the Catholics to proofs from the Scripture, but allowing them to argue from the fathers.⁴⁴

In contrast, Harding and his allies chafed against the limit Jewel imposed. Harding said that Jewel 'might and ought likewise to have allowed reason, tradition, custom, and authority of the church, without limitation of time'.⁴⁵ This rather missed the point of Jewel's basic premise that these church traditions and customs were new and therefore not legitimate proofs, but he never noticed that. He just focused on meeting the challenge, by using three arguments as evidence that the Roman Church was the true universal church: tradition, apostolic succession, and the divine promise to stay with the church.

These three arguments show that Harding claimed authority exclusively through the institution of the church. This can be seen clearly in the *Detection*, where Harding rested his claims on church tradition and the unbroken line of bishops: 'We require to have recourse for trial of our faith to the tradition of doctrine of the Roman Church... We appeal to the faith of that church taught abroad in the world, and by successions of bishops brought down to us'.⁴⁶ Harding

⁴⁰ 'These are not the words of Chrysostom'.

⁴¹ 'This is more the church than the Scripture'. See Reginald Pole, *Pro Ecclesiasticae Unitatis Defensione* (Strasbourg, 1555), 39v, 92 [Magdalen College Library Oxford Shelfmark 1.17.10].

⁴² Alexander Nowell, *A reprofue, written by Alexander Nowell* (London, 1565), A2v.

⁴³ John Ayre, ed, *The Works of John Whitgift* vol 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853), 624.

⁴⁴ John Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker* (London.: John Wyatt, 1711), 181.

⁴⁵ Thomas Harding, *An answer to Maister Iuelles challenge* (Louvain, 1564), 188.

⁴⁶ Harding, *Detection*, 8v.

constantly pointed out that Christ had promised to remain with his church, and since the Roman Church was the only church in existence at the time, that meant that Christ was in that church. He wished that his adversaries would simply accept that, so that they could all move on to other things. 'If then these matters... be brought to that consistory and to that seat of judgement, whereunto all controversies ought to be referred, I mean the Catholic Church, the pillar and sure stay of truth, in which the Holy Ghost the spirit of truth is resident... we should soon be at accord.'⁴⁷ Jewel, for his part, denied that such grace had been promised in perpetuity, and turned to other sources of authority to support his argument - sources he had studied while in exile. He also turned to other strategies for presenting his arguments, using the extensive knowledge of classical rhetoric which he had learned during his years at Oxford.

The Challenge

Jewel used many rhetorical devices, such as repetition, humour, and emotional appeal. His most effective rhetorical weapon, however, was the device of the challenge. Challenging one's opponents was an important part of written polemic because it allowed the author to make a stand over a particular point or issue. In one sense all polemic was a challenge, since it was considered unacceptable to leave any polemical work unanswered. As Alexandra Walsham points out:

...silence and failure to retaliate was seen as tantamount to an admission of defeat. Works that stood unchallenged were thought to present a particular risk. ...If the poison they contained was not isolated and neutralized, the souls of the 'lighter' and 'unlearned sort' were in danger of being consumed by Satan, that deadly enemy of their salvation.⁴⁸

Defeat was not acceptable, whether it came through silence or through the failure to convince. Thus, polemicists had to fight both their opponents and their readers, in order to ensure that the right message came across.

This was the all-encompassing challenge of polemic. From within it, polemicists issued a more direct form of challenge to provide special emphasis. For example, Cranmer gave Gardiner a challenge in his *Answer to a Cavillation*, saying that he, Cranmer, would maintain that he had the correct interpretation until Gardiner could prove 'that these authors spake one thing, and meant another, and that qualities

⁴⁷ Harding, *Rejoindre*, A4v.

⁴⁸ Alexandra Walsham, 'The Spider and the Bee: The Perils of Printing for Refutation in Tudor England,' in *Tudor Books and Readers*, edited by John N. King (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 170.

and accidents be substances'.⁴⁹ This was an unanswerable challenge due to its subjectivity, and did not really expect a literal response. It was meant both to discredit Cranmer's opponent and to halt any possible misinterpretation the reader might develop, and thus it was more important for its dramatic tone and implied conviction than for its actual content. Such drama was the compelling part of this sort of polemic. As Peter Matheson puts it: 'no small part of the entertainment value of Reformation literature was its war game character: ritual challenges, calls to battle, [and] epic stories of heroism'.⁵⁰

Jewel's challenge had a grander scope than many sixteenth-century rhetorical challenges. For example, Thomas More's use of the challenge was far more specific. In his *Confutation*, he said that there was never a time when it was appropriate for a monk to marry a nun, and challenged Tyndale to prove him wrong. 'Wherein if Tyndale dare say that I lie, let Tyndale...bring forth of all the old holy saints someone that said the contrary, which I am very sure he can not.'⁵¹ Thomas Cranmer used the device of the challenge in a similar way, when he demanded in his *Defence* that 'the papists' show some authority for their opinion, 'and let them not constrain all men to follow their fond devises, only because they say'.⁵² In contrast, Jewel's challenge was thrown out to all learned men, not just to one group or to one opponent, and he clearly delineated both the sources and the purpose of the challenge.

Many other challenges simply asked for an opponent to show proof that rendered the author's point incorrect. Jewel took it to the next level and challenged his opponents to change his entire world-view.

If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive be able 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, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved, that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time... or that there was then any communion ministered unto the people under one kind: or that, the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue, that they understood not: or that, the Bishop of Rome was then called, an universal bishop, or the head of the universal church...or that the lay people was then forbidden, to read

⁴⁹ Henry Jenkyns, ed, *The Remains of Thomas Cranmer* vol 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1833), 469.

⁵⁰ Matheson, *The Rhetoric of the Reformation*, 4-5.

⁵¹ Thomas More, *The second parte of the co[n]futation of Tyndals answere in whyche is also confuted the chyrche that Tyndale deuyseth* (London, 1533), xc.

⁵² Thomas Cranmer, *A defence of the true and catholike doctrine of the sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Christ* (London, 1550), 58v.

the word of God in their own tongue. If any man alive were able to prove, any of these articles, by any one clear, or plain clause, or sentence, either of the scriptures: or of the old doctors: or of any old general Council: or by any example of the primitive church: I promised then that I would give over and subscribe unto him.⁵³

Within this challenge lies Jewel's subtle re-definition of the 'catholic' church. Jewel claimed authenticity for the primitive apostolic church and denied the legitimacy of papal leadership. He emphasized the importance of participation by each individual in the church, connecting that to the use of the vernacular tongue. Significantly, he referred to the universal church in his denial of the claims of the pope, suggesting that he was thinking of a church both within and beyond the borders of England.

This provoked Harding into defending more recent church traditions and the papal supremacy, which Jewel then countered. As their debate proceeded, both men began to draw demarcation lines around their confessions, based on the perceived authority of these claims to catholicity. They each limited the universal church. As Peter Marshall argues, 'it undoubtedly has something important to tell us about the culture of mid-sixteenth century England that a word whose etymology denotes universality and inclusivity should come to feature so prominently in the pathology of religious division'.⁵⁴ In the case of Jewel and Harding, it tells us how they each defined their positions in resistance to the ideologies of their adversaries.

It is possible to trace this development over the course of their ten-year debate. In the original Challenge Sermon, Jewel claimed that the Church of England was returning to the 'catholic' church of Christ. Harding's response was that 'we' remain in the 'catholic' church, and 'you' do not, because 'you' deface the church.⁵⁵ In his *Reply*, Jewel retorted that 'he defaces not the church, that defaces the defacers of the church', and that Harding and his side were not truly 'catholic'.⁵⁶ Harding rejected that statement in his *Rejoinder*, and threatened that the Catholic Church would abandon Jewel and the Church of England if they did not repent. This did not seem to concern Jewel: in his *Apology*, he said that 'we have indeed set ourselves apart' from the Roman Church.⁵⁷ This led to further division in the exchange. In the *Confutation of the Apology*, Harding was shocked that 'they' called themselves

⁵³ John Jewel, *The true copies of the letters betwene the reuerend father in God Iohn Bisshop of Sarum and D. Cole* (London, 1560), 163-164.

⁵⁴ Marshall, 'Is the Pope Catholic?', 42.

⁵⁵ Harding, *Answer*, 3v.

⁵⁶ Jewel, *Replie*, Preface 6.

⁵⁷ Jewel, *Apologie* 1564, G8r.

Catholic and ‘us’ papists, which led to a discussion of the term and its meaning. Harding claimed that the writings of St Paul gave ‘a manifest prophecy that the Roman faith and the Catholic faith should be all one’.⁵⁸

Jewel clarified his stance in both the 1567 and 1570 editions of the *Defence*. In his own copy of the 1567 book, which is in the library at Magdalen College Oxford, Jewel made notes which were later incorporated into the second edition. These notes rejected Harding’s interpretation of ‘universal’, which was: ‘that thing must be held for catholic, that everywhere, evermore, and of all men has been believed’. This interpretation was based on the work of Lirinensis, a fifth-century writer whose only lasting work, his *Commonitorium*, attempted to combat heresy through an examination of divine law and church tradition. Harding, notably, did not include Lirinensis’ qualification of that statement, which was that this sort of definition only applied when the church had not been corrupted.⁵⁹

Jewel could not accept that interpretation even with its qualification, because there was no one thing that all men believed, especially in religion. As he wrote, by that definition even the gospel of Christ could not be considered ‘catholic’, because ‘Turks receive it not, and the Jews abhorred it’.⁶⁰ Jewel’s analysis of this argument in the 1570 edition further removed the Roman Church from the ‘catholic’ church, and set up the Church of England as a true representative of the ‘catholic’ church. It expanded his claim in the 1567 edition that the English Church had actually returned to the ‘catholic’ church, not left it, which meant that Harding’s side were the ‘false catholics’.⁶¹

From 1567, the division seems firm and complete. In the *Detection* (1568), Harding accused Jewel of making two churches, and referred to the members of Jewel’s church for the first time as ‘the Protestants’. He also presented a scenario in which the world was half Catholic and half Protestant, with an air of regretful resignation.⁶² Jewel shows similar levels of acceptance in the 1570 edition of the *Defence*. He claimed that Harding said that ‘the Protestants have forsaken Christ, the Protestants have become Jews... The Protestants at their next proceeding will utterly deny God’, and denied that any of these things were going to happen.⁶³ However, he did not argue against Harding’s inclusion of the Church of England into

⁵⁸ Harding, *Confutation*, 3,196.

⁵⁹ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 93-94.

⁶⁰ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 94 (Magdalen College Library Oxford Shelfmark o.17.8).

⁶¹ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 21, 124.

⁶² Harding, *Detection*, A2r, 88-88v, 202.

⁶³ Jewel, *Defence* 1570, B2.

‘the Protestants’. At this point, it seems that Jewel had fully determined that the universal church was operating within and through the various Protestant churches.

That Jewel saw a certain affinity between the Church of England and continental Protestants can be seen in his argument with Harding over Michael Servetus. Servetus was an anti-Trinitarian who helped found the Unitarian movement, and he was executed for heresy in 1553.⁶⁴ Harding taunted Jewel that Servetus was one of the brethren of Jewel’s church, and Jewel denied it with a chillingly simple response.

As for...Servetus the Arian, and such other the like, they were yours, Master Harding, they were not of us... We detected their heresies, and not you: we arraigned them: we condemned them: we put them to the execution of the laws. It seems very much to call them our brothers, because we burned them.⁶⁵

Religious historian John Coffey suggests that Jewel was both defending the execution of heretics and denying any association of Protestantism with heresy by this.⁶⁶ Peter Lake discusses the incident in more detail, claiming that ‘Bishop Jewel’s famous throwaway reference to ...Servetus betrays not only the centrality...of the assumption of reformed solidarity in the face of popery and Protestant heterodoxy but also the ease with which that assumption was made and expressed’.⁶⁷ The lines between ‘us’ and ‘them’, Catholic and Protestant, and indeed Protestant and heretic, had been clearly and forcefully drawn.

Between the Lines

These demarcation lines must be considered within their historical context. Lucy Wooding calls the period between the 1530s and 1570s the ‘formative years’ of a religious divide, and points out that the progress of Catholicism was as important for this development as the emergence of Protestantism.⁶⁸ In 1564 the decrees of the Council of Trent were confirmed, after twenty years of discussion, and while many English Catholics did not mention Trent in their writings, it did have an effect on

⁶⁴ Peter Marshall, ‘(Re)Defining The English Reformation,’ *Journal of British Studies* vol 48, no 3 (2009), 579.

⁶⁵ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 30.

⁶⁶ John Coffey, *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558-1689* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), 25.

⁶⁷ Peter Lake, ‘The Anglican Moment? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s,’ in *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*, edited by Stephen Platten (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), 92.

⁶⁸ Lucy Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 2.

them.⁶⁹ Harding referred to it in the second thread of his debate with Jewel, especially in his *Confutation*, where he set out to prove the value of general councils and affirm Trent's authority. He also applied that authority to Jewel himself: 'Neither are you condemned by the bishop of Rome only...but by the universal church of Christ represented of late in general council held at Trent'.

In this passage Harding meant the universal church in the physical sense, and used the force of numbers to further prove Trent's authority, scoffing at Jewel's claim of the value of the 'little flock' of God's people in the process.⁷⁰ Significantly, Harding also attempted to use Trent as an authority in his *Rejoinder*. Due to the six-hundred-year time limit, he could not use it in his responses to the twenty-six Challenge Sermon articles, so he used it to discredit Jewel. He said that he felt obliged to tell the reader that Jewel was accursed according to the Tridentine Council, which had decreed that particular punishment for anyone who blasphemed the mass.⁷¹

Pius V was elected in 1566, and that changed the direction of continental Catholicism. David Loades claims that the exiles at Louvain 'became convinced that the Catholic Church in England was simply dying of inaction, and that the national instinct to avoid persecution was at the root of the trouble'. With the election of Pius V, these exiles found themselves led by a man whose zeal, they thought, could be turned toward the spiritual welfare of the English.⁷² Unfortunately, the zeal of Pius V led to the papal bull of 1569, *Regnans in Excelsis*, which both excommunicated Elizabeth and released her subjects from any obligation to obey her. It also re-established papal authority over English Catholics, and thus caused great confusion and distress.⁷³ Politically, it marked the end of what Glen Bowman calls the 'cautious timidity' of English Catholics toward Elizabeth's government. After the Northern Rising of 1569, the tactics of Catholic leaders would turn into 'intense political polemic'.⁷⁴

These events helped firmly mark the demarcation lines between the Roman and English Churches, and also assisted in the development of a distinct Catholic textual community. Beginning with his *Rejoinder*, Harding spoke proudly of the

⁶⁹ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 188.

⁷⁰ Harding, *Confutation*, 128v.

⁷¹ Harding, *Rejoindre*, 188.

⁷² David Loades, *Politics, Censorship, and the English Reformation* (London: Pinter Publishers, 1991), 74-75.

⁷³ Loades, *Politics, Censorship and the English Reformation*, 75-76.

⁷⁴ Glen Bowman, 'Elizabethan Catholics and Romans 13,' *Journal of Church and State* vol 47 (2005), 535.

group of Catholic men with whom he worked, some of whom were his old college fellows. These included John Rastell, Nicholas Sander, and Thomas Stapleton, who were all associated with ‘Oxford House’ in Louvain.⁷⁵ This close proximity made this group very self-aware and close-knit, and their works reflect that. Each man answered specific aspects of Jewel’s challenge, and engaged different opponents. This shows a high level of co-ordination, which widened the influence and scope of their work; something that will be studied further in the next chapter.

In contrast, the textual community around Jewel was less defined. At its core were the five writers who supported Jewel by contributing to the controversy, and the other divines who enabled them. However, they were not as closely knit as Harding’s group, in either the literal or figurative sense. They did not work out of one university, but out of various churches and universities throughout England. Also, they were more aware of their own universality, in part because most of them had been exiles or friends of exiles. This was significant, because Jewel deliberately fostered such a sense of universality. He aligned his works with particular reformers of the country and the continent.

This comes through most clearly in Jewel’s response to Harding’s taunt about John Knox’s *First Blast of the Trumpet*, which clearly did not support the rule of Elizabeth. Jewel denied any connection with this work, deciding that Knox had to deal with the consequences of that on his own. Also, he added, ‘Master Calvin, Master Martyr, Master Musculus, Master Bullinger, whom you call the faithful brothers of England, disliked that enterprise, and wrote against it’.⁷⁶ Jewel’s textual community was based on particular doctrine, inner faith, and loyalty to the godly magistrate rather than location or institutional universality. Jewel intended to represent a properly balanced faith, and this separated his community from both papists and extremists such as John Knox.

His determination reflects the sort of moderation identified by Ethan Shagan, and contrasts with the traditional scholarship on the Elizabethan settlement. The settlement is often portrayed as a flawed compromise; a ‘fluid’ or ‘flexible’ attempt to please as many people as possible.⁷⁷ Theologians H.F. Woodhouse and Leonard Trinterud, for example, both held dim views of it. Woodhouse argued that the

⁷⁵ John E. Booty, *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (London: S.P.C.K, 1963), 59-60.

⁷⁶ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 206.

⁷⁷ Ian Green, *Humanism and Protestantism in Early Modern English Education* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), 4-5; Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought: 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 10.

settlement's poor structure resulted in a lack of doctrine for the church.⁷⁸ Trinterud described it as 'deliberately non-ideological', and the means of preventing further reform.⁷⁹ This interpretation does not seem to acknowledge the efforts of the settlement's defenders. Jewel encouraged individual faith and promoted the church's doctrine as aligned with the primitive church, and his adversarial mentality would not have allowed him to defend a doctrine-deficient compromise with such devotion. If Jewel's message and motivation is considered in the evaluation of the Elizabethan settlement, it makes it possible to argue that the settlement attempted to create not a compromise but a balanced faith. It gave the church a form that reflected its own Edwardian and Henrican history, and acknowledged the connections forged by exposure to the continental reformers during the Marian exile.

Through this alignment with these reformers, Jewel established his church in a moderate position that Lucy Wooding considers significant, since it was the position which English Catholicism had taken in the 1530s. When Jewel and his reformers took up that position, 'in many ways the tables had been turned on the English Catholics, and it was perhaps not surprising that an increasing rigidity in theological outlook was the result'.⁸⁰ Here Wooding captures the essence what happened in the Jewel-Harding debate. The two men pushed each other into clearer definitions and stronger claims, both through promoting their own side and through trying to damage the reputation of the other side.

Harding defended the Roman Church based on its unity, traditions and customs, seven sacraments, saints and miracles, and unbroken succession. Then he tried to disparage the Church of England by claiming that 'they' allowed clerical marriage, made the sacrament of the Eucharist into nothing but a bare sign, rejected part of the Bible, and did not acknowledge papal authority. For his part, Jewel promoted the Church of England's connection to the apostolic church, defended its doctrine based on its connection with the scripture and the church fathers, and proclaimed the high moral standards of their clergy. Then he scorned the Roman Church's acceptance of brothels and concubines, rejection of civil authority, and addition of 'unwritten verities' to the word of God. Over the course of the debate, these issues became firm points of separation between the two confessions, marking out what beliefs and traditions belonged to each one.

⁷⁸ H.F. Woodhouse, *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology* (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), 13.

⁷⁹ Leonard Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 23.

⁸⁰ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 225.

The lines were further deepened through Jewel's and Harding's treatments of the invisible church. Harding began by arguing against the idea that Jewel's church was part of an invisible universal church, and then switched tactics and started to suggest that Jewel's church was invisible in the sense of something 'secret and hidden', which meant that it had to be wrong. The real church was a city on a hill, a light that no one could miss, so an invisible church was by definition not a true church. In the *Detection*, Harding spoke most boldly about the issue. 'By your own confession, your doctrine has not been in all churches, at all times taught, and therefore you have told us, we know not what of your church, that it is invisible, secret, unknown, and lurks in corners...and therefore you are not catholic.'⁸¹

Harding also added an emotional appeal to this claim. Emotional appeals were a rhetorical device often used in polemic after exposition and persuasion, in order to direct the audience to the right interpretation of their new knowledge.⁸² It was a common feature in preaching as well as in written polemic, as a method of argument and a means of using language effectively, and it was used with great skill throughout the Reformation controversies.⁸³ Andrew Pettegree notes that the audience expected such emotional displays: 'the ability to transfer his own emotional intensity to the auditory was widely regarded as a sign of an effective preacher'.⁸⁴

Harding's use of emotional appeal was neither as frequent nor as eloquent as Jewel's, but he did use it effectively to question the legitimacy of the invisible church. In the *Detection*, he said: 'O Master Jewel...when time will not bear out this gay glorious confession of yours, then, as your manner is, [you] run to corners, to seek some comfort of an unknown invisible church, where both the ministers...the sacraments, the people...are all together invisible'.⁸⁵ This was a very clever strategy: it turned the shift in the definition of 'catholic' into a point in Harding's favour. Where earlier reformers had insisted that they were the ones remaining in the traditional Catholic Church while the papists were departing from it, Jewel had declared that the Church of England had left the Catholic Church. It was part of his portrayal of the 'Englishness' of the Church of England, but Harding saw it as a

⁸¹ Harding, *Detection*, 30v.

⁸² David K. Weiser, 'The Prose Style of John Jewel,' *Salzburg Studies in English Literature* vol 9 (Austria: Insitut Fur Englische Sprache Und Literatur, 1973), 14.

⁸³ Peter Mack, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 2.

⁸⁴ Andrew Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 36.

⁸⁵ Harding, *Detection*, 123.

retreat. As he put it, once his opponents could not support their beliefs within the Catholic Church, they ran away and created an ‘unknown invisible church’. When phrased in this way, the invisible church sounds not like a true universal church, but an adolescent attempt to get out of trouble. Such a strategy provoked further clarification of the national universal church from Jewel, in order to justify its separation from the Roman Church.

As this section has shown, the Jewel-Harding controversy offers a unique window into the religious developments of the 1560s. In focusing so exclusively on the vestarian controversy, therefore, historians do a disservice to the study of the early Elizabethan church. Many of the clergy in England supported Jewel in his work, through providing sources and information, or by taking on one of the challengers. Jewel did not face this challenge alone. By ignoring this in favour of studying the vestarian controversy, historians focus on dissention between clergy rather than on the ways in which they worked together against a common adversary. This makes them seem to be a much more divided group than they actually were.

Due to the number of people involved, the amount of time covered, and the detail of its discussion, the Jewel-Harding controversy also provides unique insight into one aspect of early Elizabethan studies that cannot be studied through the vestarian controversy: the role of the audience in debates over the nature of the church. The vestarian controversy was in many ways a clerical dispute, fought out between the supreme governor and her clergy. The Jewel-Harding controversy, although it was fought out between clerics and scholars, engaged a far wider and greater audience. It is to the question of audience that we now turn.

The Prize of Soul and Body

Reformation historian Felicity Heal points out that both sides of the Jewel-Harding controversy were fighting for the same prize: that of ‘the soul and body of the English nation’.⁸⁶ It was a different prize than it had been just a generation earlier, because the reigns of Edward VI and Mary I had altered attitudes and re-defined religion in ways which affected the monarch and her ministers as much as it had the nation itself. As Diarmaid MacCulloch points out, a large part of the Elizabethan government was made up of Nicodemites, who had managed to keep

⁸⁶ Felicity Heal, ‘Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemic and the National Past,’ *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* vol 68, no 1/2 (2005), 117.

their reforming convictions while still conforming to the Roman Church.⁸⁷ This meant that they were willing to use more covert and subtle means of gaining religious stability than they may have once been. For example, William Cecil spent the Marian years at the fringes of the political world. Then he became, as MacCulloch phrases it, the ‘architect of a Protestant transformation in the English Church’.⁸⁸ As that architect, Cecil employed a policy of cautious moderation in choosing church leaders: he knew that the presentation of particular doctrine in a favourable light required the careful creation of a helpful clergy. As David Loades puts it, ‘it was clearly recognized that prevention was better than cure and Cecil, like Cromwell, was a master in the management of positive propaganda’.⁸⁹

What Loades calls positive propaganda has been called persuasion in Andrew Pettegree’s important work *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*. Pettegree categorizes the shifts in attitudes and the re-definition of religion that occurred over the sixteenth century by dividing the reformation into a first and second generation. The first generation of reform happened during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI, and involved painful decisions on the part of English people to reject the traditional church and accept the new learning based on nothing more than ‘the good faith and charismatic authority of preachers who had often emerged from a comparatively lowly position in the local clerical hierarchy’. The second generation involved an ‘extended process of reorientation’ to new churches. People could adhere to the new religion that emerged during the reign of Elizabeth without any real mental engagement, simply because it was the new official church.

This lack of mental engagement on the part of church members was not acceptable to the reformers of this second generation. They knew that ‘the process of building a new church required much more than conversion. Education, assimilation, and the creation of new enemies – a new dialectic of belonging and rejection – all played their part’.⁹⁰ Jewel and Harding were part of this second generation of reform, and their debate exemplifies this culture of persuasion. As Pettegree notes, the process of education, assimilation and the creation of new

⁸⁷ Diarmaid MacCulloch, ‘The Latitude of the Church of England,’ in *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006), 49.

⁸⁸ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England* (London: McMillan Education Ltd, 1990), 27.

⁸⁹ Loades, *Politics, Censorship and Reformation*, 105.

⁹⁰ Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, 1-2, 6.

enemies took place in ‘public, communal settings’ like marketplaces and pulpits.⁹¹ This was the way that Jewel and Harding’s debate first reached the public: Jewel preached the Challenge Sermon three times before he published it, and he also preached each of his responses to Harding before he published them.

Harding often enviously referred to Jewel’s access to Paul’s Cross, especially in connection with Jewel’s success. In the *Rejoinder*, for example, Harding summarized Jewel’s career as: ‘your favour of the common people and others that clap you on the shoulder, your vain pulpit buzzing...at Paul’s Cross: all this has made many...believe that Master Jewel was a great clerk, a pillar of the gospel, a peerless fellow’.⁹² This suggests that Harding was aware of the role preaching had in the persuasion of the people, and wanted the same opportunity. To his chagrin, he could offer only written responses. Also, his work was banned in England, limiting him all the more because the majority of the audience could read his point of view legally only through the passages included in Jewel’s works.⁹³

A further limitation was the exclusive use of the vernacular. Christopher Highley suggests that Catholic exiles used the vernacular ‘to demonstrate their attachment to “our mother tongue” and to an emotionally resonant linguistic definition of Englishness’. They did not particularly like using English, which they considered ‘rude utterance’, but they used it in order to compete for ‘possession of the mother tongue and for the symbolic capital it embodied’.⁹⁴ A.C. Southern suggests that their reluctance stemmed in part from the limitation of the English language when it came to constructing traditional forms of rhetoric and logic.⁹⁵ This can be supported by a comment by the Catholic Thomas Dorman, who suggested that people who willingly wrote in the vernacular were ‘the less learned and wise’.⁹⁶

Significantly, after 1568 many Romanist scholars shifted locations from Louvain to Douai, and at the same time they also shifted away from writing in the vernacular and started to work in Latin once again. Lucy Wooding attributes this to their determination to study doctrine in more depth in preparation for missions: they restricted the use of the vernacular to works which avoided discussion of doctrine and emphasized Catholic loyalty and identity instead, such as devotional works and

⁹¹ Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, 8.

⁹² Harding, *Rejoindre*, C1.

⁹³ Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 46.

⁹⁴ Christopher Highley, *Catholics Writing the Nation in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 45.

⁹⁵ Southern, *Elizabethan Recusant Prose*, IX-XI.

⁹⁶ Thomas Dorman, *A disproufe of M. Nowelles reprofue* (Antwerp, 1565), +3.

martyrologies. She also connects this shift in language to a trend for Romanists to take refuge ‘not in scripture, but in the institutional church’.⁹⁷ This shows how closely they identified the universal church with the Church of Rome, and its members as a ‘mass of souls’.

Harding insisted that the liturgy should be conducted in Latin, because the ‘high and worthy mystery’ of the sacrament should be ‘honoured with secretness, closeness, and silence’, but he was resigned to the use of the vernacular in polemical debate.⁹⁸ He even used the vernacular when a Latin option was available to him. When confuting the *Apology*, he did not use the Latin edition of 1562, but based his response on the 1564 English edition. This was partly a sign of his acceptance of the vernacular, but it also may have been strategic. Harding made frequent and disparaging mention of the 1564 edition’s translator, Lady Anne Bacon.

Lady Bacon was the daughter of the humanist and educator Sir Anthony Cooke, and Lord Keeper Nicholas Bacon’s wife. She had a reputation as an excellent scholar, and was best known for her skills in Greek, Italian, and Latin. In recent historiography, her translation of the *Apology* has received a great deal of attention, mostly from a literary rather than a historical perspective. For this reason, much of the existing scholarship focuses on gender studies or the role of a translator in sixteenth-century literature. However, it also draws out two aspects of Lady Bacon’s translation that is significant for this study: her expectations of readership, and her vernacular style.

Patricia Demers, Gemma Allen and Alan Stewart all suggest that Lady Bacon wrote her translation with the expectation that it would reach a greater audience than her own circle of friends. Their evidence comes from a close reading of Archbishop Matthew Parker’s dedicatory epistle, which was published along with the translation. Parker claimed that Lady Bacon did not intend for her work to be published, but as Demers suggests, this may well be just an example of the humility topos. Alan Stewart takes this further, suggesting that Parker’s letter not only intended to provide the customary nod to modesty, but was actually structured in the same way as dedications written to important patrons. This gave Lady Bacon a doubly significant role as both sponsor and translator, which acknowledged the worth of her work.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 226-227.

⁹⁸ Harding, *Answers*, 163.

⁹⁹ Patricia Demers, ‘Nether Bitterly Nor Brabblingly: Lady Anne Bacon’s Translation of John Jewel’s *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*,’ in *English Women, Religion and Textual Production*, edited by Micheline White (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011), 208; Alan Stewart, ‘The Voices of Anne

Notably, Parker also said that the Latin *Apologia* was a ‘public work’ that had not been ‘truly and well translated’ until Lady Bacon’s edition. Her translation pleased both him and Jewel, because it allowed them to make ‘his good work more publicly beneficial’.¹⁰⁰ This shows a keen awareness of the needs of their audience and the means of meeting them.

Gemma Allen and Patricia Demers both focus on Lady Bacon’s awareness of the significance of a vernacular translation. Demers notes the importance of a vivid English translation to the ‘vernacular theology’ of the time.¹⁰¹ Allen suggests that Lady Bacon deliberately used Old and Middle English words when some words of French origin would have sufficed, so that she could give an ‘authentically English’ voice to her text.¹⁰² This further enhances the importance of the vernacular to this debate, and the connection between national pride and true faith. It also suggests that Lady Bacon was familiar with Jewel’s style. Allen points out that Lady Bacon deliberately gave her translation a verbal feel with the use of such words as ‘behold’ and ‘lo, ye’. This reflected the structure of Jewel’s Challenge Sermon, and shows that Lady Bacon attempted to bring out his methods of persuasion in her translation.¹⁰³

English scholar Lyne Magnusson suggests that Lady Bacon’s greatest accomplishment was her translation of Jewel’s *Apology*, because it made her words the voice of the established church.¹⁰⁴ Lady Bacon’s version has been considered the standard translation of the *Apology* since its first appearance; it was used in the passages Jewel included in his 1567 *Defence*, and in all of his exchanges between himself and Harding. It was also the version used in the 1609 collection of Jewel’s works. By the time Lady Bacon died in 1610, it had been in circulation for nearly forty-five years, and continually praised for its vivid prose and skilled translation.

Cooke, Lady Anne and Lady Bacon,’ in *This Double Voice’: Gendered Writing in Early Modern England*, edited by Danielle Clarke and Elizabeth Clarke (London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 2000), 93; Gemma Allen, ‘A Brief and Plain Declaration: Lady Anne Bacon’s Translation of the *Apologia Ecclesie Anglicanae*,’ in *Women and Writing 1340-1650: The Domestication of Print Culture*, edited by Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Philippa Hardman (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer Ltd, 2010), 62.

¹⁰⁰ John Ayre, ed, *Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury* vol 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1835), 51.

¹⁰¹ Demers, ‘Neither Bitterly Nor Brabblingly,’ 212, 217.

¹⁰² Allen, ‘A Brief and Plain Declaration,’ 72.

¹⁰³ Allen, ‘A Brief and Plain Declaration,’ 71.

¹⁰⁴ “Bacon [Cooke], Anne, Lady Bacon (c.1528–1610),” Lynne Magnusson in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eee online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: OUP, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/987> (accessed May 11, 2012).

However, Harding did not acknowledge Lady Bacon's scholarship, referring to her as Jewel's 'youthful lady interpreter'. He occasionally suggested that she was complicit with Jewel in trying to deceive the reader through her translation, with such subtle disparagements as: 'my lady the interpreter, not without the will and advice of this Defender...has altered the sense of the Latin'.¹⁰⁵ This was not something Jewel was prepared to accept; he shot back using some of the most vehement terms he had used in the entire controversy. He said that Harding had 'lewdly demeaned himself' towards Lady Bacon, and praised her highly, calling her a lady of 'learning, virtue and gravity...as far from all unwomanly presumption...as you are from all manly modesty... [and] as full of wisdom as you of folly'.¹⁰⁶

Jewel was more passionate about the rejection of Latin than Harding was about the acceptance of the vernacular, and this was not unusual for second-generation reformers such as himself. English and religion scholar John N. King suggested that by using the vernacular Elizabethans were simply imitating the English Bible, since through it they had 'inherited the tradition of vernacular prose'.¹⁰⁷ Other historians attach more significance to this. Timothy Rosendale suggests that the English reformers considered Latin 'an obfuscatory veil behind which the Roman Church worked its corruption', and that it was part of the promotion of Englishness to elevate English above Rome and its language.¹⁰⁸ David Birch agrees that a sense of Englishness affected the choice to promote the vernacular, arguing that it was a part of the shift that moved reforming ideas from the wider European scene to the local.¹⁰⁹ Essentially, by writing in English, reformers made their doctrine seem English.

This strategy seems to have had some effect. As Lucy Wooding notes, whether or not the attempt to establish a new faith during the sixteenth century worked, 'the bid for a more intellectualized faith does seem at least to have had some success, as ideological concerns became increasingly central to the experience of Protestant and Catholic alike'. Wooding attributes this in part to the use of the vernacular.¹¹⁰ Similarly, Peter Matheson argues that textual communities could

¹⁰⁵ Harding, *Confutation*, 49, 50.

¹⁰⁶ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 89.

¹⁰⁷ John N. King, *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1982), 139.

¹⁰⁸ Timothy Rosendale, *Liturgy and Literature in the Making of Protestant England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 61-62.

¹⁰⁹ David Birch, 'Early Reformation English Polemic,' *Elizabethan and Renaissance Studies* vol 92, no 7 (1983), 29-30.

¹¹⁰ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 2-3.

develop in part due to the use of English, because it brought groups within the church together. ‘The recourse to the vulgar language...meant a break with an elitist view of education and religion and church; there were no longer to be two kinds of Christians, spiritual and worldly, using two different languages.’¹¹¹ Matheson is referring to a wide textual community in this case, involving not only the core members but the people with whom they were sharing their interpretation of particular texts.

The makeup of these textual communities is a complex issue, because once a textual community goes beyond a relatively small number of people it tends to lose its cohesion, and that blurs its purpose. This is especially true when the purpose is polemic. Alec Ryrie suggests that the polemic of this era was focused on shoring up the faith of the converted, not on drawing new people in to the faith or on converting the opponent.¹¹² This is not completely borne out in the textual communities around Jewel and Harding. While it is certainly arguable that the opponents were not the main audience, it is not as easy to agree that there was no hope of making new conversions. Convincing others of the truth of their particular interpretation was an important activity for textual communities.

At the same time, it is hard to define what would be a ‘new’ conversion, since all the people involved would be considered Christians of some sort. I would argue that the waverers and the weary were the main focus of Jewel’s polemic, and thus they represent the converts he and his textual community hoped to make. These people all had faith of some sort, but had not yet made a decision as to what form their faith would take. By the 1560s the people of England had endured over thirty years of reform and the reversal of reform. Many did not want to invest in yet another new form of religion, and their reluctance weakened the church and its doctrine. As Patrick McGrath notes, ‘the Elizabethan church had to face the fact that there existed an increasingly educated and self-conscious laity very ready to criticize defects in its ministers and determined to keep the church in its proper place’.¹¹³ Their conversion was very important for the survival of the church, but neither Elizabeth nor her ministers wanted to force that conversion. Thus, they employed what the social historian Christopher Marsh called the ‘softly, softly’ approach to reformation.

¹¹¹ Matheson, *The Rhetoric of the Reformation*, 23.

¹¹² Alec Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 4.

¹¹³ McGrath, *Papists and Puritans*, 20.

The ‘softly, softly’ approach was a slow and cautious pace of reform first advocated by Cranmer, which showed a ‘sensitive appreciation of popular tastes’. Marsh noted that it worked well with the English people, because it ‘fitted reasonably well with other, older trends, but did not attempt to force their pace with excessive aggression’. Significantly, it worked with the rising levels of literacy and ‘an intensifying consciousness of nationhood’.¹¹⁴ This shows an awareness of the audience and a willingness to adapt methods to match their needs, something which was consistently part of Jewel’s work. As linguistics scholar David Weiser notes, this sort of slow steady pace of conversion can be found in the Challenge Sermon. Jewel’s strategy of shifting the burden of proof to the Church of Rome was both bold and restrained.

Although Jewel often seemed impatient for further reform in his letters of 1559 and 1560, it was the suppression of heresies that he most wanted then, and as quickly as possible. Specifically, he wanted the Marian clergy and the mass removed: he was sure that conversion to the true church would happen through the simple preaching of the gospel once the hindrance they presented was gone.¹¹⁵ Jewel was more patient when it came to the business of persuading the waverers and the weary. He recognized that too much of a show of strength was self-defeating and advocated simple truth, because the truth ‘never abases itself, never flatters any[one], dissembles nothing, feigns nothing’. To Jewel, truth was best presented with restraint, so that it was obvious to the listeners that the preacher was furthering God’s cause, not his own.¹¹⁶

Notably, Jewel did not argue against only one extreme of religion in his work of persuasion, but continued to resist all the adversaries of the true church, as he had during the Edwardian Reformation. In a 1560 letter to Martyr, Jewel reported that the leaders of the Elizabethan church were busily trying to kill off the ‘large and inauspicious crop of Arians, Anabaptists, and other pests’ which had sprung up like mushrooms during the ‘darkness and unhappy night of the Marian times’. He told Martyr that their means of accomplishing this was through ‘purer doctrine’, which was not an unusual strategy for Jewel.¹¹⁷ Presenting purer doctrine suited his ‘softly, softly’ approach, and his emphasis on the responsibility of the individual to evaluate

¹¹⁴ Christopher Marsh, *Popular Religion in Sixteenth-Century England: Holding their Peace* (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1998), 206-207.

¹¹⁵ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, 1205-1208.

¹¹⁶ Weiser, ‘The Prose Style of John Jewel,’ 49; John Ayre, ed, *Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury* vol 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1835), 962, 963.

¹¹⁷ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 92.

religious arguments for themselves. It was always the foundation of his strategy in his efforts to maintain a true and balanced faith, as can be seen in the ways he used the same reasoning and the same strategies against Arians, Anabaptists and ubiquitarians as he did against the Romanists.

With the ubiquitarians, for example, he grounded his disagreement on the church fathers and simply corrected the misinterpretation of Augustine that had led to their error, much as he did when correcting misinterpretations that seemed to provide legitimacy for papal supremacy.¹¹⁸ Then, having presented the Augustinian passage in context and made its meaning clear, he called the idea of ubiquitarianism a fantasy, because claiming that ‘the body of Christ is everywhere ...utterly denies the verity of Christ’s body’.¹¹⁹ This strategy helped his work of persuasion, first by clarifying which were acceptable beliefs for those who were unsure, and second by allowing him to counter Harding’s arguments. As we have seen, Harding tried to equate the Church of England with extremists such as the Arians, Anabaptists and ubiquitarians, in order to damage its credibility.

Jewel’s wide range of adversaries meant that he addressed people who held deeply divergent views, and his attitude toward them suggests that he targeted all of these people in an attempt to bring them back to what he saw as the correct interpretation of the faith, contained in the true universal church. His methods, which focused on education, challenge the assumption that the clerical elite would not have entrusted ordinary people with the knowledge of deep and complex issues of the faith; an assumption John Craig calls a commonplace in sixteenth-century writing. However, it is not entirely clear who was ‘ordinary’. It was not based only on class, but on obedience. Men and women were often labelled as ‘well-ordered in religion’, ‘conformable’ or ‘unconformable’.¹²⁰ Arguably, those who were ‘conformable’ (a term which would best describe the waverers and the weary) most needed to hear the messages presented in the controversy. Both Jewel and Harding were aware of that, and attempted to reach them using the rhetorical device of direct address. They frequently referred to the ‘dear reader’, the ‘good reader’, the ‘Christian reader’, or the ‘reader’, prefaced with any combination of those three adjectives.

¹¹⁸ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 353.

¹¹⁹ Jewel, *Replie*, 349. See also CC1v-CC2, Ce1, Ce2.

¹²⁰ John Craig, *Reformation, Politics and Polemic: The Growth of Protestantism in East Anglian Market Towns* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001), 3, 26.

The two men used this device in ways that reflect the basic difference in how they viewed the individual. Harding spoke to a group, the ‘mass of souls’ first mentioned in the introduction to this chapter. Jewel spoke to individuals, and he often used the device to teach a concept. In the *Reply*, he paused in his response to an article about the private mass to teach the ‘good Christian reader’ about how communion was administered not by one man, but ‘by the priest and whole congregation together’ in the primitive church.¹²¹ This emphasized the fellowship of the congregation, and their universality of faith.

Jewel also used direct address to conduct revision, telling the reader to ‘look back and to consider the whole substance of all that Master Harding has laid in for proof’.¹²² He was frequently very specific in what he said to the reader, especially when he was pointing out failings in logic or style, or when he deliberately brought the reader back around to the basic point of the original challenge. In one passage about the private mass, Jewel said that Harding was wandering vainly through the treatise, and not really answering the question at hand. Thus, he suggested to the reader that ‘it may please you to remember my first negative proposition touching the same, which in effect is this: They are not able to show, that within six hundred years after Christ, there were five Masses said anywhere, in any one Church, in one day, throughout the world’.¹²³ Jewel was willing to respond in detail to Harding’s proofs and claims, but he would not let the purpose get lost in the polemic.

Harding also addressed the reader and asked them to judge the value of his authority versus that of Jewel, but his attitude was very different. He did not seem to have any particular respect for his readers, referring to them as ‘tinkers and tapsters’, and he told them quite clearly what to believe.¹²⁴ His favourite expression was ‘mark, reader’, which would be followed by a particular statement for said reader to accept. In the *Rejoinder*, Harding used this expression to tell his audience that Jewel ‘proceeds with hows and questions, after the guise of Jews, Turks and infidels’.¹²⁵ In the *Detection*, Harding used it to decree the legitimacy of the structure of the mass, and to declare that Jewel’s church was new and heretical. As Harding phrased it: Luther started it, ‘ergo [Jewel’s] company is not the church’.¹²⁶

¹²¹ Jewel, *Replie*, 176.

¹²² Jewel, *Replie*, 218.

¹²³ Jewel, *Replie*, 495.

¹²⁴ Harding, *Rejoindre* 77v; *Confutation*, 279v.

¹²⁵ Harding, *Rejoindre*, 59, 187.

¹²⁶ Harding, *Detection*, 90v, 354v.

This displays Harding's adversarial mentality, which was similar to that of the community of reformers in its desire for moderation – that is, to hold the proper position against the extremes of religion. He just had a different idea of what constituted the proper position. In that same passage in the *Detection*, Harding went on to condemn his opponents because they let people come up with their own interpretations. He expected his readers to accept the faith which they were given by the church, often using the image of 'sundry waxes' blending into one candle to illustrate this. He explained it most clearly in the *Confutation*.¹²⁷ 'I trust so many as love the truth, fear God, think of their soul's health, and understand what danger it is to be out of the church, will follow Paul's counsel to Timothy, which is utterly to refuse [the reformers] and give ear to no part of their false and perilous teaching.'¹²⁸

Perhaps the best way to summarize how Jewel and Harding saw their audiences differently can be found in how they phrased their addresses to the reader. Jewel said that he spoke to them for their better *understanding*; Harding said that he spoke to them for their better *instruction*.¹²⁹ This fine distinction shows how the Jewel-Harding controversy built on existing sixteenth-century polemical tradition. In his debate with Tyndale that took place in the early 1530s, Thomas More had treated the reader in a way that was similar to Harding's method, in that he provided the reader with the correct conclusion: that the Catholic Church was to be believed.¹³⁰ More also seems to have thought of his audience as a 'mass of souls', since he rarely referred to the 'reader', preferring instead 'the readers'.¹³¹ William Tyndale, however, treated the reader as a judge, and also presented a viewpoint that placed the onus of responsibility on the individual, claiming that it was time for the English people to 'see with their own eyes'.¹³² Like Jewel, he aimed to help his readers understand.

The similarity between styles inspired literature scholar David Weiser to suggest that Jewel may have been influenced by Tyndale. In his opinion, Jewel's writings parallel those of Tyndale in their 'unremitting clarity' and 'careful yet

¹²⁷ Harding, *Rejoindre*, 147.

¹²⁸ Harding, *Confutation*, 349v.

¹²⁹ Jewel, *Replie*, ¶2v ; Harding, *Rejoindre*, ***4r.

¹³⁰ Thomas More, *The co[n]futation of Tyndales answere made by syr Thomas More knyght* (London, 1532), cccxvii.

¹³¹ More, *co[n]futation of Tyndales answere*, ccxl; More, *The second parte of the co[n]futation*, clxxxiv.

¹³² Henry Walter, ed, *An Answer to Thomas More's Dialogue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1850), 10.

hammer-like' sentences.¹³³ However, Weiser also thought that Jewel's connection with Tyndale was not direct, but came through Cranmer. One example of their similarity can be found in Cranmer's debate with Gardiner in the early 1550s: Cranmer had a tendency to refer the reader to his own judgement, something which can also be found in Jewel.¹³⁴

Based on this evidence, it seems that Harding attempted to re-claim a wide segment of the population, and Jewel aimed to persuade them. Chapter five will examine the extent of Jewel's success, both during his lifetime and for twenty years beyond it. For the present, it is enough to point out that the Challenge Sermon and its descendants were preached and published not only for the general London public, but for powerful and influential people such as the mayor and aldermen, the nobles of the court, and all levels of clergy. Many of the clergy were reluctant to accept Elizabeth's settlement, especially those who had openly supported the restoration of the church to Rome. Jewel said in a letter to Peter Martyr that 'if...obstinacy were found anywhere, it was altogether among the priests, those especially who had once been on our side. They are now throwing all things into confusion, in order, I suppose, that they may not seem to have changed their opinions without due consideration'.¹³⁵

Jewel may have inspired them, and their contemporaries among the laity, to give the settlement that consideration. A letter from Jewel to William Cecil shows that Jewel's responses were eagerly awaited: Jewel explained why his *Reply* had taken so long to write, and said that he understood Cecil's impatience. Then he promised that he was working diligently on completing the work: 'I know many look for it greedily, and some wonder it is not abroad long sithence. ...All this forces me not to hasten faster than I may; which thing, as, God willing, it shall not hinder the cause.'¹³⁶ It seems that Jewel's efforts to present meticulous research and carefully consider individual needs were not wasted on his readers.

The National Universal Church

While Jewel argued that the Church of England was indeed a true church, legitimately part of the universal church due to its pure doctrine and the faith of its individual members, he also had to establish the 'of England' part. The national was

¹³³ Weiser, 'The Prose Style of John Jewel,' 113, 116.

¹³⁴ Jenkyns, *Remains of Thomas Cranmer*, 187.

¹³⁵ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 45.

¹³⁶ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, 1262-1263.

an integral part of the universal in Jewel's mind. He had to reconcile the idea of a universal church with the idea of a royal supremacy, and he had to convince his audience that they had a place within it. He did this in four ways: first, by establishing its basic 'Englishness'; second, by making connections between the Church of England and the faithful people of the Old and New Testament. Third, he placed the church within an apocalyptic context, and finally, he emphasized the role, and the value, of each of the church's members.

Jewel established the Church of England's 'Englishness' by emphasizing the role of crown and parliament in its formation. Several times over the course of the controversy, Jewel emphasized that 'all churches that received their faith from Rome, keep the orders of the Church of Rome. But the Church of England followed not the orders of the Church of Rome'.¹³⁷ Jewel took it as a point of pride that the Church of England had not joined the general council at Trent but had made its decisions regarding doctrine and liturgy through a provincial synod. He said that the English Church had 'homemade laws', implying that it was not a strange foreign church but something uniquely theirs.¹³⁸ This, as David Loades phrases it, called upon 'the powerful and growing sentiment of patriotism to rally the country behind a church which few really liked but which had the immense advantage of being "mere English"'.¹³⁹ By portraying it as 'mere English' Jewel promoted the religious settlement as a collaborative effort; a product of the community.

This aspect of Jewel's argument has not yet been fully explored in either parliamentary or religious studies of the 1560s. Jennifer Loach's *Parliament Under the Tudors* did an excellent job examining Parliament's function and how it was received, but Loach did not look at how its decisions were used by its clergy to support the legitimacy of the church.¹⁴⁰ Michael Graves acknowledges that the Elizabethan settlement made the government the maintainers of the religious status quo rather than its challengers, for the first time since Henry VIII. However, he does not examine the significance of that by looking at how it affected religious authority.¹⁴¹ Norman L. Jones' work comes closest to examining this issue; he argued that parliament was the supreme legislator, so 'the Reformation began and was continued through parliamentary statute, and it was for this reason that anyone

¹³⁷ Jewel, *Replie*, 168.

¹³⁸ Jewel, *Apologie*, O8r, P1v.

¹³⁹ Loades, *Politics, Censorship, and Reformation*, 45.

¹⁴⁰ Jennifer Loach, *Parliament Under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 100-103.

¹⁴¹ Michael Graves, *Elizabethan Parliaments, 1559-1601* (London: Longman Group UK Ltd, 1987), 24.

wishing to alter the church had to seek parliament's approval'.¹⁴² However, Jewel's use of the parliament as a supporting authority for the legitimacy of the Church of England is not mentioned.

As Jewel promoted that aspect of the English Church, Harding tried to discredit it. He did this mainly through attacks on the *Apology*, because its first edition was published anonymously, without any visible signs of royal approval. Harding pretended that he did not know who wrote the *Apology*, and then repeatedly used the Bishop of Salisbury as an example of everything that was wrong with the clergy of the Church of England.¹⁴³ Jewel went along with the pretence and referred to 'the man who wrote the *Apology*' in his *Defence*, which led to Harding's 'discovery' that Jewel had written it.¹⁴⁴ Harding feigned shock about this discovery in the *Detection*, and then dismissed Jewel's contribution: 'By the multitude of the light scoffs, it appears that he [Jewel] was the penman of it, marry the stuff I hear say was gathered by the whole brotherhood'.¹⁴⁵ It is likely that he meant to discredit the clergy of the Church of England as well as Jewel himself by this, since he then went on to disparage the entire book.

First, he asked why the author of the *Apology* was not named on the title page, and why none of the bishops had signed their names to it. Then he taunted Jewel about the *Apology's* lack of visible signs of official royal approval. 'Of all things in it, that only is most orderly done, that it is set forth without the prince's privilege, though the same be unlawful. For great shame had it been...authorized by public privilege.'¹⁴⁶ The *Apology* actually had been printed under royal authority, so Harding was either mistaken in this, or deliberately choosing to ignore it. He most likely did not know that Cecil himself commissioned Jewel to write it, and supervised the editing and publishing process.¹⁴⁷ However, he would have seen that it was printed by Reginald Wolfe, a printer with royal connections that stretched back to the days when Harding had been at Oxford.

Wolfe had enjoyed royal privilege during the reign of Edward as the king's printer for Latin, Greek and Hebrew. During the reign of Elizabeth, he again became the royal typographer for Latin, Greek and Hebrew, and printed the Latin editions of

¹⁴² Norman L. Jones, 'Religion in Parliament,' in *The Parliaments of Elizabethan England*, edited by D.M. Dean and Norman L. Jones (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 117.

¹⁴³ Harding, *Confutation*, 56v.

¹⁴⁴ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 358.

¹⁴⁵ Harding, *Detection*, 10.

¹⁴⁶ Harding, *Confutation*, 22-22v.

¹⁴⁷ T.H.L. Parker, *English Reformers* (London: SCM Press, 1966), 4; Booty, *Jewel As Apologist*, 40.

the Book of Common Prayer and Nowell's *Catechism*, as well as Jewel's *Apology*.¹⁴⁸ Wolfe also printed the 1562 and 1564 English versions of the *Apology*, and included the royal arms and 'God Save the Queen' opposite the title page of the 1562 English version. Harding ignored this connection to royal privilege, and decided that the lack of signatures and the royal arms meant that the English clergy was ashamed of their book, and wanted to keep it hidden away.

Jewel responded to this in the *Defence*, pointing out that the *Apology* had been translated into several languages and sent throughout Europe, which meant that they were most definitely not ashamed of it. Also, they had no need to set their names to it. 'Neither is it necessary...to join private men's names to public matters: neither in so mighty and ample a realm...is it so easy to be done. Briefly, our *Apology* is confirmed by as many names as the high court of the Parliament of England is confirmed.' Jewel went on to claim not only parliamentary authority but ecclesiastical: 'if names be so necessary, we have the names of the whole Clergy of England, to confirm the faith of our doctrine'.¹⁴⁹

In this, Jewel showed how his sources of authority were very different from those of Harding. Jewel used the church fathers and the scriptures as evidence for his definition of what was 'catholic', and then he used the collective authority of parliament and clergy as evidence that the Church of England did indeed fit that definition. Harding also used the church fathers to support his claims, and to a lesser extent the scriptures, but he relied most fully on the Roman Church and the papacy to support his claims of catholicity. This is shown further in another of Harding's attacks on the *Apology*, when he demanded to know why the *Apology* was not submitted to papal authority for verification.

Such a demand may reflect the depth of Harding's belief in papal authority, but it also may have been an attempt to draw Jewel out of solid doctrinal ground and into more sandy areas, such as the question of royal supremacy and the authority of the universal church. However, Jewel was not moved, and in his response in the *Defence* Jewel showed how clearly the Church of England had separated itself from the Roman Church, and indeed how clearly he separated the Roman Church from the universal church. He asked why they would even consider submitting the *Apology*

¹⁴⁸ "Wolfe, Reyner (*d.* in or before 1574)," Andrew Pettegree in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, September 2011, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/29835> (accessed May 10, 2012).

¹⁴⁹ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 28.

to the pope, since ‘he is not our bishop: he is not our judge’. Their judge was the universal church, so they ‘offered the profession of our doctrine unto the whole church of God: and so unto the pope, and the Council too, if they be any part or member of the church’.¹⁵⁰ That ‘if’ shows that, in Jewel’s opinion, some Catholics may have had the faith required to be part of the universal church of God, but the Catholic Church did not make up the church of God on its own.

Jewel also denied that England first gained the Christian faith through any effort of Rome. Instead he related Geoffrey of Monmouth’s story of King Lucius and his conversion through the miracles of some young Christian missionaries. Jewel claimed that Lucius became a Christian before Constantine even made Christianity the official religion of the Roman empire, and that the pope Eleutherius told Lucius ‘you are God’s vicar within your own realm, according to the Prophet David’.¹⁵¹ In doing this Jewel established not only England’s independence from Rome, but gave some historical foundation to the royal supremacy. Felicity Heal notes how important this foundation was for the first advocates of the Elizabethan church: their dominant concern ‘was for a universal history of the true church to challenge the false narratives of Rome’. Contemporaries of Jewel, such as John Bale, used King Lucius to develop England’s unique status, or as Heal calls it, their ‘curious identity’.¹⁵²

Connected to this establishment of a historical foundation was Jewel’s attempt to remove any and all similar foundations for the Roman Church. Jewel claimed that England was converted by the combined efforts of Joseph of Arimathea and St Paul himself, and rejected the story that Augustine, the pope’s representative, was the first to bring the gospel to England.¹⁵³ He claimed that Augustine was not at all popular on the island, because he was ‘a hypocrite, a superstitious man, cruel, bloody, and proud above measure’.¹⁵⁴ In fact, since he did not speak English, his influence was next to negligible.¹⁵⁵ This interpretation of the efforts of Augustine attacked both the Roman Church’s claims to missionary influence, and its attachment to Latin.

¹⁵⁰ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 29.

¹⁵¹ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 11, 634-644.

¹⁵² Felicity Heal, ‘What Can King Lucius Do for You? The Reformation and the Early British Church,’ *English Historical Review* vol 122, no 487 (2005), 596.

¹⁵³ Jewel, *Replie*, 167.

¹⁵⁴ Jewel, *Replie*, 185.

¹⁵⁵ Jewel, *Replie*, 186.

More recent history also contributed to the historical foundations that Jewel gave his church: that of the tragic stories of the Marian martyrs. Jewel held Harding and his church responsible for the torture and death of Harding's fellow Englishmen.¹⁵⁶ In a way that reflects his focus on the 'federation of individual worshippers', Jewel did not simply present the facts of the torture, but individualized the victims. 'You have slain... married, unmarried, learned, unlearned, old, young, boys, maids, laymen, priests, bishops, archbishops, without mercy.'¹⁵⁷ He also referred specifically to particular martyrs, especially Archbishop Cranmer.¹⁵⁸ Harding said that Queen Mary's action in executing Cranmer was 'only the execution of outward justice', and Jewel responded with restrained anger and grief. 'Concerning that most grave, and godly, and learned Father...with whom you did whatsoever your pleasure was, God grant, his blood be never required at your hands.'¹⁵⁹

Jewel connected the sacrifice of the martyrs to the responsibility for the newly-established church to develop good doctrine. In the *Reply*, he prayed that God would 'make us the vessels of his mercy, that we may...build up again the broken walls of his Jerusalem', because 'this is the faith and catholic profession which the apostles have delivered, the martyrs have confirmed, and the faithful keep until this day'.¹⁶⁰ The profession of which Jewel spoke was the doctrine expressed in his *Apology*, which he did not, notably, describe as a confession of faith. Theologian William Jacob suggests that the defenders of the Church of England did not feel the need to draw up a confession of faith, because 'they believed that their reformed branch of the church believed what the church had always taught'.¹⁶¹ Peter Lake holds a similar theory: that the English reformers saw themselves as 'heirs to the apostles because they had inherited their true doctrine'.¹⁶² Jewel claimed apostolic inheritance, but he also traced the Church of England's inheritance still further back than that, and associated England with Israel through the historical and prophetic portions of scripture, which provided a wealth of models to choose from. As Patrick

¹⁵⁶ Jewel, *Replie*, 574.

¹⁵⁷ Jewel, *Replie*, 573.

¹⁵⁸ Jewel, *Replie*, 429.

¹⁵⁹ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 656.

¹⁶⁰ Jewel, *Replie*, Iii3v.

¹⁶¹ William Jacob, 'The Development of the Anglican Communion,' in *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*, edited by Stephen Platten (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), 193.

¹⁶² Lake, 'This Anglican Moment,' 93.

Collinson puts it; ‘If Christianity... is all about God and the soul, the soul and its God, the Old Testament is about God and the nation, the nation and its God’.¹⁶³

The Nation and its God

Using vivid imagery and analogy, Jewel created a concept of England as inheritor of the Hebrew covenants. In the *Reply*, he presented a threefold view of the history of the faith that beautifully connected Israel to the early Christians, and Jewel’s own time period to the second coming. He said that Christ, whether called the Messiah or the Saviour, was all one, but they all saw him differently. ‘Some see in a dark shadow, some in a perfect image, and some in the clear light. ...As the Jews were in shadow in comparison to that brightness of light that we see now, even so are we likewise in a shadow, in comparison of that light that we hope for, and is to come.’¹⁶⁴ This sort of imagery helped Jewel teach the English about the faith and provide a history for the English people.

Jewel also connected the English to Israel in a series of parallels that supported his stance on various issues of the day. He set up further support for the use of the vernacular in worship and in scripture in his *Reply*, when he said: ‘God said thus unto his people: hearken O Israel: let the words that I speak to thee this day rest in thy heart’.¹⁶⁵ He interpreted this to mean that God spoke in a language people could understand, and thus accept. He explained to Harding why God let the Roman Church continue so long by saying that ‘it was God’s secret providence that certain of yours should remain amongst us a season, as the Canaanites remained amongst the people of Israel’. He rejected the Roman tradition of images by associating images with the false god Dagon, and noted that they would eventually fall before the truth as Dagon had fallen before the Ark of the Covenant.¹⁶⁶

It must be noted here that Jewel was not unique in making this association. As Collinson notes, many preachers used Israel to describe England’s ‘present standing and likely destiny’ in both pulpit and publication.¹⁶⁷ Similarly, T.M.L. Parker argued that these associations were part of ‘a general urge toward national

¹⁶³ Patrick Collinson, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), 14.

¹⁶⁴ Jewel, *Replie*, 468.

¹⁶⁵ Jewel, *Replie*, 518.

¹⁶⁶ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 37, 41.

¹⁶⁷ Collinson, *This England*, 171.

centralization', caused in part by the crown's need to enforce conformity.¹⁶⁸ However, it may have been more personal for Jewel. He gave Elizabeth herself a role in this association, describing her as the nurse of the church whom he hoped would become an 'old mother in Israel', which is an unusual wish to present to a woman but was at least sincere.¹⁶⁹ In this he diverted a rhetorical device from himself to the subject of his argument, by making Elizabeth a messenger for God and a moral defender. He also used the rhetorical device of exaggerated moral outrage on her behalf when he protested Harding's audacity in dedicating the *Confutation* to her, and claimed that Elizabeth was sent to reform the church.¹⁷⁰ In Jewel's opinion, God sent princes to fix what the church was doing wrong, for the well-being of the people.¹⁷¹ Godly magistrates had the authority to punish heretics, remove idols, and most significantly call councils.¹⁷²

The position of Elizabeth as head of the church was one that needed to be defended if it was to be accepted by the English people, as Jewel and his fellow polemicists knew only too well. Perhaps this explains why the majority of the passages Jewel marked in his copy of Martyr's *In Epistolem S Pauli Ad Romanos* were in reference to the godly magistrate; Jewel wanted to ensure that his defence was grounded well on Biblical precedent.¹⁷³ Polemicists had the important role of defining the faith in a way that was compatible with official policy, as religious historian Daniel Eppley notes, so that they could help secure 'the orderly and peaceful England unified behind obedience to its prince for which these defenders worked'.¹⁷⁴ Jewel seemed to be one of those whose support of the royal supremacy was pure and genuine, instead of born out of obligation, uncertainty, or indifference. In the dedication to Elizabeth that appeared in both editions of the *Defence*, he described himself as 'your majesty's most humble subject and most faithful orator'.¹⁷⁵

David Weiser suggests that this shows Jewel's belief in being faithful to both his God and his Queen, and his attempt 'to convince his countrymen that these two

¹⁶⁸ T. M.L. Parker, 'The Problem of Uniformity,' in *The English Prayer Book 1549-1662*, edited by Clifford W. Dugmore (London: S.P.C.K., 1963), 37.

¹⁶⁹ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, A4v, 389.

¹⁷⁰ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, A4r.

¹⁷¹ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 637.

¹⁷² Jewel, *Replie*, 259.

¹⁷³ See Peter Martyr, *In Epistolem S Pauli Ad Romanos* (Basle, 1558). [Magdalen College Library Oxford Shelfmark: T.14.10]

¹⁷⁴ Daniel Eppley, *Defending Royal Supremacy and Discerning God's Will in Tudor England* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 2.

¹⁷⁵ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, A5v.

loyalties belonged together'.¹⁷⁶ In this way, Jewel brought loyalty to the monarch into his concept of a true universal church. That it was a central concern for him is shown in a letter that he once sent to Peter Martyr. Jewel often used the emperors that had ruled during the era of the early church as examples of monarchs exercising authority over the church, and wanted to ensure that he provided ample evidence for that. He also wanted to ensure that the evidence was accurate, so he asked Martyr for help. He said in his letter that he remembered that Sylverius and Vigilius 'were removed from their office [of patriarch] by the emperor Justinian', and wanted Martyr to help him find the source of that information: 'when you next write, I will thank you briefly to point out the place where this circumstance is recorded'.¹⁷⁷ Jewel did not just accept the supremacy of Elizabeth over the church because it was convenient, but because it was an important part of his definition of a national universal church.

Part of being loyal to Elizabeth's church meant rejecting its enemies, and Jewel encouraged that rejection through a skilful development of a concept of 'the other' that presented said enemies as evil and dangerous. As we saw first in the discussion of Jewel's definition of the universal church, Jewel defined 'catholic' both by what it was and by what it was not, and turned the charge of novelty around by telling Harding that 'you are new, not us'.¹⁷⁸ He did the same thing in his connections to the primitive church, making it very clear that papal supremacy was not part of the church of the apostles – so clear, in fact, that he made a bold claim that he wanted to tell the pope that he was wrong to his face.¹⁷⁹ This suggests the same sense of proud, independent Englishness that led John Aylmer to write that 'God is English' in 1559. Aylmer meant it as a way of saying that God was not French, but Jewel could have used the same phrasing to describe his belief that God was not Roman.¹⁸⁰

The Nation and Its Future

Jewel not only looked backward to secure a place in history for the Church of England, but forward. Apocalyptic imagery and a general expectation that the world would not last much longer helped him develop the idea that the English held a

¹⁷⁶ Weiser, 'The Prose Style of John Jewel,' 66.

¹⁷⁷ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 18-19.

¹⁷⁸ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 32.

¹⁷⁹ Jewel, *Apologie* 1564, K7.

¹⁸⁰ Collinson, *This England*, 5.

particular place in God's divine plan. This was not exclusive to Jewel; the apocalypse was a major theme in religious writings during the sixteenth century.¹⁸¹ Concern about the end of the world was a common result of the experience of exile, according to scholars such as Jane Dawson.¹⁸² However, while Jewel may not have been unique in his use of the apocalypse, he was in his method. As theologian Katharine Firth notes, Jewel's use of apocalyptic imagery was unusual: 'a finely ironic blend of caution in identifying the Antichrist with a transparent argument for the apocalyptic tradition in history'. Jewel made apocalyptic thought part of the apology of the church, instead of just part of polemical propaganda.¹⁸³

This may have influenced Jewel's decision to end the period of the primitive church at 600 years. Aside from the historical perspective that corruption set in after 600, the choice may also have been connected to the apocalyptic tendency to explain church history based on particular periods.¹⁸⁴ This, as Eamon Duffy notes, was encouraged by Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*.¹⁸⁵ Collinson supports this, arguing that Foxe re-wrote history in order to subdue it to the principles of persecution and martyrdom, and in the process divided the church into the true and the false church.¹⁸⁶ However, it is important not to overstate this connection for the English nation. Many scholars have accused William Haller of doing just that, due to his book *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation*.¹⁸⁷ Theologian Richard Bauckham calls it 'influential and overrated', arguing that Haller's idea that Foxe and Bale created the seventeenth-century concept of the 'elect nation' is unsupportable when Foxe's book is placed in context with other apocalyptic writers of his time.¹⁸⁸ Loades points out that while it might be acceptable to call England *an* elect nation, due to its awareness of the 'special providence' of God upon it, it is inappropriate to call it *the* elect nation.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸¹ Richard Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse* (Oxford: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978), 11; Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie, 'Between Coercion and Persuasion,' in *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, edited by Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 3.

¹⁸² Jane Dawson, 'The Apocalyptic Thinking of the Marian Exiles,' *Prophecy and Eschatology: Studies in Church History* vol 10 (1994), 75.

¹⁸³ Katherine Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 85.

¹⁸⁴ Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: the Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 69.

¹⁸⁵ Eamon Duffy, 'The Shock of Change: Continuity and Discontinuity in the Elizabethan Church of England,' in *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*, edited by Stephen Platten (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), 52.

¹⁸⁶ Collinson, *This England*, 16.

¹⁸⁷ William Haller, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963).

¹⁸⁸ Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, 12.

¹⁸⁹ Loades, *Politics, Censorship, and the English Reformation*, 43, 48.

One might say that England was an elect nation because it was made up of people who were themselves elect. This is not meant in the sense of predestination, but rather in the sense of individual value. Jewel emphasized individual responsibility and membership in the universal church throughout his debate with Harding, and this became all the more meaningful for English people because it took place during a time when self-awareness and what Stephen Greenblatt calls ‘self-fashioning’ were developing in English society.¹⁹⁰ Stephen Chavura and Torrance Kirby both note the growing importance of the individual conscience at this time: according to Chavura, ‘the individual was roused with a duty to work out his own salvation directly before God’, and Kirby calls the space between the individual conscience and institutional authority an ‘ever-widening gap’.¹⁹¹ Alexandra Walsham considers this individual awareness of responsibility a mixed blessing, and connects it to the power of printed works in the sixteenth century. These works ‘offered the clergy an opportunity to exert influence and control’ and yet they were dangerous because they had the capacity ‘to create a virtual priesthood of believers and to open a Pandora’s box of private interpretation’.¹⁹² It seems that this was a risk Jewel was willing to take, for the sake of his readers’ understanding.

The growing awareness of individual conscience in the sixteenth century inspired a quest for identity, which both Catholic and Protestant church leaders acknowledged. Harding offered identity through membership in the Catholic Church, and through this emphasized the importance of unity, as did many Catholic writers of the time. Unity in this sense implied adherence more than like-mindedness, and it was not acceptable to Jewel. He called the Roman definition of unity ‘a vile subjection and servitude’ based on nothing but a desire ‘not to be divided from the communion of the whole world’. In this, it was an infidelity to true unity and a ‘great mischief’.¹⁹³

Jewel claimed instead that true faith came with a unity of will and affection, not person or substance.¹⁹⁴ In talking about the common prayers and the Lord’s Supper he maintained the image of the many coming together, and in the Challenge Sermon he prayed that the faithful would ‘all be able, with one heart and one spirit,

¹⁹⁰ Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

¹⁹¹ Chavura, *Tudor Protestant Political Thought*, xii; Kirby, ‘Public Sermon,’ 21.

¹⁹² Walsham, ‘The Spider and the Bee,’ 163-164.

¹⁹³ Jewel, *Replie*, 260.

¹⁹⁴ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 243.

to know and to glorify the only, the true, and the living God'.¹⁹⁵ He also talked about diversity in unity, claiming that 'the voice is diverse, the religion all one', and emphasizing that though there may be different churches, there was one Christ.¹⁹⁶ He connected unity in diversity to nationhood by arguing that 'France, England, Africa, Persia...and all the barbarous nations worship one Christ, and keep one rule of the truth. If we seek for authority, the whole world is greater than the City of Rome'.¹⁹⁷ This definition of unity allowed Jewel to present a view of history that gave each English person a special role in both the past and the future of the universal church, through their loyalty to crown and country.

Jewel felt that people should have the opportunity to learn, and so he frequently mentioned the importance of education, and more importantly education that even the simplest could understand.¹⁹⁸ From learning and understanding came individual faith. Jewel emphasized the value of the person's inner conviction over membership in the church, arguing that Christ was in the heart, not in a building.¹⁹⁹ Nor was Christ exclusively in the clergy. Christ could be found in the humble as well as the great, because Christ provided understanding to the faithful. Thus the religious knowledge of one plain yet faithful man could outweigh that of the pope.²⁰⁰

Jewel made ordinary people important through this emphasis on a personal and informed faith, but his appreciation for them really shows through in his insistence that they were valuable. Perhaps the most poignant example of this can be found in Jewel's references to the English as God's flock, his chosen believers.²⁰¹ Jewel was not thinking of an elect nation in this context, but a beloved 'federation of worshippers'. Because of this, each person had value, and Jewel did not want to see their salvation endangered. He once begged Harding to stop deceiving his readers, because 'they were bought at a price: they are the people of God'.²⁰²

Conclusion

The debate between Harding and Jewel centred around the question of catholicity. Because they differed on this one fundamental point, Harding and Jewel never did, and never could, come to an agreement. Harding saw the institution of the

¹⁹⁵ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 1, 25.

¹⁹⁶ Jewel, *Replie*, 124; Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 113.

¹⁹⁷ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 110.

¹⁹⁸ Jewel, *Replie*, 218; *Apologie* 1564, K4; *Apologie* 1564, M2-M3.

¹⁹⁹ Jewel, *Replie*, 319-321; *Apologie* 1564, I7-J3.

²⁰⁰ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 489.

²⁰¹ Jewel, *Replie*, 17, 492, 534, Iii1v.

²⁰² Jewel, *Defence* 1567, RRR2v.

Roman Church as the seat of all authority, and membership in it as the only sure path to salvation. Jewel, however, saw the scriptures as the seat of all authority, and faith as the only path to salvation. Moreover, he saw faithful individuals as the true universal church, and completely rejected the Roman Church as the ‘catholic’ church. These differences were gradually clarified over the course of the debate between them, resulting in clear boundaries around their respective ideologies.

Jewel embodied a paradox, being a reformer who was saturated in the beliefs of the continental reform and yet promoted the doctrine and structure of the Church of England as being ‘mere English’. He applied this personal paradox to the church he defended, by portraying it as an inheritor of the primitive church, led by a godly monarch, with a role to play in the end of the world. Thus, he made the Church of England a national universal church, with a place in ecclesiastical history that was all its own. This leads us to the question of whether or not he successfully re-defined the term ‘catholic’. He certainly presented a definition that could be supported by the work of the Henrican and Edwardian reformers, and reflected the knowledge and experience he gained through continental exile.

Before we can turn to the question of impact, however, it will be necessary to examine the ways that the textual communities around Jewel and Harding absorbed and applied Jewel’s definition. After all, the Elizabethan church emerged from the decade of this controversy profoundly different than it had been at its start. In 1559, the Challenge Sermon had been part of the attempt to shore up a very shaky settlement that no one expected to last for very long. In 1572, the final edition of *The Defence of the Apology* was placed in parish churches all over England because it was considered representative of the basic doctrine of a firmly established church, albeit one which was about to encounter a whole new challenge, and Jewel himself had earned an enduring reputation as a champion of the Church of England.²⁰³

As for the works of the Jewel-Harding controversy, they had been acknowledged as significant and effective examples of sixteenth-century polemic by 1570. Southern claims that the influence of these books was ‘both widespread and diverse’ because of the answers they provided to ‘the burning questions of the day’.²⁰⁴ This included questions about the nature of the church. Jewel and Harding may not have managed to reconcile their differing views, but through their

²⁰³ Clifford W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformers* (London: McMillan and Co, 1958), 226; Gary Jenkins, *John Jewel and the English National Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 1; Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 30-31.

²⁰⁴ Southern, *Elizabethan Recusant Prose*, 42.

arguments, they developed and clarified their individual beliefs, and lived to see textual communities of people grow around them. Their work became the foundations on which other religious debates could build. Perhaps it could be said, then, that the thundering of these two mighty adversaries proved at least somewhat enlightening.

Chapter Four: Textual Communities and Catholicity

The combatants on both sides of the Jewel-Harding controversy entered the lists with a clear definition of the term ‘universal church’ in mind. These definitions differed, and this distinction became a central theme that pervaded the various doctrinal and structural issues that were under debate. Both sides wanted to claim catholicity, but by the end of the first stage of the controversy in 1571, one side rarely claimed to be Catholic. The writers who were defending the English Church gradually started to describe the universal church as the church of Christ or the invisible church, rather than as the ‘catholic’ church. This was part of the process of separating themselves both theologically and psychologically from the Roman Church, and drawing strong demarcation lines between the two confessions.

In their contributions to the controversy, both the defenders and their challengers worked collaboratively with their like-minded fellows. Their publications revolved around the works of two charismatic leaders, John Jewel and Thomas Harding, and echoed them in both style and content. Also, both the defenders and their challengers aimed to expand upon those texts, and use them to persuade a wider audience. These features make it possible to define these two groups of men as distinct textual communities, with one element in common: a concern for universality. The community inspired by Harding was concerned with physical universality, while the one Jewel inspired expanded upon the Edwardian and Henrican ideas of spiritual universality. Its members came to identify themselves with the continental reformed churches, while still maintaining a sense of their own unique nationality. This chapter will examine the works of these two communities, building on the discussion in chapter three about their self-awareness and sense of purpose.

The works of Jewel’s textual community show how Jewel’s concept of a national universal church spread over the course of the 1560s. Its members developed Jewel’s argument that their church was simultaneously distinct from, and connected to, the greater reformation movement. The difference in their church leadership, embodied in the royal supremacy, set them apart. At the same time, similarities in doctrine and in their use of the sacraments connected their church to the primitive, apostolic true church. This led them to reject the Roman Church as thoroughly as Jewel had, and further re-define the term ‘catholic’, completing the shift that had started during the Henrican reformation. As we have seen, ‘catholic’ had been used in the early years of Henry VIII as synonymous with ‘Christian’. By

the later years of the Jewel-Harding controversy, it was strongly associated with the Romanists. Jewel himself was occasionally using ‘catholic’ in a pejorative sense, and other writers in the controversy were openly referring to themselves as Protestant.¹

This development can be traced through the major works of the Jewel-Harding controversy that were published while Jewel and Harding were still alive. Thus, the sources for this chapter begin with the first respondent to the Challenge Sermon, Henry Cole, whose letters were published in 1560. They end with the last publication of a defender of the English Church, Edward Dering, whose *A Sparing Restraint* appeared in 1568. During this time, the writers of the controversy were constantly responding to one another, and encouraging public interest in the debate through preaching and publishing their letters. They had a clear understanding of their audience, and used various methods of persuasion, born of experience with rhetoric and disputation, to spread their ideas. The controversy was active and immediate, and had a direct effect on the religious atmosphere. The writers gradually shaped a national universal church in the form of the established Church of England, through defending the royal supremacy, finding a place in the history of the church, and promoting the value of the individual.

After the deaths of Jewel and Harding in 1571 and 1572 respectively, the energy of the controversy fizzled out. No one contributed a new work until 1577, when it became more of a passive academic exercise. William Fulke, the head of St John’s College Cambridge, wrote the majority of the works. He responded to various Catholic publications from the original 1560s debate, and only one person made a new contribution in return: the priest Richard Bristow. He wrote to defend Cardinal William Allen against Fulke’s attack. Six works were published in total, the last of them in 1586. They were written and published in a very different historical context, for a different purpose, and had a different audience. For this reason, they will be discussed in the next chapter, which will examine the later years of Elizabeth’s reign.

Because the writers of the Jewel-Harding controversy have never been studied as two distinct textual communities, this chapter will begin with a detailed examination of the communities themselves. It will look at the historiography of confessionalization in the 1560s, and return to the question of whether or not the early Elizabethan church established a *via media* religion. Then, it will examine the

¹ John Jewel, *A defence of the Apologie of the Church of Englande* (London, 1567), 232.

communities' views of catholicity, and how greatly their views were inspired by the works of Jewel and Harding. This will lead to a discussion of their re-definition of the term 'catholic', and how that influenced the development of a national universal church. The chapter will conclude by studying the perceived audience of these communities, in preparation for the discussion of reception that will be central to the final chapter.

Identity and Catholicity

In the historiography of the Elizabethan settlement, it is argued that it took a long time for the various elements that made up the Elizabethan Church of England to solidify into a recognizable form. Felicity Heal and Peter Holmes suggest it took more than ten years; Diarmaid MacCulloch argues that the real shape of the settlement did not become clear until a half a century had passed.² Peter Marshall considers the settlement a starting post, rather than a finish line, for a race of self-definition which took two generations to complete.³ This chapter will challenge this interpretation, by incorporating evidence from ecclesiastical debates that has not been prevalent in most studies of the settlement.

As Arnold Hunt has argued, studies of the settlement have focused on 'legal, liturgical, and doctrinal documents, which creates an imbalance, with more attention paid to the way that the settlement was constructed on paper than on the way it was mediated'.⁴ Hunt's work attempts to correct this imbalance through an examination of the way the settlement was disseminated through preaching. This chapter will take up a similar examination, but it will look at how the various combatants in the Jewel-Harding controversy employed both preaching and publication. It will expand on the argument in chapter three that Jewel's whole-hearted defence presents the settlement in a much more positive light than it has been assigned in the past. He and his colleagues from the community of reformers began to work for its defence as soon as its terms were settled, and the popularity of their work suggests that it had some immediate effect.

Many historians of the Elizabethan and Jacobean age question when the religious majority in England shifted from Catholic to Protestant. Susan Wabuda

² Felicity Heal and Clive Holmes, *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700* (London: MacMillan, 1994), 359; Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England 1547-1603* (London: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1990), 6.

³ Peter Marshall, 'Introduction,' in *The Impact of the English Reformation*, edited by Peter Marshall (London: Hodder Headline Group, 1997), 232.

⁴ Arnold Hunt, 'Preaching the Elizabethan Settlement,' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough et al (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 366.

suggests that Protestantism may have taken hold either in the 1570s or under James I, due more to generational shifts than any immediate conversion.⁵ Christopher Haigh and John Bossy lean toward the 1570s as the beginning of the shift, because they see the death of medieval Catholicism in the 1560s and its rebirth as modern Catholicism with the advent of seminary priests and Jesuit missionaries.⁶ Nicholas Tyacke suggests that the majority altered with the generations: as the people who had known Catholicism in its pre-1534 manifestation died off in the early years of Elizabeth, the majority of the population became Protestant, in some form.⁷

All of these historians suggest not only different times for this change, but different reasons for it. This chapter will contribute to this scholarship by examining when the religious leaders of the English Church started to think of themselves as Protestant. This development is often lost in the debate about whether the reformation in England was, as Scott Wenig phrases it, ‘a political event or a religious process’. Wenig is unique in his consideration of the role of ecclesiastical revolution in the movement that became the English Reformation.⁸ Many other historians consider the political, social, spiritual and economic factors that influenced the gradual acceptance of reformed religion in England, but few discuss the self-identity of the clergy who made up the new Church of England.

This seems a considerable oversight, considering the role of the clergy in late sixteenth-century England. These church leaders were different from the priests of late-medieval England, whose ‘decisive identity’, as David Aers and Sarah Beckwith phrased it, was based on their ability to convert bread and wine into Christ’s body and blood.⁹ Instead, sixteenth-century clerics were expected to be, as Jewel described them, ‘pastors, labourers and watchmen’, with direct influence on their dioceses, churches, and local government.¹⁰ They were expected to be preachers, who carefully and continuously presented their arguments to various segments of the population. Thus, when they developed a Protestant identity, it is very likely that

⁵ Susan Wabuda, *Preaching During the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 4, 5.

⁶ Christopher Haigh, ‘The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation,’ *Past & Present* no 93 (1981), 37.

⁷ Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism 1530-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 54.

⁸ Scott Wenig, *Straightening the Altars* (New York: Peter Lang, 2002), 1.

⁹ David Aers and Sarah Beckwith, ‘The Eucharist,’ in *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, edited by Brian Cummings and James Simpson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 157.

¹⁰ John Ayre, ed, *The Works of John Jewel* vol 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1835), 1221.

their congregations were affected. If so, the 1560s saw the beginning of the trend toward confessionalization, not the later years of Elizabeth's reign.

These later years still receive most of the attention in Elizabethan studies. Often, the 1560s are forgotten. A good example of this can be found in Deborah Shuger's *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance*. She claims that she intends to study 'the dominant culture of the period between the Elizabethan Settlement and the Civil War, between...the consolidation of this dominant culture and its dissolution'; in actuality, her focus is on the years between 1580 and 1630.¹¹ No particular reason is given for this, other than that she considers these years to be the 'central' ones. Other historians provide a clearer reason for not considering the first decade of Elizabeth's reign. D.M. Palliser, for example, considers the 'Elizabethan Age' to begin with the 1570s, after the Elizabethan government faced the challenge of the arrival of Mary, Queen of Scots. Until that point, he claims that the Elizabethan government was focused on stability, making the 1560s essentially nothing but a case study in survival. He also considers early Elizabethan religion to be completely unsettled, because theological positions were 'not yet sharply or irrevocably defined' until after the 1570s.¹²

This dismissal of the 1560s reflects revisionist historiography, which denies that there was any immediate response to the Elizabethan settlement. Christopher Haigh suggested that during the 'transitional period' of the 1560s and 1570s, 'the Church of England was not immediately protestantized in its clergy, furnishings, services [or] the beliefs of its people'.¹³ Similarly, Eamon Duffy argued that the 1560s saw just the 'stripping away of familiar and beloved observances, the destruction of a vast and resonant world of symbols', while the new system of ritual and faith did not take hold until the 1570s and 1580s. Then, according to Duffy, the constant repetition of Cranmer's prayer book and the new *Book of Homilies* started having an effect, as did Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. Duffy included Jewel's *Apology* in the list of works that helped develop a new national identity for the members of the English Church, but he did not consider the wider controversy or

¹¹ Deborah Shuger, *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 4.

¹² D. M. Palliser, *The Age of Elizabeth: England Under the Later Tudors*, second ed (London: Longman Group UK Ltd, 1992), 23; D. M. Palliser, 'Popular Reactions to the Reformation During the Years of Uncertainty,' in *The English Reformation Revised*, edited by Christopher Haigh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 94.

¹³ Christopher Haigh, 'The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation,' in *The English Reformation Revised*, edited by Christopher Haigh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 178.

place the *Apology* itself in its historical context.¹⁴ Thus, by not studying the 1560s in depth, the development of a Protestant identity and a national church that can be traced through the Jewel-Harding controversy is overlooked.

Further examination into the 1560s would assist in understanding Elizabeth's motivations in the first years of her reign. Norman L. Jones thought that she wanted a *via media*, an idea that can be supported by the work of A.G. Dickens and John Tonkin. They said that a *via media* meant that 'an independent national church, reformed by royal authority along scriptural lines yet retaining an organic connection with the church universal, [could] steer a middle course between stiff Romanist reaction and presumptuous Protestant innovation'.¹⁵ This shows that Dickens and Tonkin saw the connection between catholicity and nationality as an attempt to reconcile a paradox, not as a deliberate strategy. To Dickens and Tonkin, the Elizabethan settlement was still an attempt to compromise. D.M. Palliser presented an idea similar to this when he said that the Elizabethan government was trying to avoid antagonizing Catholic subjects during the 1560s, which resulted in the formation of a *via media*.¹⁶

In contrast, Nicholas Tyacke and Anthony Milton suggest that the *via media* of the Church of England was actually created in the nineteenth century, and projected backward onto the early Elizabethan church.¹⁷ This interpretation seems much more likely when taking the Jewel-Harding controversy into consideration, because the evidence does not support the idea that either side was looking for compromise. Instead, as we have seen in the first three chapters, the writers of both sides were actually concerned with maintaining moderation. They took a deliberate stance that they considered 'right', by which they meant properly balanced in opposition to the extremists that they saw as 'wrong'. It is notable that not only did the writers of the controversy have an adversarial mentality that would not consider a compromise in religion, but that mentality also had royal support. Much of Jewel's work against the Roman Church was commissioned by Elizabeth's government, and other church leaders were openly involved in the debate and supported by crown

¹⁴ Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580* second ed (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 591, 593.

¹⁵ Norman L. Jones, *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1993), 12; A.G. Dickens and John Tonkin, *The Reformation in Historical Thought* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Ltd, 1985), 60.

¹⁶ Palliser, *The Age of Elizabeth*, 23.

¹⁷ Nicholas Tyacke, *Aspects of English Protestantism 1530-1700* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 176; Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought: 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 1.

authority. For example, as Brett Usher suggests, Cecil supported Jewel and Nowell in their clerical roles from the beginning, because they had ‘in their own way contributed toward the preservation of an English church’ while in exile, specifically during the troubles in Frankfurt.¹⁸

This developed into a more direct collaboration between Jewel, Elizabeth, and Cecil in 1561, after Nicholas Throckmorton, the ambassador to France, sent a letter to Elizabeth warning her of the negative French Protestant reaction to her possible acceptance of the papal nuncio. She insisted that she had no intention of changing the country’s Protestant religion, and seemed to see the necessity of ensuring that the wider Protestant community was aware of that. Thus, a committee made up of Matthew Parker, Robert Horne, William Cecil, Nicholas Bacon, Thomas Young and John Jewel met at Greenwich ‘by the queen’s command’ to determine how to proceed.

Out of this meeting arose the *Epistola*, a letter written by Jewel as if by an ordinary Englishman and sent to Throckmorton to be printed and distributed in Paris. John Booty argues that it was a stopgap response, to stave off rumours until the *Apology* could be printed and distributed, and it does present essentially the same arguments as the *Apology*, albeit in a much shorter form.¹⁹ Jewel, as ‘Nicholas N.’, assured the fictional ‘John N.’ of the pure doctrine, peaceful order, and legitimately ordained clergy that could be found in the Church of England. He connected the English Church to the primitive church, and acknowledged that while there was some small diversity in matters of ceremony, the people were still in unity about essential matters of the true faith, such as the scriptures, the sacraments and the means of salvation. Also, they no longer allowed certain aspects of false religion, such as monks and monasteries, idolatry, transubstantiation and the saints.²⁰

This suggests that Elizabeth may have had a different agenda in mind than compromise. While it cannot be denied that Elizabeth did not make clear statements of her intent for religion at the beginning of her reign, which caused some uncertainty about the form English religion would take, she did allow the promotion of the catholicity of the English Church and its separation from the Roman Church

¹⁸ Brett Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy, 1559-1577* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2003), 28.

¹⁹ John Booty, *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England* (London: S.P.C.K., 1963), 37, 40, 42-45. See also Joseph Stevenson, ed, *The Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, 1558-1589* vol. 4: 1561-1562 (London: Longman, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1866), 103.

²⁰ The original document can be found the British Library: Anonymous, *Epistola cuiusdam Angli qua afferitur consensus verae religionis doctrinae* (Paris, 1561). An English translation can be found in John Booty’s *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England*, 210-225.

very soon after her accession. As Marvin O’Connell pointed out, that doctrinal separation from the Roman Church clarified the issue, so ‘the term *via media* sometimes used to describe it – as though it was a unique middle way between Catholicism and Protestantism – does not really apply’.²¹ This chapter will show that this doctrinal separation quickly led to a distinct identity for the Church of England.

Authority and Catholicity

One of the major themes of Reformation studies is the quest for legitimate authority. This chapter will look at this quest from the perspective of catholicity, rather than politics or church structure. Thus, it will depart from the discussion of one aspect of authority that is frequently found in studies of church supremacy and the interpretation of scriptures: the use of patristic sources in sixteenth-century polemic. Peter McCullough, Gillian R. Evans, and many other historians study how reformers and their opponents both tried to claim the church fathers as their supporters. In the *Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, Katrin Ettenhuber studies the way that early Elizabethan preachers, including Jewel, used patristic commonplaces and placed the fathers in their historical context, in order to interpret the fathers’ work more accurately.²² Lucy Wooding’s study of English Catholicism also discusses this dual purpose for the fathers, but her work examines the way English Catholics used the fathers from the Henrican to the Elizabethan times.²³ A.C. Southern takes a different approach, looking at the use of patristic sources as one of the many methods employed by sixteenth-century polemicists to present their arguments, one that was essentially equal to the use of logic, rhetoric, and personal attack.²⁴

Several other historians note Jewel’s use of the fathers, including Wyndham Southgate, John Booty, and Gary Jenkins, Jewel’s biographers. More recent scholarship, however, such as the work of Jean-Louis Quantin and Mary Morrissey, has suggested that Jewel’s use of the fathers was less important than once thought. It may have been after Jewel’s death that his use of patristic sources became such a major part of his historical importance. Jean-Louis Quantin attributes this to the

²¹ Marvin O’Connell, *The Counter Reformation* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1974), 70.

²² Katrin Ettenhuber, ‘The Preacher and Patristics,’ in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough et al (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 36.

²³ Lucy Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 167, 188-189.

²⁴ A.C. Southern, *Elizabethan Recusant Prose (1559-1582)* (London: Sands and Co, 1950), 66.

development of an Anglican identity in the nineteenth century, while Morrissey argues that:

It was probably Jewel's immediate successors who saw in his writings something that answered *their* needs for an account of authority more nuanced than a simple espousal of the primacy of scripture, and [so] they attributed to Jewel a higher estimation of the fathers than he in fact held.²⁵

The question of authority continued after Jewel's death, and later theologians gathered what they could from Jewel in search of an answer. However, Jewel's beliefs rested on the primacy of scripture, so when he used the church fathers to support his arguments, it was often as a means of ensuring correct Biblical interpretation. This can be most clearly seen in his apologetics.

In the polemical controversy, Jewel's use of the fathers was different. Because he deliberately debated only the negative, his treatment of the fathers was more deconstructive than constructive. He pointed out various ways that the fathers' writings could be interpreted in a way that aligned with English beliefs, rather than supportive of the Roman Church. This showed the extent of his learning and his knowledge of the early church, and greatly angered his opponents. Thus, they defended their interpretations of the church fathers all the more vehemently, and the use of the fathers became a polemical storm in a teacup, which can distract modern readers from the actual issues under debate.

For the purposes of this chapter, the usefulness of historiographical arguments about the church fathers is still more limited. The fathers were rarely used to look beyond questions of doctrine and papal supremacy to the question of the universal church itself. As H.F. Woodhouse noted in his study of Church of England theology, finding a definition of the church is not easy in either the fathers or the early councils, because 'the church did not reflect upon her nature in primitive days, probably because the reality of the church was so apparent that no need arose for exact formal definition'. The first treatises on the church as a whole were composed in the late middle ages, which meant that they were not used in the Jewel-Harding debate.²⁶ Jewel himself erased them from consideration by limiting the argument to the first six hundred years of the church. This limitation was irritating to many of

²⁵ Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 1; Mary Morrissey, 'The Challenge Controversy and the Question of Authority,' in *The Search for Authority in the Reformation*, edited by Elaine Fulton et al (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, pending), 1-2.

²⁶ H.F. Woodhouse, *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology* (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), 1.

the men who responded to Jewel's challenge, but still the majority of them honoured it throughout the controversy.

Two Textual Communities

Most of the writers of the Jewel-Harding controversy had been active in the church during the reign of Edward, and their work shows a certain continuity with the argumentative strategies of that time. However, their goals changed after the Marian exile. The writers of both sides became concerned not only with the work of conversion and persuasion, but with imposing the balanced religious view that they felt they represented. They wanted to firmly and permanently establish the true church as they defined it. Significantly, they worked in community toward that goal, and studying this aspect of sixteenth-century polemic has great potential for Tudor scholarship. As Lucy Wooding notes, it is too easy to 'lose sight of the Reformation as a corporate endeavour, a widespread desire for a purified faith', and see only the conflict that occurred.²⁷ To focus instead on consensus and collaboration is a valuable exercise. It shows how particular ideas took hold in the minds of the leaders of the church and were then passed on to its members.

One immediate difficulty that must be addressed is that of terminology. Fourteen divines answered Jewel's challenge, and five divines defended it. There was, as we shall see, a clear line between them that would develop into a confessional divide, but it is still not entirely accurate to label these two groups as 'Catholic' and 'Protestant'. Nor would 'Catholic' and 'Anglican' be appropriate, as 'Anglican' in academic usage tends to relate to the later seventeenth century and beyond. Also, the nature of the debate over the term 'catholic' complicates using that particular word to describe the defenders of the Roman Church at all. The most appropriate label seems to be 'Louvainist', given that the majority of the men in this group were exiles who had gathered together at the University of Louvain.

Finding a label that would apply to all the members of the other side of the debate is more difficult. The Louvainists gave them several labels, most of which have very negative connotations, such as 'heretics'. These would not be appropriate to use. However, Harding often referred to them as gossellers, which was the only label that Jewel accepted. He pointed out more than once that while Harding used the term mockingly, it was actually a compliment. In his *Reply*, he said that 'it misliketh [Harding] that we build the unity of the church upon Christ only, and not

²⁷ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 2.

also upon the pope, and this he calls these new gospellers' doctrine. God be thanked: these gospellers have good warrant for their doctrine'.²⁸ Other reformers seemed to accept the term as well: John Parkhurst used it in his correspondence with friends in Zurich, and James Pilkington used it in a sermon he preached in 1563.²⁹ Both of these men were part of Jewel's textual community, so it seems appropriate to use it to refer to the community itself.

The gospellers were made up of a group of English divines who had positions of power in the Elizabethan church. The majority of them were indirectly involved in the controversy as supporters or patrons, such as William Cecil, Archbishop Matthew Parker, and the future archbishop Edmund Grindal. Cecil commissioned the *Apology* and edited the work before it went to the printers, and Parker supervised its translation into English.³⁰ Grindal checked over some of the contributions to the controversy, and may have considered writing for it himself, especially after the Louvainist John Martial tried to draw him into the debate.³¹ These men had been part of the network of scholars to which Jewel belonged, as were other gospellers, such as the divines John Aylmer and Edwin Sandys. Those two men were well known for encouraging Jewel's work: in William Whitaker's 1578 Latin translation of Jewel's *Defence of the Apology*, he claimed that he dedicated the work to them because he knew they had loved and supported Jewel.³²

Within this wider community were the divines who contributed to the controversy directly: John Barthlet, James Calhill, Thomas Cooper, Edward Dering and Alexander Nowell. These men all responded to attacks on Jewel's Challenge Sermon and his *Apology of the Church of England*. All five were living in England and working for the crown in some capacity, and most of them contributed more than one work to the controversy. As can be seen in their activities during the 1560s, they held a range of beliefs, from the radical young preacher James Calhill to the conservative Thomas Cooper, who was head of Magdalen College School at Oxford when he wrote in defence of Jewel, and promoted to the bishopric of Lincoln in

²⁸ John Jewel, *A replie vnto M. Hardinges answere* (London, 1565), 256.

²⁹ Hastings Robinson, ed and trans, *The Zurich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others with some of the Helvetian Reformers, During...The Reign of Queen Elizabeth* first series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842), 29; James Pilkington, *The burnynge of Paules church in London* (London, 1563), C7.

³⁰ John Strype, *The life and acts of Matthew Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1711), 99, 179.

³¹ John Strype, *The History of the Life and Acts of the Most Reverend Father in God, Edmund Grindal* (London, 1710), 111, 112.

³² John Strype, *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion In the Church of England* third ed, vol 2 (London: printed for Edward Symon, 1738), 550.

1571.³³ Despite this diversity, each one wrote as if they considered themselves spokesmen for the wider group of clergy in the Church of England, and they all defended the same basic points of doctrine. They showed a concern for the unity and catholicity of the church, and an awareness of their own role within it.

Little of what these gospellers wrote went beyond the arguments of Jewel in either content or rhetorical style. They maintained the same themes as Jewel, and their imagery often aligned with Jewel's as well. For example, Calfhill, Dering, and Cooper all used the same Biblical allusion as he had when describing the faithful people of the church as God's flock. They defended the unique direction taken by the English Church by claiming that the sheep responded to the voice of the true shepherd and the shepherd knew which of the sheep were his own. Both Calfhill and Dering used this imagery defensively, to support the Church of England's reliance on scripture instead of tradition.³⁴ Cooper used it as an offensive weapon, arguing that 'if your mother the Church of Rome be the fold of Christ, and if the sheep thereof be his sheep, they will hear his voice and obey his word. If they do not, allege the name as oft as you will, I will say you be sheep of another fold and not of his'.³⁵

Although they aligned their work with Jewel's, the men of his textual community did not follow blindly. If they considered Jewel's work in need of correction or expansion, they noted that in their own work. Alexander Nowell, for example, emphasized the royal supremacy partly because he thought that Jewel was sometimes over-zealous to maintain brevity on that topic. Nowell found several places in the *Apology* where Jewel was correct in his statements, but did not say enough to block the attacks of the Louvainists. One such place was in Jewel's use of the third Constantinopolitan council to support the rule of magistrates in ecclesiastical matters. Nowell said that Jewel treated the matter in 'less than three lines', leading Thomas Dorman to claim that Jewel treated the matter 'slenderly' because the evidence did not support him. Nowell, therefore, responded by talking

³³ "Cooper, Thomas (c.1517–1594)," Margaret Bowker in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/6229> (accessed September 26, 2012).

³⁴ James Calfhill, *An aunswere to the Treatise of the crosse* (London, 1565), 23; Edward Dering, *A sparing restraint, of many lauishe vntruthes* (London, 1568), 46.

³⁵ Thomas Cooper, *Answer to an apologie of priuate masse* (London, 1562), 58-59.

about the matter in detail, showing how the proceedings of that council provided even more proof than Jewel had mentioned.³⁶

The Louvainists, since most of them were in constant contact with each other, presented works that display even more consensus and collaboration than that of the gossellers. It sometimes seemed to go beyond consensus into copying, so the Louvainists were accused of parroting one another. Alexander Nowell frequently noted how the Louvainists seemed to borrow each other's work, and provided evidence in his *Reproof* (1565). According to Nowell, Thomas Dorman had taken his arguments directly from Harding, who had taken his arguments directly from the Polish Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius.³⁷ John Barthlet also saw the influence of Hosius in the works of the Louvainist Richard Shacklock. He decried Shacklock's translation of some of Hosius' work, deciding that Hosius would not take Shacklock's 'abuse' of his words kindly.³⁸

The major difference between the works of the wider controversy and those of Jewel and Harding was not in either their content or style, but in their scope. The Louvainists and the gossellers responded to particular parts of Jewel's challenge, not all twenty-six articles. For the most part, the works addressed the real presence in the Eucharist, the legitimacy of the private mass and receiving communion under one kind, and the supremacy of the pope. However, there were exceptions. John Martial argued for the legitimacy of the crucifix, images and prayers for the dead, and Thomas Stapleton focused his argument on the correct interpretation of – and translation of – the Word of God. The most famous divine to contribute to the debate, Cardinal William Allen, argued for the doctrine of purgatory and in support of the status of the priesthood. He was one of the two who did not work out of Louvain, but he certainly aligned his work with the Louvainist response to Jewel's challenge, referring to Jewel as 'our English bragger'.³⁹

Unity in Texts

The common thread running through all the arguments within this second phase of the Jewel-Harding controversy is catholicity. Both sides were fighting to claim the status of true, universal, and apostolic church. The gosseller James Calfhill gently suggested to the Louvainists that all their controversies would be over

³⁶ Alexander Nowell, *The reproofe of M. Dorman his proufe* (London, 1566), 250v.

³⁷ Alexander Nowell, *A reproofe, written by Alexander Nowell* (London, 1565), A3v.

³⁸ John Barthlet, *The pedegrewe of heretiques* (London, 1566), 2.

³⁹ William Allen, *A defense and declaration of the Catholike Churchies* (Antwerp, 1565), 53.

if they would just accept his definition of the true church.⁴⁰ Louvainist Thomas Dorman once said to his main opponent, Alexander Nowell, that Nowell must prove that the English Church was the true church, because ‘it is the way to end all controversies, to cease all strife, to restore unity, to betray schismatics, to make manifest the true catholics, and so consequently to make it appear, whether you have no religion but only Christ’s’.⁴¹ Nowell did not respond to that request directly, but he did later claim that the English were part of the true universal church: ‘Small bragging make we sir, but only defend ourselves by the ancient usage of Christ’s true church against your false accusations of us, for leaving of your novelties’.⁴²

The debate between Dorman and Nowell was a controversy within a controversy, involving the greatest number of separate works. Dorman published *A Proof of Certain Articles in Religion Denied by M Jewel* in 1564, and Nowell responded with *A Reproof...of A Book Entitled A Proof* less than a year later. Dorman responded with *A Disproof of M Nowell’s Reproof* in 1566, to which Nowell responded with *The Reproof of M Dorman His Proof* in 1566. Nowell then summarized the whole debate, and responded to a work by Nicholas Sander that disagreed with his arguments against Dorman, in his *Confutation of M Dorman’s Last Book* in 1567.

This exchange between Dorman and Nowell was notable for its length and detail, which almost rival the works between Jewel and Harding. The other writers that responded directly to each other’s works, such as Thomas Cooper and John Rastell, or John Martial and James Calphill, did not have nearly the same depth. Cooper and Rastell argued about the correct form of the sacrament and the authenticity of temporal power. Martial and Calphill debated about the legitimacy of images and clerical marriage. In contrast, Nowell and Dorman argued about the supremacy of the pope, the real presence, and the private mass; and in the process they discussed authority, legitimacy, and Biblical interpretation.

Some sources, although included in the list of sources for the controversy because they were meant to contribute to it, are translations of other works and prove less useful than the original works of the controversy. This is mostly because they are so general. Thomas Stapleton was the translator for three of these sources: *The Apology of Fredericus Staphylus*, Bede’s *History of the Church of England*, and *Of*

⁴⁰ Calphill, *An aunswere to the Treatise of the crosse*, 23.

⁴¹ Thomas Dorman, *A disproufe of M. Nowelles reprove* (Antwerp, 1565), 126.

⁴² Alexander Nowell, *A confutation, as wel of M. Dormans last boke entituled a disproufe* (London, 1567), 247v.

the Express Words of God, originally written by Cardinal Hosius. These works tended to argue against a generic enemy labelled ‘heretics’, and rarely dealt directly with the issues within the debate. Their most significant contribution is to the argument over the origins of the English Church, as noted by William Sheils.⁴³ Similarly, John Fowler’s *Oration Against the Unlawful Protestants of Our Time* and Lewis Evans’ *Certain Tables* dealt with the errors and crimes of all Protestants, and did not focus on the issues of the Jewel-Harding debate. It is significant that these authors identified the gossellers with the Protestants enough to consider these works relevant, but that is the extent of their usefulness.

Other works of the controversy can be grouped together because they were addressed directly to Jewel. Henry Cole, Thomas Heskyns, Lewis Evans, and Thomas Stapleton all attacked Jewel’s arguments in the Challenge Sermon, the *Apology*, or the *Reply*. Cole, who wrote his letters to Jewel from prison in London, was unique in that he wrote mainly to draw Jewel out of the negative and into an active debate. His attempt failed completely, which is perhaps why the letters were published along with the text of the Challenge Sermon in 1560. Thomas Heskyns wrote in defence of the traditional interpretation of the church fathers, and claimed that he detested Jewel’s heresy while loving Jewel himself. His gentleness found its opposite in Lewis Evans: in his *Brief Admonition to the New Made Ministers in England*, Evans threatened the entire clergy of the Church of England with exposure as frauds. Somewhere between Heskyns’ gentleness and Evans’ malevolence was Thomas Stapleton’s *A Return of Untruths on M Jewel’s Reply*, which responded to the first four articles of the *Reply* in a treatise that was direct, intense, but remarkably free of insults.

Two works in the controversy responded directly to Harding. John Rastell’s *A Brief Show of the False Wares* was written to support Harding, and designed to act as a quick guide to Harding’s *Confutation*. It was written very much in the style of a disputation, in an attempt to display the logical fallacies in the *Apology*. In contrast, the last work of the controversy, Edward Dering’s *A Sparing Restraint*, was written in letter form. He answered Harding’s letter to Jewel from the *Rejoinder* in a tone of gloating triumph. To Dering, the gossellers had clearly won the debate.

⁴³ William Sheils, ‘Polemic as Piety: Thomas Stapleton’s *Tres Thomae* and Catholic Controversy in the 1580s,’ *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* vol 60, no 1 (2009), 75, 94.

Follow the Leaders

One notable aspect of all of these works is how the authors treated the main combatants, Jewel and Harding. The five writers of the gossellers' side greatly admired Jewel. Dering referred to him as 'our Alexander in Christian war and godly courage', and Nowell said that '[Jewel's] worthiness...well deserves the state and name of a bishop and of a jewel'.⁴⁴ They also occasionally imitated him. For example, Nowell echoed Jewel's style and format. He took on Jewel's self-portrayal as a representative of a wider movement by using 'we' in his arguments rather than 'I', and maintained Jewel's insistence on the importance of education in the faith.⁴⁵ Cooper used Jewel's trick of comparing the English reformers to Christ and his persecuted apostles in his work of 1562, which Jewel had used in the *Apology*, published just a few months previously.⁴⁶

Most importantly, the work of the gossellers shows that they took up the challenge to defend the English Church due to Jewel's inspiration. Barthlet said that he included the 'New Sacramentaries' in his list of heresies in part because he respected Jewel's authority regarding a similar heresy, that of the ubiquitarians.⁴⁷ Dering and Calhill echoed the resonating phrase of Jewel's Challenge Sermon by issuing challenges of their own that they would 'yield' and 'subscribe' if their opponents could prove them wrong.⁴⁸ Nowell describes Jewel's work as his motivation for writing *The Confutation*, explaining that since he had preached about Dorman's work already he had intended to let Jewel finish defending their position in print, since Jewel would respond 'better than I should answer it'. However, he changed his mind when the publication of Jewel's *Reply* was delayed, since he did not want to leave the position undefended for any longer than necessary.⁴⁹

The Louvainists also recognized how inspirational Jewel was to the gossellers. Robert Pointz called Jewel the gossellers' 'proud champion'.⁵⁰ The anonymous writer of *An Apologie of Priuate Masse*, which was refuted by Cooper, directed his work to Jewel because he was 'counted the greatest clerk on [the gossellers'] side'.⁵¹ Dorman said that there were some in England 'with whom

⁴⁴ Nowell, *Confutation*, 6v.

⁴⁵ Nowell, *A Reproufe*, 83; Nowell, *Confutation*, *2; Nowell, *Reproufe of M Dorman his proufe* (1566), 1-2, 175v.

⁴⁶ Cooper, *Answer to an apologie of priuate masse*, 93v.

⁴⁷ Barthlet, *The pedegrewe of heretiques*, 54.

⁴⁸ Dering, *A Sparing Restraint*, 5; Calhill, *An aunswere to the Treatise of the crosse*, 123v.

⁴⁹ Nowell, *Confutation*, 27.

⁵⁰ Robert Pointz, *Testimonies for the real presence* (Louvain, 1567), 143.

⁵¹ Cooper, *Answer to an apologie of priuate masse*, 2v.

[Jewel] is in such credit, that they believe verily each word that proceeds from [his] mouth, to bear for truth the weight of the gospel'.⁵² Of course, the Louvainists did not have such a high opinion of Jewel. Often they refused to name him at all, calling him the Proclaimer, the Author, or the Defender. John Rastell wrote three works in which the words 'beware of M Jewel' are repeated dozens of times, all in very dramatic capital letters. Robert Pointz decided that Jewel was demonic, because 'Iuel [Jewel] lacks but one letter of Diuel'.⁵³ This particular argument was more creative than convincing.

The gospellers had Jewel to emulate; was there an equivalent for the Louvainists? William Trimble, in his work *The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England*, suggested that the Catholic laity in England during the 1560s did not have guidance or leadership, claiming that 'there were a few colourful figures, but no outstanding leader or writer or thinker'.⁵⁴ This may well have been true for the laity, but the Louvainist writers had Thomas Harding. John Rastell and John Martial looked up to him, referred to him in their works, and held him in high esteem.⁵⁵ Thomas Dorman dedicated his first response to Jewel's challenge to Harding, crediting Harding for bringing him out of the darkness of Calvin's doctrines into the light of the church.⁵⁶ To these men, Harding was a leader and a mentor. To other members of the Louvainist group, Harding was a valued colleague. He had attended Oxford with Thomas Stapleton and Robert Pointz, and he was named Apostolic Delegate to England by the pope along with Nicholas Sander, who wrote an entire section in his *Supper of Our Lord* that directly supported Harding's work.

As we have seen, it is possible to identify the Louvainists as a distinct community from the beginning of the controversy. Significantly, they also saw themselves as a coherent and co-operative community. Henry Cole's letter of 1560 included a plaintive request that Jewel 'let me and my fellows alone in your sermons' if Jewel did not have the scriptural and patristic evidence to support his claims. After all, 'we trouble you not, nor give you cause to deal so unmercifully with us, as some of your side do, as though we were the most unreasonable men in

⁵² Thomas Dorman, *A Request to M Jewel* (Louvain, 1567), 2.

⁵³ Pointz, *Testimonies*, 142v.

⁵⁴ William Trimble, *The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England* (Massachusetts: The Belknap Press, 1964), 6.

⁵⁵ Southern, *Elizabeth Recusant Prose*, 82.

⁵⁶ Thomas Dorman, *A proufe of certeyne articles in religion, denied by M. Iuell* (Antwerp, 1564), A2.

the world'.⁵⁷ Cole, like the majority of the Louvainists, was a New College man, but he was imprisoned soon after the Westminster disputation and never managed to escape into exile. He was still considered one of them, however. In 1564, John Rastell defended Cole, protesting that Cole, as one of the 'good and learned Catholics, which continue in endurance', should be regarded as more than a common Englishman. In fact, Rastell felt that Cole should be held above Jewel, because Jewel spoke 'so loudly and basely, that it may be well marvelled, why such a Catholic [as Cole] would submit himself unto a Protestant'.⁵⁸

This sense of solidarity developed further during the controversy, as different members of the Louvainist group recommended each other's works as admirable and effective answers to different parts of the challenge. In 1567, Sander told his readers to read Dorman, Rastell and Stapleton regarding the primacy of the pope, Martial for his treatment of images, and Harding for his proper doctrine. Dorman's 1567 work, *Request to M Jewel*, went further still, demanding that Jewel do as he promised and yield and subscribe, based on the authority of the writings of contemporary Catholics.⁵⁹ Although Dorman produced the usual patristic and scriptural evidence in this work, his claim to victory was not based on it, but on the writings of his fellow Louvainists. All of this shows the development of a textual community. The Louvainists supported the arguments of their fellow-members, and so became workers with a common culture and a common goal.

The early solidarity of the Louvainist group seems to support Lucy Wooding's thesis that these men were in part persisting with the work began under Mary, providing religious instruction for the more unlearned laity and perpetuating some of the Marian ideas about scripture, faith and reform.⁶⁰ Nearly all of them had studied divinity or law at university. Many had held positions of authority under Mary, which would have involved them in the work of restoring the Roman faith to the country during her reign: Thomas Stapleton, Henry Cole and Thomas Heskyns had all been prebendaries in different cathedrals, and William Allen, in his role as university proctor, participated in the purge of Oxford in 1556 and 1557 that led to a revival of traditional faith.⁶¹

⁵⁷ John Jewel, *The true copies of the letters betwene the reuerend father in God Iohn Bisshop of Sarum and D. Cole* (London, 1560), 9v.

⁵⁸ John Rastell, *A replie against an answer* (Antwerp, 1565), 4.

⁵⁹ See Dorman, *A Request to M Jewel*, 5, 12v, 16.

⁶⁰ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 12.

⁶¹ "Allen, William (1532–1594)," Eamon Duffy in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eee ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman,

However, while they may have been trying to perpetuate their Marian work, they did acknowledge that the audience had changed. As Catholic historian Thomas Veech phrased it, during the 1560s ‘the efforts of the exiles at Louvain were directed to the practical end of providing a stimulus to the Catholics in England’.⁶² They were trying to maintain a faith that had gone underground, not re-establishing a religion under the protection of the crown. The gossellers were clearly their enemies, and they were also dealing with complications on their own side due to papal and conciliar authority. The Council of Trent decided not to publish works of theology in the vernacular, which meant that the Louvainists had to get permission to continue their polemical debate with the gossellers after 1564. To further complicate matters, Pius V charged Harding and Sander to emphasize to the English Catholics that they could not attend Church of England services, even if they also secretly heard mass.⁶³ This decree by the pope, and the Tridentine decrees, lent a certain urgency to the Louvainist writings, because the very authority they defended had determined that many of their countrymen lay outside the true church. Thus, they had to redouble their efforts for conversion.

This is not to say that they needed this extra motivation in order to write in defence of traditional religion. Rather, they felt an obligation to do so. As William Allen said, he wrote due to ‘the case and condition of this present time, and my duty towards my mother the church’.⁶⁴ The Louvainists felt that they alone could properly claim the name of Catholics. Their adversaries could not, because those ‘new masters’ of the English Church were simply heretics, who had sprung from the continental heresies and English heretics such as John Frith.⁶⁵ The Louvainists believed that the work and doctrine of the gossellers was proof of their conspiracy, and a deliberate collective effort to deceive the people of England. Thus, they needed to be stopped.

The gossellers, for their part, thought much the same about the Louvainists. Alexander Nowell accused them of conspiring to unleash popish books upon the world, because by ‘common conference’ they translated Latin books ‘wherein there is nothing to any purpose written’ and produced nothing that was original. He noted

October 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/391> (accessed December 3, 2012).

⁶² Thomas McNevin Veech, *Dr Nicholas Sander and the English Reformation* (Louvain: Bureaux du Recueil, 1935), 99.

⁶³ Veech, *Sander and the English Reformation*, 38.

⁶⁴ Allen, *A defense and declaration*, 5.

⁶⁵ Thomas Stapleton, *A Fortresse of the Faith* (Antwerp, 1565), 177.

that many of the men writing were ‘young and of mean learning’, led by the unscrupulous older people among them.⁶⁶ Edward Dering saw the flood of responses by the Louvainists as nothing but intimidation tactics, and said that he hoped the English readers would not fear this slander, but see it as nothing but empty words.⁶⁷

The gossellers viewed their adversaries as conspirers against queen and country, and themselves as the reformers who were continuing what the leaders of the Henrican and Edwardian reforms had done. To them, their doctrine was as old as the faith itself, but their collaboration was more recent. Specifically, it reached back to the break from Rome. James Calphill claimed that the doctrine maintained by the Elizabethan church had begun in England with Latimer and Cranmer. Like Zwingli and Luther had done in other countries, Latimer and Cranmer had been raised up by God ‘to beat down the walls of the malignant church’. To Calphill, their work had been so effective that the papists had had to try a new tactic: ‘they have thought it most gainful for them, to come in with a new battle: a battle of books’.⁶⁸ In this way, Calphill gave the gossellers a history, and emphasized the Englishness of their reform.

To hold Cranmer and Latimer in such esteem was not unusual among the gossellers; they followed Jewel’s example in that. Calphill, however, as he was wont to do, took it further than others, and opened himself up to challenge by the Louvainists. They immediately claimed that such a recent beginning meant that the English Church was not legitimate, and could claim no authority. Nowell defended Calphill by arguing that the Louvainists were deliberately misinterpreting the work of Calphill, Jewel and himself. He pointed out that the work of his fellow divines in England was original, but their message was not.⁶⁹ After that, the question of when the gospel began in England was subtly dropped, although it did return in debates over the origin of English Christianity, which will be discussed later in the chapter.

Nowell’s defence of Calphill was an example of how the gossellers were aware of themselves as a group. Their textual community revolved around Jewel, who seemed to be simultaneously part of and separate from them. He may not have known some of them personally at all. John Barthlet, for example, wrote his contribution to the controversy soon after being released from house arrest over the

⁶⁶ Nowell, *A Reproufe*, A2v-A3.

⁶⁷ Dering, *A Sparing Restraint*, 43, 81.

⁶⁸ Calphill, *An aunswere to the Treatise of the crosse*, 17v.

⁶⁹ Nowell, *Confutation*, B1v-B2.

issue of the vestments, and Edward Dering spent the majority of the 1560s as a fellow of Christ's College Cambridge, somewhere Jewel does not seem to have visited.⁷⁰ There is little evidence to suggest that either man ever met him. However, Jewel most likely did know Alexander Nowell, since Nowell spent the majority of his Marian exile in Strasburg, at the same time as Jewel was there. Both men were present when Martyr lectured on Judges.⁷¹ Nowell was also prolocutor of the lower house during the 1563 Convocation, which Jewel attended. Being the Bishop of Salisbury, Jewel was part of the upper house, but since Nowell frequently reported the decisions of the lower house to the upper house, he would have been more likely to come into contact with him.⁷² Both Nowell and Jewel were popular preachers at court and at Paul's Cross, and often chosen to contribute to the Lenten sermon series.

Whether or not Jewel knew the members of his textual community personally, he certainly was aware of the wider controversy surrounding his work, and he occasionally weighed in on another debate. In the *Defence*, for example, he refuted Dorman at the same time as he refuted one of Harding's points, which confirmed Nowell's claim that Dorman's work borrowed heavily from Harding.⁷³ Jewel also challenged Harding's claim that the anonymity of the *Apology* meant that the clergy was ashamed of it, by pointing out that the *Apology of Private Mass* (to which the gospeller Thomas Cooper responded) was not signed, either, even though it claimed to represent the Roman point of view. Thus, unless that anonymous author was ashamed of his work, a lack of signature was not necessarily an indicator of shame.⁷⁴

Thomas Cooper's response to the *Apology of the Private Mass* showed how he too considered himself part of a community that was defending Jewel: 'this is a common quarrel, touching not only him that is named but all others that either teach or believe as he does'.⁷⁵ Nowell showed a similar sense of community in his

⁷⁰ "Bartlett, John (fl. 1562–1567)," Brett Usher in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eee online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: OUP, , <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/1576> (accessed October 29, 2013); Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 5.

⁷¹ Ralph Churton, *The Life of Alexander Nowell, Dean of St Paul's* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1809), 23.

⁷² "Nowell, Alexander (c.1516/17–1602)," Stanford Lehmborg in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eee ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/20378> (accessed December 1, 2012).

⁷³ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, A2v, B2v.

⁷⁴ Jewel, *Defence* 1567, 28v.

⁷⁵ Cooper, *Answer to an apologie of priuate masse*, E3.

Reproof. He said that while Dorman seemed to be responding to Jewel himself, anything ‘in name and word...written against the said bishop, yet they be in deed and meaning written against us all...for that they do oppugn and assault the cause, which is common to us all with him’.⁷⁶ Nowell’s preface to this book also pointed out the errors of Rastell and Harding, showing an awareness of the wider controversy and its influence on the people of England. Dering took this further: to him, the community was geographically larger than England. He showed this when he said that ‘we condemn...the vile reproaches against the Bishop of Salisbury, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Peter Martyr, Beza and such others, and pray unto the living Lord...to mollify the hearts of our enemies’.⁷⁷ This connected the gossellers with the reformers on the continent, both living and dead.

The relations between these two groups, and their perceptions of themselves and each other, both encouraged their enmity and developed their sense of community. This, according to Jesse Lander, was part of sixteenth-century polemic. Polemic was both the verbal equivalent of war and the ‘attempt to consolidate as a particular community of conviction’.⁷⁸ Thus, it is not surprising that the demarcation lines between them deepened over the course of the controversy, especially when they had the literal and symbolic leadership of Jewel and Harding. The writings of both men inspired and sustained the work of the others, and both men also served as representatives of false doctrine for their enemies. They embodied the ‘us vs. them’ mentality of the controversy.

Re-defining ‘Catholic’

As discussed in chapter three, Jewel looked at the people of England as individual worshippers who had to develop their own faith in God, while Harding looked at the people as a mass of souls who needed to be reminded of their duty of obedience. The same attitudes can be found in the other writers of the controversy. The gossellers aimed to encourage people to develop a direct and personal relationship with God, because through that relationship they could become members of the universal church, which was the body of Christ. They were unified in their appreciation of the individual, and in their belief in the individual’s responsibility to develop an active and reformed faith. Calhfill, for example, argued

⁷⁶ Nowell, *A Reproufe*, A4.

⁷⁷ Dering, *A Sparing Restraint*, 51, 23.

⁷⁸ Jesse Lander, *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print and Literary Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 16.

against the necessity of a physical sign of the cross, arguing that it was individual faith in the person on the cross, not the cross itself, that would save souls.⁷⁹ Edward Dering emphasized the importance of participation in the sacrament, an emphasis which can also be found in Thomas Cooper's argument against the celebration of mass in private. Cooper claimed that participating in the sacrament imitated the 'concord and equality' Christ had shown. He was vehemently against the idea that the priest could receive for the people, arguing that it defaced the death and passion of Christ and unduly glorified the priest, making him seem like a 'means of reconciliation between God and his people'.⁸⁰

The Louvainists consistently resisted the emphasis on individual faith. John Martial claimed to speak with the authority of the church fathers, claiming that the fathers should have more credit in the minds of his audience than the preaching of 'tailors coming from the shop, smiths from the forge...weavers from the loom, scholars from the school, [and] Protestants from Geneva'.⁸¹ John Rastell was equally as scornful of individual participation, complaining that 'the church of God, so well ordered with excellent men of learning and godliness, is constrained to suffer cobblers, weavers, tinkers...fiddlers, and other of like profession'.⁸² It was not only that these were the lower classes to Rastell and Martial; it was that they were not clergy, and yet they questioned the message provided by the church. Rastell made this more clear in a later passage, arguing that if the people who accept the power of the priests to consecrate 'believe whatsoever the church teaches, and if they agree to the ordinances of her, then lo they...are not bound to make search of the intention of the priest, but under this faith, that all is well done in the Catholic Church...their devotion is... acceptable to God'.⁸³

William Allen described a similar picture of Catholic devotion, and then prayed 'that this simple sincere fidelity might once take place again in our days, for the comfort of the poor faithful flocks that are now burdened with questions of infidelity'.⁸⁴ Allen also emphasized the role of the priest in the forgiving of sins, which further limited the role of the individual in salvation.⁸⁵ This agreed with the perspective of the anonymous author of the *Apology of Private Mass*, who also

⁷⁹ Calfhill, *An aunswere to the Treatise of the crosse*, 30v, 52v.

⁸⁰ Cooper, *Answer to an apologie of priuate masse*, 24, 29.

⁸¹ John Martial, *A treatyse of the Crosse* (Antwerp, 1564), 9-9v.

⁸² John Rastell, *A Confutation of a Sermon Pronounced by M Jewel* (Antwerp, 1564), 2.

⁸³ Rastell, *Confutation*, 90.

⁸⁴ Allen, *A defence and declaration*, 223v.

⁸⁵ Allen, *A defense and declaration*, 167.

emphasized the role of the priest, making it relatively unnecessary for people to be present during the mass.⁸⁶ Richard Shacklock took this further still, implying that lessening the role of the priest in salvation was heretical.

As Ellen Macek notes, the role of the clergy was one of the polemical points that reformers took up with enthusiasm. They described the dangerous passivity of the laity in the medieval church, which they claimed was the result of the priests' elevated role in salvation. They also argued that people lived sinful lives due to the priests' teaching that masses for the dead could save them after their deaths, 'at the expense of moral conversion and regeneration during one's lifetime'.⁸⁷ Macek points out that by promoting the priesthood of all believers rather than the status of the clergy, the reformers were exploring humanist implications for religion, 'exhibiting an enthusiastic but sometimes unrealistic attitude toward the power of preaching and private reading of the scripture'.⁸⁸

This concept had an impact on the question of the importance of the individual in a true 'catholic' church, as can be seen by Richard Shacklock's description of four beliefs that were the signs of heresy. These were: when everyone becomes a judge of doctrine, when everyone can interpret scripture, when everyone thinks that the authority of the fathers is not authentic, and when 'the church can neither be seen or known, so that it is free for every congregation in corners to challenge the name of a church'.⁸⁹ The last of these is the most significant for the issue of catholicity, because it rejects the concept of an invisible universal church in favour of one that is visibly universal. However, all of them imply that a select few are authorized to interpret doctrine, scripture and the fathers. They make participation a sign of heresy, which shows how little the Louvainists valued the individual.

It also shows how they defined beliefs that were outside the Catholic Church. With the Louvainists declaring so clearly what was not Catholic, the gossellers had to adapt their means of argument and its terminology. Chapter three studied how this process developed between Jewel and Harding themselves: Jewel changed from claiming that the English Church was the 'catholic' church and the papists had separated, to claiming that the English Church had separated from the Catholic

⁸⁶ Cooper, *Answer to an apologie of priuate masse*, 9, 15.

⁸⁷ Ellen Macek, *The Loyal Opposition: Tudor Traditionalist Polemic* (New York: Peter Lang, 1996), 101.

⁸⁸ Macek, *The Loyal Opposition*, 158.

⁸⁹ Richard Shacklock, *A Hatchet of Heresies* (Antwerp, 1565), 1-1v.

Church while still remaining ‘catholic’, to acknowledging that the two churches were distinct. He then started arguing that the English Church was part of the invisible universal church, an idea that Harding mocked.

The gossellers echoed this development in their work. Over the course of the debate they slowly came to acknowledge the separation of the churches, and align with the invisible universal church. More and more, they valued their membership to the church of Christ, which contained within it many particular churches, and were less inclined to label themselves as ‘the true Catholics’. This happened in conjunction with a changing attitude towards them on the part of the Louvainists. At the beginning of the conflict, the Louvainists held the attitude that the English Church was infected with a few scattered Protestants. Gradually, this idea changed into an idea that the Protestants were a sect within the church, which had taken control of its doctrine. By the end of the decade, the Louvainists were treating the whole English Church like a separate, distinct, and Protestant institution.

This development can be traced chronologically. In Henry Cole’s 1560 letters, he equated Jewel with ‘Calvin, Bucer and other Protestants’, and in 1564 four different works presented much the same viewpoint. Dorman said that the group of leaders in the English Church wanted Christ as the head of the church, ‘as the Protestants do’.⁹⁰ John Martial also referred to the leaders of the English Church as ‘these new Protestants brought over from Geneva’, and complained that they were being accepted at court.⁹¹ Thomas Stapleton claimed that the sacramentaries of Geneva were ‘the most common and allowed sect in England’, and blamed the state of the English Church on the ‘gossellers in King Edward’s time, and of the stinking martyrs of that age’.⁹² All of these descriptions imply that the Louvainists perceived the reformers of England as a small group of people who were influenced by Protestantism and gradually gaining ground, but did not represent the English Church as a whole. Indeed, John Rastell claimed that no matter what Jewel was preaching, three-quarters of the English people were at heart Catholics.⁹³

The next year, in 1565, Rastell showed that he saw a division between the churches, when he said that he wrote *A Reply Against an Answer* in part to help ‘in this fight with the Protestants, that we might come to some peace and conclusion’. He did not refer only to individual Protestants, however, but to the ‘new religion’ his

⁹⁰ Jewel, *The True Copies*, 1v; Dorman, *Proufe*, 9.

⁹¹ Martial, *Treatise of the Cross*, 55v, 138.

⁹² Stapleton, *Apology of Fridericus Staphylus* (Louvain, 1565), 8v, 148.

⁹³ Rastell, *Confutation*, 19v.

enemies had established, implying that the Protestants had become the official leadership. William Allen, writing three months later, also treated the leaders of the English Church as the Protestant group in charge, and he did not approve of their structure. ‘It is not your bare bread and board, nor your seniors, nor your elders, nor your superintendents, nor whatsoever you list be called, that shall outface God’s church’. He also said that the leaders could ‘call themselves Lutherans or Calvinists or whatever they will, but Catholics’.⁹⁴ To Allen, the gossellers had gone far beyond the limits of what could be termed ‘catholic’.

The division becomes even more clear in the next two works of 1565: Thomas Stapleton’s translation of Bede’s history of the Church of England, and Lewis Evans’ *Certain Tables*. Both of these were designed to describe the true church and label the false churches, and it is obvious that Stapleton and Evans placed the English Church outside of the true church. This suggests that the Louvainists were no longer thinking simply of the leaders of the English Church as heretical Protestants, but the English Church itself as heretical and Protestant. A further sign of this change came with Richard Shacklock’s translation of Hosius’ treatise: he said in his dedication to Elizabeth that he hoped his countrymen would deny discord after reading it, and return to Christ’s holy church.⁹⁵

The trend toward seeing the entire country of England as part of this new religion continued with Stapleton and Dorman in late 1565. Stapleton addressed his *Fortress of the Faith* to the ‘Protestants of England’, and told them that they were either deceived, or in the midst of deceiving others.⁹⁶ Dorman showed how completely the English Church had been rejected: ‘it is not...the imprisonment of heretics, nor the death of your stinking martyrs, nor all the acts and monuments of Foxe, that can prove one Protestant a good Catholic’.⁹⁷ Not only was the division more marked by this time, but it was also more vehement. The English people were treated as strangers and foreigners by their own countrymen; they had become fully associated with the continental Protestants.

In 1566, which was the year that the vestarian controversy disrupted the English Church, the Louvainists began to encourage the dissention of the English

⁹⁴ Allen, *A defence and declaration*, 191, 266v.

⁹⁵ Shacklock, *A Hatchet of Heresies*, A7v.

⁹⁶ Thomas Stapleton, *Fortress of the Faith* (Antwerp, 1565), 2.

⁹⁷ Dorman, *Disproufe*, 145.

clergy.⁹⁸ They started pointing out specific divisions between the churches, treating the Church of England as if it were a distinct institution that had distinct doctrine. Rastell challenged the church regarding the vernacular, asking why the gossellers did not give Welshmen the opportunity to hear their services in Welsh, if the use of the vernacular in church was so important to them.⁹⁹ Nicholas Sander and John Martial rejected the Church of England altogether, because of its association with Protestantism. Sander commented that at least Luther had done some good, in that the evil people had once been mingled with the good in the Catholic Church, but now ‘two bodies are made, one out of Catholics, another of the Protestants, and the church of God remains, purged from that wicked generation of men’.¹⁰⁰ John Martial started treating the Church of England not only as Protestant, but as a particular sect of Protestantism, led by usurpers who had not been ‘hired of any true gardener that has the custody of Christ’s vineyard’.¹⁰¹

In the same span of years, the gossellers also showed a gradual shift into a more solid definition of the doctrine and structure of their own church. From the beginning they treated it as part of the universal church, but it was not Protestant until near the end of the controversy. The first writings were focused on responding to points of doctrine, such as the real presence and the private mass, and they treated these issues as conflicts between their ‘catholic’ church and the papists’ novelties. The first mention of the development of a distinct English Church on the gossellers’ side of the controversy was in Nowell’s 1565 *Reproof*. Dorman had accused the English congregation of being ‘scattered and unknown’, and said that this scattered nature was ‘the very definition of a Protestant church’. Nowell responded with: ‘Our congregation is not so scattered, nor so secret and unknown to the world, as M Dorman does make it...and we take this objection as no reproach, being common to our congregation to the primitive church of our saviour Christ and his holy apostles’.

Nowell also denied that the English Church was a headless body, because the members of it had Christ in heaven and the prince on earth as leaders, and prelates to provide ecclesiastical guidance. It can be seen that Nowell’s concept of the Church of England was firmly based on a community of the faithful, and separate from the Church of Rome. Significantly, Nowell also said that they in the English Church

⁹⁸ Hunt, ‘Preaching the Elizabethan Settlement,’ 378; Leonard Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 7.

⁹⁹ John Rastell, *A Treatise Entitled, Beware of M Jewel* (Antwerp, 1565), 65v.

¹⁰⁰ Nicholas Sander, *The Supper of Our Lord* (Louvain, 1566), 13v.

¹⁰¹ John Martial, *A replie to M. Calphills blasphemous answer* (Louvain, 1566), 105.

were the ones writing against the heretical sects and preaching God's doctrine out of God's word, so 'we be therein, as in all other things indeed, the catholics, and not they'.¹⁰² The Church of England at this point identified itself as both separate and 'catholic'.

Six months later, James Calfhill responded to Martial's treatise about the cross. He pointed out that it was a popish practice 'to make roods and images roll their eyes, to sweat and to speak', not a Protestant one. Therefore, the Catholics did the Protestants wrong in calling them delusional and dishonest. Calfhill identified the Church of England with the Protestants when he did not argue against being labelled a Protestant, but once again there was a clear sense that the Church of England was distinct. As Calfhill said, 'Indeed we profess a separation from you, as our *Apology* does witness, and show good reason why. ...But in separating from you, the enemies of God and his truth, we join (as we ought) with the church of Christ'.¹⁰³ Calfhill had a clear sense of who made up the church of Christ, and he placed both the Protestants and the Church of England inside it, based on the history of the Protestants and the doctrine of the Church of England.

Like Calfhill, Nowell showed a sense of solidarity with Jewel and his *Apology* in his next contribution to the debate, suggesting that the *Apology* had effectively provided a clear definition of what was and was not part of the Church of England.¹⁰⁴ Significantly, Nowell did not claim the title of Catholic in this work, but concerned himself with defending the church of Christ, and proving how the Church of England was part of it. The same pattern can be found in the next work of a gospeller, *The Pedigree of Heretics* by John Barthlet. Barthlet did not claim that the Church of England was Catholic, but part of the church of Christ. He went so far as to label the Catholics as heretics, and enumerate a whole list of particular heresies of which they were guilty.¹⁰⁵

The next contribution to the controversy on the gospellers' side was Nowell's 1567 *A Confutation of M Dorman's Last Book*. In it, Nowell showed how his 'catholic' identity had undergone a further transition. He still claimed to be part of the invisible church of Christ, but the church of Christ had become Protestant. To him, the papists could talk against the English Church's 'new gospel' and 'invisible church' if they wished, but that would not change anything. The true multitudes of

¹⁰² Nowell, *A Reproufe*, 40v, 104.

¹⁰³ Calfhill, *An aunswere to the Treatise of the crosse*, 121.

¹⁰⁴ Nowell, *Reproufe of M Dorman his proufe*, 250v.

¹⁰⁵ Barthlet, *The pedegrewe of heretiques*, 1v-2.

the faithful would still be in the primitive church, and those multitudes were found among the Protestants.¹⁰⁶ Nowell also showed that he associated the Church of England with the Protestants when he pointed out that there was not much of a point in answering Dorman yet again, since ‘all that is said or written anywhere to any purpose, by any papist, is somewhere, by some Protestant, already answered’. Later on, he claimed the title of Protestant, referring to himself and the rest of the English episcopate as ‘us Protestant bishops’.¹⁰⁷ Considering that Nowell had claimed that the English were the Catholics only two years before, this shows a significant shift, and a rapid development of self-identity in the Church of England. It is echoed in the last contribution to the debate, when Dering claimed that the Church of England was part of the church of Christ, while the Church of Rome was the synagogue of the devil. ‘Your ancient religion we hate’, he said. ‘It is so old that it is rotten, and one piece will not hang with another’.¹⁰⁸

In just a few years, the Church of England had been established, defended, and solidified as not only a separate faith from the Roman Church, but a separate institution. This institution was both universal and distinctly Protestant. Jewel’s *Apology* helped create this Church, and the men in his textual community helped defend it, in part through a new emphasis on the primitive church. Advocating this concept allowed the gossellers to argue that there could be particular churches in each country, and yet they could each be inheritors of the true apostolic church. It also allowed them to hedge around the early reformers’ rejection of the legitimacy of a visible, institutional church and establish their own institution. Thus, their English Church could be visible and yet invisible, representative of the ‘little flock’ of God’s people and yet found throughout the world.

This is the paradox at the heart of their establishment of a national universal church. Catherine Davies notes that Henrican Protestants maintained a self-image of a ‘persecuted little flock of Christ’ under the unpopular religious policies of the last Henrican years, creating a vision of the true church that proved surprisingly influential throughout Edward’s reign. ‘There remained a tension within Edwardian Protestantism between that vision of the church as a persecuted minority and a rather

¹⁰⁶ Nowell, *Confutation*, 57v.

¹⁰⁷ Nowell, *Confutation*, B2, 14.

¹⁰⁸ Dering, *A Sparing Restraint*, 33, 48, 39.

grander image of the church as a commonwealth of Christians.’¹⁰⁹ The same tension existed at the establishment of the early Elizabethan Church of England, which may be at least partially due to the prominence of Edwardian reformers in its leadership. It proved a source of scorn for many of the Louvainists, who did not accept the gossellers’ attempt to reconcile the small and the universal, especially when the gossellers identified themselves with reformers on the continent and claimed that the ‘little flock’ had expanded throughout Europe.

Dorman, for example, said that once the English Protestants ‘could glory in your fewness, with boasting on the scriptures...that many were called but few chosen, [and] such like’. Then, ‘after that your heresies have gotten in a great part of Germany, in England, France, Scotland and elsewhere, some more liberty...you vaunt yourselves of your number, and make in your *Apology* a necessary argument, that your doctrine must needs be true and sound.’¹¹⁰ The Louvainists attributed this promotion of a paradox to inconstancy, and accused the gossellers of changing their faith to suit their circumstances. They were equally resistant to the extension of the paradox, in which this small but universal church became uniquely English, under the headship of a reigning queen.

The Universal Church of England

Anthony Milton suggested that the Church of England wanted to be ‘the inclusive church of the English people’ for the first century of its existence, and thus it was subject to many different visions of what that church should be.¹¹¹ The range of beliefs represented by the gossellers of the Jewel-Harding controversy both confirms and denies this. The gossellers did have different visions for the church, which became very clear in their later careers. However, they were unified in one sense, because they knew what they wanted the Church in England to be: a congregation joined with the invisible universal church, maintaining a real and personal faith as part of the ‘little flock’ of the Good Shepherd, and made up of individuals who were participating in the sacraments and reading the scripture. This was the church *in* England envisioned by the gossellers. Their Church *of* England

¹⁰⁹ Catharine Davies, ‘“Poor Persecuted Little Flock” or “Commonwealth of Christians”; Edwardian Protestant Concepts of the Church,’ in *Protestantism and the National Church*, edited by Peter Lake and Maria Dowling (London: Croom Helm, 1987), 78-79.

¹¹⁰ Dorman, *Proufe*, 118-118v.

¹¹¹ Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, 10.

had all of these qualities, but it also had a national identity, a sense of its uniqueness as a purely English institution.

This sense of Englishness became part of their identity as members of the (Protestant) universal church in three main ways. First, it formed the foundation of their claim that they had the authority to reject foreign powers and their influence on the English people. This issue arose in the Jewel-Harding debate when the Louvainists challenged the gossellers about their concept of a universal church that recognized only Christ as its head, and yet was led by a monarch. The result was a detailed examination of the royal supremacy, a denial of papal primacy, and the avocation of what Jewel called ‘homemade laws’. The gossellers turned the role of queen and parliament in the formation of their religion from a weakness into a strength.

Second, it allowed the gossellers to place themselves into both the recent and the ancient history of the universal church. This occurred even as the gossellers were participating in the debate, since they had to respond to the challenges to their history presented to them by the Louvainists. As A.G. Dickens and John Tonkin phrased it, their historical theory was created ‘simultaneously with the events, as if the actors wrote the script while treading the stage’.¹¹² It started when the gossellers attempted to answer the eternal question ‘where was your church before Luther?’. Jewel himself established this as a point of debate, due to his insistence on using the sources from the first six hundred years of the church. As Rosamund Oates explains it, Jewel ‘set the polemical agenda for the next decade: historical analysis, rather than theology, was to be the mainstay of future debates’.¹¹³ After that, the use of historical events and sources placed in their historical context became a major part of the argument regarding Englishness, and from there affected the development of a national universal church.

Third, they used both print and pulpit to defend their doctrine. Thus, they reached a widespread audience, especially since their use of the vernacular became both a point of pride and a way of disseminating information. It supported their point that all Englishmen were welcome in the national universal church, if they held common beliefs. This proviso became a point of contention very quickly, but

¹¹² Dickens and Tonkin, *The Reformation in Historical Thought*, 59.

¹¹³ Rosamund Oates, ‘For the Lack of True History: Polemic, Conversion and Church History in Elizabethan England,’ in *Getting Along? Religious Identities and Confessional Relations in Early Modern England – Essays in Honour of Professor W.J. Sheils*, edited by Nadine Lewycky and Adam Morton (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012), 137.

initially it assisted in the widespread acceptance of the Church of England as a distinct and yet legitimate member of the universal church. The gossellers claimed the authority of the people, through their insistence on participation and the value of the individual, and thus aligned their church with their nation.

Governor of a National Universal Church

Jewel's work has gained some attention in the historiography of the royal supremacy, because being a champion of the church often involved defending the queen's authority. Claire Cross, for example, discussed Jewel's attempt to reconcile his portrayal of a church that 'formed part of the universal church and taught universal truths' with a clergy that was appointed by the crown.¹¹⁴ Leonard Trinterud examined how Jewel worked to define and justify the royal supremacy, both within the church and in his wider works.¹¹⁵ However, much of the historiography involving Jewel suggests that his defence of the royal supremacy was not entirely voluntary. Daniel Eppley, in his recent book about defending the royal supremacy in Tudor England, suggests that English polemicists in general had no choice but to defend the royal supremacy 'in a manner compatible with official policy' if they were going to gain the peaceful, ordered England they wanted. In his opinion, they 'failed to safeguard against false understandings of God's will' and so left the authorities vulnerable to resistance. Eppley does not use the works of the Jewel-Harding controversy in his study. He focuses instead on two writers who, in his opinion, did not fail in this task of safeguarding: Christopher St German and Richard Hooker.¹¹⁶ In choosing this as his focus, Eppley misses out on the important role played by Jewel and his fellow gossellers. Over the course of the Jewel-Harding debate, adhering to the royal supremacy became a part of the Protestant self-identity of the Church of England.

This claim challenges many of the assumptions that can be found in revisionist history. Christopher Haigh, in his *English Reformations*, suggests that the royal supremacy was a sticking-point on the accession of Elizabeth, one that almost blocked the Elizabethan reformation before it started. This argument was part of his emphasis on the divisions between Elizabeth and her clergy, which is an example of

¹¹⁴ Claire Cross, *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1969), 29.

¹¹⁵ Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism*, 6-7.

¹¹⁶ Daniel Eppley, *Defending Royal Supremacy and Discerning God's Will in Tudor England* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 2.

a historical focus on conflict rather than consensus.¹¹⁷ Similarly, J.J. Scarisbrick suggested that the royal supremacy was troublesome for the defenders of the Church of England, calling it a ‘transplant into the body Protestant and never a complete success’. Haigh did not consider the Jewel-Harding controversy in his work, and Scarisbrick used it in a way that suggests that he did not study it fully. He acknowledged that Jewel’s Challenge Sermon put the Roman Church on the defensive in a series of battles, but claimed that Jewel eventually ‘overstepped himself’ and lost the war. Scarisbrick based this claim on an analysis of the controversy by the Jesuit Robert Parsons and some early seventeenth-century writers, not on a personal examination.¹¹⁸ Thus, it seems that both Haigh and Scarisbrick have missed the way that the gossellers used the royal supremacy, and the queen herself, as a focal point for their Protestant self-identity.

Other historians have seen this connection, and the role Jewel played in making the royal supremacy such an important point. Julian Lock studied it from the gossellers’ point of view, suggesting that the clergy used the royal supremacy from the beginning. He said that ‘the Church of England was defined by the royal supremacy first and by reformed doctrine only later’, and pointed to Jewel as a promoter of the royal supremacy as part of a national identity.¹¹⁹ Marvin O’Connell attributed this development of a Protestant identity to the ‘success of Queen Elizabeth and her advisors, acting out of differing degrees of personal religiosity, in identifying the interests of the regime and the nation with a Protestant authority’.¹²⁰ It is uncertain who O’Connell included in the group he labelled Elizabeth’s advisors, but he did include those who manipulated the pulpit and the printing press, which suggests a wider group than simply Elizabeth’s councillors.

Jewel certainly led the way in defending the royal supremacy, but he was not alone. The debate between Dorman and Nowell dealt with the topic of the royal supremacy at length. Dorman reached back into the time of Henry VIII in an attempt to show how the royal supremacy was not legitimate. He suggested that the country’s leaders had given Henry something which they could not give in order to

¹¹⁷ Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society Under the Tudors* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 239-240, 244-245.

¹¹⁸ J.J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984), 180-183. Scarisbrick’s point of view has been taken up by Gary Jenkins in his 2006 biography of Jewel, with a similar amount of analysis and evidence; further study into these sources, and the seventeenth century works, is needed.

¹¹⁹ Julian Lock, ‘Plantagenets Against the Papacy: Protestant England’s Search for Royal Heroes,’ in *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth Century Europe* vol 1, edited by Bruce Gordon (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1996), 153-154.

¹²⁰ O’Connell, *The Counter Reformation*, 232.

flatter him, and that this old mistake was made right in Elizabeth's refusal to be called Supreme Head. However, Dorman did not think she had gone far enough. She should have refused to be the governor as well. After all, if Nowell and his fellow gospellers could claim that the head of the universal church was Christ, not the pope, then Christ was the head of the English Church too. They could not say that 'he is head of all other churches, and has only left ours headless', then set up a supreme governor.¹²¹

Nowell responded to this in 1565 with an explanation that showed how the English Church already had a national identity. He claimed that just as there was no one king over all the kingdoms of the world, so there was no one head over the churches of the world. However, the various kingdoms of the world did have heads to lead them, and so did the various churches in those realms, governing God's church 'by his providence'.¹²² This meant that 'particular churches', different in each realm, could still be part of the one universal church. Dorman denied this argument: 'you are not headless, if so many bishops as you have so many heads you be under. But you join to no one head on earth... Your prince in earth...cannot make you have a head in earth'. Dorman denied that this system had any grounds within God's word, and that the Church of England therefore knew not 'whither to go nor whereupon to rest'.¹²³

Nowell's response made all the more of a national statement, stating that their English princes did not claim 'such popish pre-eminence' as to be head of the church in that sense, but only in the ways all the 'virtuous and godly princes' of both the Jewish and Christian churches had always been head. He claimed that different countries did not need to have the same system of leadership in order to have the same role of the godly prince, and used Geneva as an example of an alternative. Elizabeth, as the English godly prince, played the same role in the church as all the other godly magistrates. She could summon bishops to synods, correct and depose the clergy, and govern the church.¹²⁴ Nowell also answered Dorman's statement about Henry VIII, claiming that the same powers were given to him as to Elizabeth. Neither of them had the right to determine what pleased them in the church, but only

¹²¹ Dorman, *Proufe*, 14v, 15.

¹²² Nowell, *A Reproufe*, 34-34v.

¹²³ Dorman, *Disproufe*, 63-63v.

¹²⁴ Nowell, *Reproufe of M Dorman his proufe*, 12v, 51v, 55.

the right to maintain and promote that which was firm and sure in reason and the scriptures.¹²⁵

The gossellers were somewhat defensive of their lay female Supreme Governor at first.¹²⁶ However, by the end of the debate they had found in her a rallying-point. Dering defended both the supremacy and the concept of the invisible church in his *A Sparing Restraint*:

The Lord has placed her, and who is he that shall put her down? She is a good nurse of Christ's mystical body, and no authority is alone hereof, but in all supremacy we tie her unto the word of God, and as she has regard to her own soul in the name of God, we charge her not to go beyond it.¹²⁷

This was gendered language, because 'nurse' at this time would not necessarily have been applied to a king. However, it was also not meant to be disparaging. Dering used this imagery to show his pride in his queen, his sense of national security that arose from being led by God himself, and his belief that the English Church was part of Christ's mystical body. He also showed how the idea of the value of individual participation had taken hold, in that he claimed that Elizabeth held all supremacy, but at the same time 'we tie her' unto the word of God, and 'we charge her' not to go beyond her limits.

The gossellers of the Jewel-Harding controversy associated rejecting the royal supremacy with the Catholics in general, and the Louvainists in particular. Trimble claimed that this was in part a conscious development, because the government 'was fully cognizant who were the leading Catholics in various counties, [and] its policy was largely directed toward controlling them' from its beginning in 1559. The English clergy had the task of helping with this, and preventing any 'manifestation of Catholic life', which would associate any rejection of the royal supremacy with loyalty to the Roman Church.¹²⁸ As shown by the writings of the Jewel-Harding controversy, the clergy who were members of Jewel's textual community fulfilled their task.

The gossellers' argument regarding the royal supremacy followed Jewel in rejecting the Roman Church, especially the primacy of the papacy over the monarchy. Calfhill charged the Louvainists with omitting the main part of

¹²⁵ Nowell, *Reproufe of M Dorman his proufe*, 124v-125.

¹²⁶ Cooper, *Answer to an apologie of priuate masse*, 2-2v; Nowell, *A Reproufe*, 33-33v. See also Claire Cross *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1969), 59.

¹²⁷ Dering, *A Sparing Restraint*, 100.

¹²⁸ Trimble, *The Catholic Laity*, 8-9.

Elizabeth's power by maintaining their loyalty to the pope, pointing out that 'the only proof of kinglike authority within her own realms and dominions, to be the supreme governor under God of all persons and causes, you deny to her'. Thus, the Louvainists dared to subject her to another authority, and refused to be subject to hers.¹²⁹ The superiority of the queen's authority was also part of Cooper's argument: he demanded that the anonymous author of the *Apology of Private Mass* accept the new authority, because the defence of the English Church was advancing 'through God's word and the authority of the prince'.¹³⁰

Dering, like Jewel, not only promoted the royal supremacy as a sign of legitimacy for the national universal church, but also the role of parliament. Dering used 1 Peter 2:13 to support his argument, a verse that required the faithful to submit to the authorities, 'whether it be unto the King, as unto the chief, or unto governors, as unto them that he sends', to provide evidence that such authority lent authenticity to the Church of England. He cast the queen and her parliament as the king and governors who had been set up as authorities, and pointed out that obedience to their decisions was thus required. Dering followed up that sentence by pointing out that the writer, who was St Peter himself, did not set up the primacy of the pope in that verse, which was further proof that royal supremacy was the legitimate form of authority over the church, not papal supremacy.¹³¹

Like Jewel and Dering, Nowell used the legitimacy of parliament both to support the creation of a national church and to reject the power of the pope. Nowell promoted parliamentary authority by arguing that the common authority of parliament had simply restored what the pope had 'unjustly removed and taken from the people'. Thus, all the true doctrine, holy scriptures, and holy laws had been 'retained and kept, and are now set forth and delivered to the people of God'. Not only were they restored, however, but improved: they were 'more perfect for edification set forth and delivered, than they were lately before... [because] God's people may understand them'. Parliament had restored the use of 'our native language to all our countrymen known'.¹³² Nowell associated the nation's religion with the power of the nation, and so promoted the Englishness of the church.

The Louvainists taunted the English writers for their parliament-made religion. Dorman remarked scornfully that the means of reconciling religious

¹²⁹ Calfhill, *An aunswere to the Treatise of the crosse*, A4v.

¹³⁰ Cooper, *Answer to an apologie of priuate masse*, 2v.

¹³¹ Dering, *A Sparing Restraint*, 98.

¹³² Nowell, *Reproufe of M Dorman his proufe*, 12v-13.

controversy in England was through parliament or a debate by the laity, which meant that ‘the conclusion of this weighty controversy might depend upon the mouth of some simple burgoise [sic] and mean artificer, who might easily by lack of judgment choose the worse part’.¹³³ Nicholas Sander took on an air of concern, wondering if the men who sat in parliament judging the high mysteries of Christ were able to understand them. ‘He that must, if a parliament be called, prescribe [a faith] to all the realm...he that accompteth himself sufficient to discern doctrines and spirits, will he say that a poor scholar of Oxford writes too high for his understanding?’ Sander predicted disaster if that was the case, since compared to the notable bishops and divines who went to Trent, even an Oxford scholar ‘is a very base member of Christ’s Church’.¹³⁴

In the historiography of the Elizabethan settlement, there has been virtually no examination of the clerical use of parliamentary authority to legitimize the church, except perhaps through examining its supreme governor. Philip Hughes, for example, has studied Elizabeth’s determination to maintain the settlement as shown by her actions in parliament.¹³⁵ Millar Maclure’s study of the Paul’s Cross sermons mentioned how Elizabeth’s government appointed particular preachers ‘during parliament time’ to promote its own agenda.¹³⁶ Stephen Alford discussed Cecil’s efforts to control and promote the queen through parliament.¹³⁷ No one seems to have gone beyond the immediate actions of parliament regarding religion to the effect it had on individual defenders of the church.

Significantly, there has been rather more scholarship on the use of parliament by challengers to the settlement. In his study of the drive for conformity in the 1580s, Kenneth Fincham discussed parliament as a place where the voice of the ‘evangelical lobby’ was heard.¹³⁸ Puritan John Field’s *Admonition to Parliament* has been studied at length by such historians as Cyndia Susan Clegg and Leonard Trinterud.¹³⁹ Patrick Collinson suggested that the Marprelate tracts were a

¹³³ Dorman, *Disproufe*, 52v.

¹³⁴ Sander, *The Supper of Our Lord*, 95.

¹³⁵ Philip Hughes, *Reformation in England, Part Three: ‘True Religion Now Established’* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1954), 156-159.

¹³⁶ Millar Maclure, *The Paul’s Cross Sermons 1534-1642* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), 13.

¹³⁷ Stephen Alford, *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 7.

¹³⁸ Kenneth Fincham, ‘Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud,’ in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, 1560-1660*, edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), 136-137.

¹³⁹ Patrick Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1983), 337; Cyndia Susan Clegg, ‘Print in the Time of Parliament,’ in *Tudor Books*

‘desperate expedient on the part of printers, pamphleteers, preachers and politicians to snatch victory from the jaws of the parliamentary defeat of the presbyterian cause’.¹⁴⁰ Considering the extent of references to Jewel’s work in these later debates of the Elizabeth church, which will be explored further in chapter five, it is arguable that further exploration of this connection between parliament and defence would be useful.

Past, Present and Future

In defending the royal supremacy and their homemade laws, the gossellers gave their particular church a national flavour, and asserted their unique status in the universal church of the present day. In the second way that they influenced the development of a national universal church, the gossellers focused on defending their past and future status. This brought the English within the compass of the greater history of Christianity. There have been several studies done on the placement of the English Church into church history, but the vast majority of them have used Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* as their primary source rather than any ecclesiastical debate. Felicity Heal’s work on the reformation in England and Ireland is an excellent example of this: she looked at the various aspects of creating a religious identity in Elizabethan England and assigned Jewel the role of ‘defending the church with the aid of the fathers’, while Foxe ‘was elaborating the cosmic pattern of Christian history’.¹⁴¹ She did not discuss the wider controversy around Jewel’s work, or the contributions of that controversy to the creation of a history and a future for the Church of England.

The gossellers used both ancient and recent history to provide legitimacy for their church, just as Jewel did. Their use of recent history was partially because those stories appealed to the emotions of their audience. It was also a useful strategy for the promotion of universality, because it connected the English martyrs to their contemporary continental counterparts. As H.F. Woodhouse notes, ‘we must not forget that this was a period of violent passions. The fires of Smithfield were remembered; the corruption of the Roman Church was still a vivid memory...the

and Readers, edited by John N. King (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 143-144; Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism*, 11-13.

¹⁴⁰ Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 78.

¹⁴¹ Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 389.

plight of continental Protestants was borne in mind'.¹⁴² It was also strategic: to have martyrs willing to die for their faith was of course a powerful weapon in proving the legitimacy of a church. As Brad Gregory put it, 'growth despite persecution was evidence that God was using martyrdom to draw people to his truth, as he had done in the early church'.¹⁴³ Thus, the Louvainists quickly tried to disprove the legitimacy of the English martyrs.

Dorman, for example, said that most of the people who suffered for the 'sacramentary heresy' did not die 'in such lingering flames as you speak of, but compassed about with bags of gunpowder'. Dorman thought that this attempt to lessen their own suffering in this way proved that these men were not martyrs, and removed their credit as true believers dying for the faith.¹⁴⁴ Nowell responded to this by insisting those who had died under Mary were in fact martyrs, because nothing could make them give up their faith, not 'the terror of tyrants, loss of goods, [or] of life also'. Through the example of the martyrs, Nowell shored up the legitimacy of the doctrine for which they had died. He also promoted individual participation through this example, because he said that the death of men like Cranmer showed up 'the errors of popery in the eyes of men and women of all degrees and ages'.¹⁴⁵ This set all these people up as witnesses to the truth of the message of the martyrs.

Although recent history was very useful for the gossellers, most of the historical argument revolved around the question of origins. They debated fiercely with the Louvainists over when the true Christian faith had arrived in England, and by what means. As in Jewel and Harding's works, this revolved around Eleutherius and Lucius. Martial summarized the Louvainist side of the argument when he claimed that 'Eleutherius pope of Rome appointed laws for Lucius King of England, and gave him authority, and commissioned him to be God's vicar in that land'.¹⁴⁶ Part of this story involved Eleutherius sending missionaries to establish the Christian faith; Sander, Dorman and Stapleton claimed that it arrived through 'Augustine the English apostle', and thus the English Church was part of the order of St Peter and subject to the Roman Church.¹⁴⁷ This meant that the pope was not a foreign usurper, as the gossellers claimed, but the originator and the symbolic head of the English Church.

¹⁴² Woodhouse, *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology*, 146.

¹⁴³ Brad S. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 172.

¹⁴⁴ Dorman, *Disproufe*, 19.

¹⁴⁵ Nowell, *Reproufe of M Dorman his proufe*, 123-123v, 182v-183.

¹⁴⁶ Martial, *Replie*, *****1v - *****2.

¹⁴⁷ Dorman, *Disproufe*, 195.

Nowell countered with the claim that even if the pope was not a foreigner in country and nation, he was a foreigner in faith and religion. The national universal church required all of its fellow members to have common beliefs, even if they did not have a common nationality.¹⁴⁸ Notably, the common beliefs to which he referred pre-dated the arrival of missionaries from Rome. This argument aligned with the other gossellers, but Nowell was the most subtle about it. He did not discuss any particular conversion story; rather, he joined the English Church with the apostolic church seamlessly, as if there had been no stretch of time since the church fathers. This was part of his insistence that it was the doctrine of the English Church that made it part of the universal church, not its place in time or space. If the doctrine had not changed, then neither had the church.

Nowell went so far as to take Dorman to task for claiming that the Roman Church communicated with all the churches that had been founded since the apostles' time. He pointed out that many of the churches founded by the apostles had been lost to 'the Mohammedans' due to the errors of the Roman Church, and denied that the Roman Church had any right to claim apostolic connections as all. Rather, it was the English Church that was connected with the church founded by the apostles in all the nations, and 'we therefore communicating in faith and doctrine with all nations...that had or have in them churches founded by the apostles' labour, do communicate with all those nations that St Austen speaks of, and so with more nations do we communicate than you do'.¹⁴⁹

Other gossellers tried to make the connection between the apostolic and English churches more concrete. Dering said that, according to the fourth-century theologian Theodoretus, 'St Paul himself preached here in his latter time', and it was Joseph of Arimethea who was one of the first to see the English receive the faith, not Roman missionaries. With the advent of Roman missionaries, 'superstition began again to breed', partly due to Augustine the monk. Augustine persuaded the king and queen not to try to convert people to Christianity. He 'thrust into the church' things which had never been seen before: namely, altars, vestments, images, masses, crosses, candlesticks, holy water, tithes and processions. He changed their rituals for Easter, brought in the first relics, built a monastery, and 'wrought many feigned miracles'. Then, 'when he could not bring all men to his diet, he moved great

¹⁴⁸ Nowell, *Confutation*, 93v.

¹⁴⁹ Nowell, *Confutation*, 56v-57.

persecution against such as defended the liberty of the church.’¹⁵⁰ Augustine, essentially, was the personification of the Roman Church, and could be directly blamed for all of the error and superstition in England that the gossellers were arguing against, including the usurping of royal authority. This gave legitimacy to the royal supremacy, established the independence of the Church of England from Rome, and aligned it with the true, primitive, apostolic church.

Calfhill, too, used the origin stories to promote the royal supremacy and reject the papal supremacy. He was less violent in his dislike of Augustine than Dering, but he still refused to accept that the faith in England had been planted by the pope’s representative. He claimed that Augustine found seven bishoprics and an archbishopric already established in England when he arrived, who were all ‘keeping their flocks in most godly order’. Significantly, Calfhill attributed the steadfast and orderly faith of the English to the support of the king, Ethelbert, who had a godly wife and a Christian bishop to help him. Augustine was no help to this king: he planted superstition, and ‘where religion was sincerely taught, he laboured what he could of a certain ambitious proud heart to pervert it’.¹⁵¹ This implied that Rome had interfered in the supremacy of the king from the very beginning.

Print and Pulpit

The question of origins was one of the many issues that was never completely resolved in the Jewel-Harding controversy. However, this lack of resolution did not seem to affect the popularity of the debate. The idea of a national universal church still spread, which may have been due to the third and most direct way that Englishness became part of the gossellers’ identity as members of the (Protestant) universal church: their use of both print and pulpit to defend their doctrine. These two means of dissemination provided the clergy, the servants of the crown, the gentry and the general populace a vastly detailed description of the beliefs of the Church of England to which they belonged. This section will show first how the texts themselves were designed to connect to their authors’ perceived audience, and then discuss how the gossellers encouraged the acceptance of their interpretation through pulpit support.

These men addressed several different groups of people in their various texts. Nowell claimed that he had ‘laboured to serve the learned and occupied reader’s

¹⁵⁰ Dering, *A Sparing Restraint*, 28-29.

¹⁵¹ Calfhill, *An aunswere to the Treatise of the crosse*, 143v.

turn' by summarizing his works at the end of the book.¹⁵² Dering too addressed the learned reader, because his defence of the truth might edify him, and 'the manner of my writing minister grace...I would no longer suppress that, which being set abroad, might be fruitful'.¹⁵³ At the same time, all the writers expressed concern for the simple, unlearned people, and often implied that other members of the audience had an obligation to help them, or at least avoid hindering them. As Nowell phrased it, 'the simple and unlearned readers have often best liking in books more boldly than learnedly written, and are most in danger to credit most lewd and slanderous lies'.¹⁵⁴ Thus, they needed help and support.

Identifying the popular audience of sixteenth-century writers is difficult for historians, but one way to approach it is through dedications and prefaces. In the case of the gossellers, these writings provide a good overview of how the gossellers perceived their audience: the prefaces especially show how the gossellers saw their readers and the readers' role in the church. As Heidi Brayman-Hackel has noted, authors used their prefaces to 'shape and control' the reception of their books, through addressing their good readers and opposing any hostile readers.¹⁵⁵ This fits with the methods of the gossellers. They consistently showed respect for individuals and included them in the controversy as fellow students in the faith.

Dering advised his 'good Christian reader' to search the scriptures, because then 'the truth shall move thee' and show the pope for what he is.¹⁵⁶ Nowell showed indignation on his readers' behalf, stating that the purpose of the gossellers' work was to give understanding to the reader, but the Louvainists 'do seem to have sought the clean contrary, and to have used all diligence to keep their readers in errors and uncertainty'. He claimed that as the reason why he decided to print the entirety of his adversaries' work with his, so that the reader could judge the truth.¹⁵⁷ All of the gossellers also noted that they were writing against someone, who was then constructed as their hostile reader. Thomas Cooper did this the most blatantly, and pretended that his book was not really meant for his 'gentle reader' at all. His gentle reader already knew the truth that he was about to read, so 'I will cease any more to

¹⁵² Nowell, *A Reproufe*, B2.

¹⁵³ Dering, *A Sparing Restraint*, *1.

¹⁵⁴ Nowell, *A Reproufe*, B1v.

¹⁵⁵ Heidi Brayman-Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 116.

¹⁵⁶ Dering, *A Sparing Restraint*, **3.

¹⁵⁷ Nowell, *Confutation*, *2.

trouble thee, and will turn the residue of my talk unto the author of this writing' that he was refuting.¹⁵⁸

In contrast, the Louvainists used their letters to the reader to promote the validity of the Roman Church. They also asked the readers to judge the value of what they read for themselves, but did not allow them to judge points of doctrine. Rather, the Louvainists expected their readers to judge the gossellers, and the gossellers' interpretations of patristic sources. As Dorman said, 'there is none of you I trust but that he judges better of the whole number of Catholics than that he can be persuaded to...condemn all the learned writers of so many hundred years'.¹⁵⁹ Similarly, Lewis Evans said in his letter that he expected the reader to use the descriptions of the various Protestant churches which he had written to divide 'the truth faith from the false...good people from bad, and true Christians from raging Antichrists'.¹⁶⁰ This shows his adversarial mentality very clearly. Similarly, John Rastell said that he hoped that all the Catholics would work toward the goal to which he worked, which was to disprove Jewel. If they did that, 'the cause of the Catholics is the stronger, [and] the hearts of the Protestants may be the fainter'.¹⁶¹ The demarcation lines are clear in these letters, as is the Louvainists' attitude toward the individual.

Dedications also afford insight into the ways that the gossellers attempted to influence their audience. As was common in sixteenth-century polemic, the works tended to be dedicated to the queen or to influential noblemen. Many writers were simply searching for patronage, but within that was an awareness that they needed to influence the people of influence. John Barthlet dedicated his *The Pedigree of Heretics* to Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and Dering dedicated his work to Thomas Wotton. The son of an Edwardian privy council member, Wotton had been imprisoned for his reforming beliefs during the reign of Mary. During the 1560s he supported Parker's efforts against radicals and papists, but did not play an official role in the government.¹⁶² In the years after the controversy ended, Wotton developed radical tendencies and fought for further reform of the church, as did Dering himself. Dering's dedication of his work to Wotton foreshadows his later

¹⁵⁸ Cooper, *Answer to an apologie of priuate masse*, E3v.

¹⁵⁹ Dorman, *Disproufe*, 3.

¹⁶⁰ Lewis Evans, *Certaine tables sett furth by the right reuerend father in God, William Bushopp of Rurimunde* (Antwerp, 1565), A3.

¹⁶¹ Rastell, *Beware of M Jewel*, A3v.

¹⁶² "Wotton, Sir Edward (1489?-1551)," Luke MacMahon in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eee online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: OUP, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/29998> (accessed March 11, 2013).

departure from the textual community of the gossellers, which will be examined further in the next chapter.

The Earl of Leicester was also a significant choice. Much of the historiography of Elizabeth's reign suggests that Leicester favoured the radical cause, but his constant support of the defenders of the Church of England counteracts this.¹⁶³ This apparent contradiction might reflect a concern for political expediency that outweighed religious considerations, but it might also show that Leicester maintained a certain moderation in his beliefs. During the controversy of the prophesyings, Leicester followed orders and helped suppress them, and Thomas Wood attacked him in print for betraying the puritans over this issue.

Leicester wrote back to Wood to deny it, claiming that: 'I am not, I thank God, fantastically persuaded in religion but...do find it soundly and godly set forth in this universal Church of England ...which doctrine and religion I wish to be obeyed duly as it ought of all subjects of this land'.¹⁶⁴ Leicester's use of the term 'universal Church of England' suggests that he was aware of the concept of a national universal church, and its separation from the Catholic Church. Considering that gossellers such as Barthlet saw him as an ally, this suggests that he may have been more closely involved in the Jewel-Harding controversy than most scholars allow. This is further supported by the fact that he was in direct contact with Jewel, as shown in the previous chapter.

The audience of the controversy, once identified, then had to be persuaded through the texts themselves. The gossellers and Louvainists used much the same rhetorical devices as those of Jewel and Harding, which is not surprising considering that all of these men had been educated with the same humanistic method and learned the same tricks of medieval disputation as Jewel and Harding had. These aspects of the controversy have been studied in detail in chapter three, through the works of Jewel and Harding, and to cover them again in reference to the rest of the works might prove repetitive. Thus, topics such as the use of emotional appeal will not be discussed in this chapter. There is still one aspect of Jewel and Harding's

¹⁶³ For some examples, see: Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*, 95-96; "Dudley, Robert, earl of Leicester (1532/3–1588)," Simon Adams in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, May 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/8160> (accessed March 3, 2014); Usher, *William Cecil and Episcopacy*, 90.

¹⁶⁴ Patrick Collinson, ed, *Letters of Thomas Wood, Puritan* (London: University of London, The Athlone Press, 1960), 15.

debate that must be applied to the wider controversy, however: the use of the vernacular.

The gossellers used the vernacular as part of the 'Englishness' of their church, which was reflective of a reformist trend. Both Patrick Collinson and David Birch see a connection between nationalist feeling and the use of the vernacular.¹⁶⁵ Lucy Wooding studies this in more detail, claiming that 'to write in English was to declare an interest in the work of religious regeneration that was such a key preoccupation of the age'. It was a sign that the writer wanted to reach the most people possible. Thus, to write in the vernacular was 'to demonstrate the deployment as well as the development of new ideas...the interface between religious ideology and popular practice'.¹⁶⁶ This interface meant that both the people and the language were edified, according to Holinshed's *Chronicles*. When Holinshed discussed the various languages used on the island of Britain, he noted that English never achieved a state of perfection until the time of Elizabeth. Then, 'John Jewel Bishop of Sarum, John Foxe, and sundry learned and excellent writers...fully accomplished the ornature of the same, to their great praise and immortal commendation'.¹⁶⁷

To emphasize Englishness through language was a goal that was implied rather than discussed in the works of the controversy. The gossellers did not say openly that they wrote in English to influence the English. Rather, they attacked the Louvainists for preferring to write in Latin. John Barthlet actually turned the idea of Latin as a learned language on its head, claiming that the clergy of the Roman Church did not have any interest in learning Greek, did not truly understand Latin, and were actually 'proud in this their ignorance'. They also burned those who wanted to read the scriptures and learn about the faith in their mother tongue, calling them heretics.¹⁶⁸ This, Barthlet implied, was not the behaviour of the learned sort. Alexander Nowell was equally scathing of the ignorance of the men who professed to be learned in Latin, suggesting that they took the change from the Latin to the English liturgy so grievously not for reasons of faith but because they could not read English. After all, 'no good and godly man can therefore justly be offended with

¹⁶⁵ Patrick Collinson, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), 5-6; David Birch, 'Early Reformation English Polemics,' *Elizabethan and Renaissance Studies* vol 92, no 7 (1983), 29.

¹⁶⁶ Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 2, 3.

¹⁶⁷ Raphael Holinshed, *The first and second volumes of Chronicles comprising 1 The description and historie of England, 2 The description and historie of Ireland, 3 The description and historie of Scotland* (London, 1587), 14.

¹⁶⁸ Barthlet, *The pedegrewe of heretiques*, 84.

such change', only a deceptive and ignorant Romanist cleric.¹⁶⁹ These two men subtly associated learning with the vernacular, and by doing so they also promoted their own language, making it the language used by the truly faithful people of the national universal church. Thus, it became symbolic of the catholicity of the Church of England, because it enabled everyone to participate.

Equally as important as writing in the vernacular was speaking in the vernacular, a topic which has recently enjoyed an upsurge of academic interest. Scholars such as Carl Truman, Arnold Hunt, Mary Morrissey and Susan Wabuda all study how important verbal persuasion was to the acceptance of the Elizabethan settlement. Truman and Wabuda both claim that the vernacular sermon moved into a central place in worship.¹⁷⁰ Arnold Hunt, in his *The Art of Hearing*, describes how actively the people of the later Elizabethan and Jacobean ages listened to sermons, employing several strategies to help them remember and evaluate the sermons they heard, including note-taking, memorization and repetition.¹⁷¹ Mary Morrissey connects the importance of the sermons at Paul's Cross to the exploration of political and religious controversies.¹⁷²

Part of the reason for this interest is the transition from oral to visual literary culture which was taking place during the 1560s. This change is not only of interest to modern scholars, however. It was something that the authors of the Jewel-Harding controversy well knew. Alexander Nowell, John Rastell and Thomas Heskyns all addressed the 'readers *and* hearers' of their works, and Heskyns emphasized that some people in a society were meant to be hearers.¹⁷³ Although public reading was not as popular by the 1560s as it once had been, the concept of 'private' had not yet taken on the meaning it has today. It referred to the domestic sphere, which would include all members of the household. As Heidi Brayman-Hackel points out, even reading in closets or bedrooms did not necessarily mean that one was reading alone. The nature of life in the sixteenth century was communal and crowded, and thus even reading was often not a solitary event.¹⁷⁴

¹⁶⁹ Nowell, *A Reproufe*, 18v.

¹⁷⁰ Carl Truman, 'Preachers and Medieval and Renaissance Commentary,' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 68; Wabuda, *Preaching During the English Reformation*, 12.

¹⁷¹ Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audience, 1590-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 114.

¹⁷² Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), xii.

¹⁷³ Thomas Heskyns, *The Parlyment of Christ* (Antwerp, 1566), Viv.

¹⁷⁴ Brayman-Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England*, 34-35.

For the Jewel-Harding controversy, this verbal aspect both brought the controversy to a wider audience and made it part of the conflicts that arose during the first decade of Elizabeth's reign. Most of this aspect of the controversy played out either at court or at Paul's Cross in London, due to the assistance of the Bishop of London, Edmund Grindal. Rarely did a new Louvainist work appear without some sort of verbal response from the gossellers. For example, John Martial published the *Treatise of the Cross* in October 1564 partly in response to the crucifix controversy that took place amongst the bishops in 1560. Nowell, who managed more than once to stumble over himself in his attempts to please the queen, tried to refute Martial while preaching at Whitehall. He attacked the use of images with such vigour that the queen ordered him to stop - during the sermon itself. This caused much scandal and embarrassment, and further encouraged Louvainist resistance to the religious settlement.

Calfhill stepped in to refute Martial on paper, arguing that Elizabeth could keep some images because she was educated so well that they could not tempt her into heresy. Other people were less blessed, and so the clergy had removed images from most churches. Some historians suggest that Bishop Grindal and Archbishop Parker were Calfhill's official backers for this work, since he was appointed the archdeacon of Colchester by the first and rector of Bocking by the second during that same year.¹⁷⁵ Unfortunately, Calfhill's attempts were not entirely successful; he only managed to halt Martial's support of images temporarily. His tendency to overstep himself also caused a new set of problems. The very next year, in 1566, Calfhill was called to task for a Paul's Cross sermon that spoke too vigorously against the crucifix.¹⁷⁶ It would seem, then, that Jewel's textual community was under strict control as they attempted to support their written work through sermons, which shows both the importance of the verbal aspect of the controversy and its dangers.

Part of its importance came from the ability of sermons to generate excitement for the written works. In May of 1565, Jewel preached against Harding's *An Answer to Master Jewel's Challenge* at Paul's Cross. News of the sermon spread all the way to Harding in Louvain. Harding demanded that Jewel give him a copy so that he could refute it, but Jewel refused. He told Harding that what he had said

¹⁷⁵ Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 77-79.

¹⁷⁶ Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons*, 75.

would soon be available in his *Reply*, which was supposed to be published later that year. Harding did not want to wait that long, so in July he published a short letter about the sermon, in which he said that ‘I think it better thus to write briefly, then by silence to seem to acknowledge a guilt’.¹⁷⁷ In August of that year, Nowell got a copy of Harding’s letter and read passages of it during his sermon, which he then vigorously refuted. He did the same thing later that same year, but in the second sermon he argued against his own nemesis, Thomas Dorman.¹⁷⁸

Such personal drama and conflict, perpetuated and expanded as the debate progressed, both engaged the audience and served as a sort of advertisement. As Mary Morrissey points out, the north side of the Cross Yard was literally against the walls of the two biggest areas in London for the book trade. That made it a central point for gossip and news, and a gathering place for people who could, and often did, purchase the written version of the sermons preached at the Cross.¹⁷⁹ The personalities involved also influenced the audience, because they were lively and entertaining, and fought with all the passion of soldiers on the battlefield. Not everyone would have been convinced of the legitimacy of the Church of England through the Jewel-Harding debate, but even those who were not had something solid to resist. Thus, the controversy helped make the Church of England an institution – a national, universal church.

Conclusion

In many ways, the controversies between the nineteen divines who were involved with the Jewel-Harding controversy reflect the arguments that took place between Jewel and Harding themselves. The same themes appear, such as Englishness, the value of the individual, authority and legitimacy, and the royal supremacy. Just as Jewel and Harding had, the Louvainists and the gossellers argued over the primacy of the pope, the right of parliament to determine religion, and the right use of the sacraments. Also, they wrote in the same style: the same tricks of rhetoric, direct address, and even the device of the challenge all came up in the wider debate, and were used much as Jewel and Harding had used them.

¹⁷⁷ Thomas Harding, *A Breife Answere of Thomas Harding Touching Certain Untruthes, to which Master John Jewel charged him in his late Sermon at Paul’s Cross the 8th of July 1565* (Antwerp, 1565), A2r.

¹⁷⁸ Churton, *The Life of Alexander Nowell*, 104-106.

¹⁷⁹ Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul’s Cross Sermons*, 3-5.

The work of the gossellers explored particular aspects of Jewel's original challenge. None of them addressed all twenty-six articles from the Challenge Sermon in their work, but each of them focused on the issues that they thought needed further discussion. They supported and endorsed Jewel's conclusions with further examples from patristic and Biblical sources, and promoted Jewel as an authority and a champion of the church. The Louvainists proved equally supportive of Harding, and equally determined to present convincing arguments on particular issues of their faith.

This shows how Jewel and Harding inspired the textual communities around them. For Harding, the connections were immediate, because many of his community members had worked with him at New College in Oxford. They all had the experience of exile in common, and were working together in a foreign university that they were attempting to make as English as possible. At the same time, they found themselves looking to the pope for the support and protection they could not get anywhere else, which lessened their connection between nation and religion. The gossellers, however, worked to strengthen that connection. They firmly believed in the royal supremacy and the legitimacy of a national universal church. This was part of their connection to Jewel, whom they universally acknowledged as a worthy and learned divine.

All of the arguments between the Louvainists and the gossellers folded into the on-going attempt to define the true universal church, which both sides claimed to represent. The question of who could say that they were 'catholic' was an old one by the time Jewel stepped into the pulpit at Paul's Cross and launched the first salvo in a verbal war. Over the decade that followed, the divines of his textual community came up with a new answer. It arose out of their adversarial mentality and their sense that the English had a place within church history, and incorporated their new sense of brotherhood with the continent. It can be summarized as follows. 'We are part of the universal church, and as such we are no longer Catholic.'

Chapter Five: Sword and Shield

The Reception and Significance of John Jewel

The description of Jewel as the champion of the Church of England was attached to him very quickly after the accession of Elizabeth, and it is still used in modern historiography. What is not usually discussed, however, is what it meant to be a champion of the church. Some historians suggest that Jewel's task was merely to destroy the old church: Philip Hughes, for example, calls Jewel's work 'a masterpiece of the art' of destructive propaganda.¹ In contrast, Michael Pasquarello suggests that Jewel's work was essentially constructive, saying that Jewel's methodology was 'sufficient to build consensus among the faithful to form a Protestant commonwealth'.² An examination of Jewel that spans the reign of Elizabeth shows that the two are not mutually exclusive. As champion of the Elizabethan church, Jewel had two distinct roles: he wielded the sword of written and spoken polemic that aimed to eradicate the Roman religion from England, and he was a shield for others who aimed to defend the church.

The adversarial mentality characteristic of the reforming community in Edwardian England survived the Marian exile, and was central to the Jewel-Harding controversy of the 1560s. Jewel and the men of his textual community wrote and preached with the attitude that it was 'us vs. them' in a battle for right religion, and that only one side could be victorious. During that decade, Jewel became a visible symbol of 'us' for both his fellow gossellers and his audience. Although his work aimed to discredit errors such as ubiquitarianism as well as refute the claims of the Roman church, it was his resistance to Rome that his contemporaries took most to heart. Rome was the Church of England's greatest threat, and the danger of popery united the gossellers and many of their fellows into a solid opposition against it.

This unity started to crumble in the early 1570s, as some of the church's own members became a threat equivalent to that of Rome. This internal enemy made it much more difficult to distinguish allies and adversaries. At first, the differences between the members of the Church of England were not great, and Jewel remained a symbol of 'us' for both sides. He steadily gained status as a theologian and apologist, as well as a historian of the early church and an expert on the royal supremacy. His reputation provided additional legitimacy to the views of those who

¹ Philip Hughes, *Reformation in England, Part Three: 'True Religion Now Established'* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1954), 101.

² Michael Pasquarello, 'John Jewel: Preaching Prelate,' *Anglican and Episcopal History* vol 69, no 3 (2000), 293.

could claim that their arguments fit into his. However, as the years progressed, Jewel became an adversary to those who wanted to continue reforming the Church of England. At that point, he all but vanished from their works of polemic, and instead became the property of the defenders of the established Church of England.

Central to later works of polemic, as it had been for the Jewel-Harding controversy, was the definition of the national universal church. Later defenders of the Church of England answered challenges to the structure and government of the church by expanding the definition established by Jewel and his fellow gossellers. Jewel's reputation as a scholar and a godly man added legitimacy to their arguments, and his work enabled them to justify the uniquely English aspects of the Church that did not have continental parallels. Thus, both the person and the work of Jewel shaped the direction of debate regarding the catholicity of the Church of England from the 1560s to the 1590s. The purpose of this chapter is to study this development through an examination of the reception and significance of Jewel's work during the reign of Elizabeth, both within his lifetime and after his death.

It will show that as internal conflict over church government and the legitimacy of a national church intensified, the simple division of the 1560s polemical debates between true and false churches grew far more complex. Ideas still developed through opposition, as they had during the Jewel-Harding controversy. Polemical attacks forced later defenders of the Church of England to clarify their definitions and set boundaries around what they considered representative of their true church, just as similar attacks had motivated the gossellers of the 1560s. However, there was a distinct shift in emphasis. While the gossellers had always accepted and promoted the idea of an invisible universal church, they had focused more on its universality than on its invisibility. Later defenders of the Church of England had to recognize the difference not only between the true and false churches, but between the visible and invisible churches within each particular true church.

Before we can examine this shift, it must be determined who these later defenders actually were, and this group is not as easy to define as were the groups discussed in the last chapter. The men who supported Jewel in the controversy with Harding (such as James Calphill, Thomas Cooper, Edward Dering, and Alexander Nowell) were all English divines of the 1560s, living in England, and writing in response to a specific challenge that lasted for a specific length of time. They also displayed enough similarity in beliefs to make the collective label of 'gossellers'

used in the previous chapter appropriate. The defenders of the Church of England who came after these gossellers do not fit any of those criteria.

These defenders included foreign reformers such as Peter Martyr and Heinrich Bullinger, covered a far longer period of time, and responded to a wide range of challenges – from a defence of the oath of supremacy by Robert Horne in 1566 to Andrew Willet's *A Christian Letter* (1599), written in response to Richard Hooker's *Laws of the Ecclesiastical Polity*. Some of the divines who contributed to the Jewel-Harding controversy can be included in the ranks of these defenders; others, significantly, cannot. Some truly believed in the settlement and the church as it had been defined in the 1560s; others were not entirely pleased, and hoped for further reform.

The only common ground between these men is that they all accepted the structure and doctrine of the Church of England as it had been established in the 1560s. For that reason, theirs will be called the conformist side. 'Conformist' is a term mainly used by historians such as Michael Questier and Peter Holmes to distinguish the supporters of the Church of England from the Catholic recusants of the later Elizabethan years.³ However, it is also sometimes used instead of 'Anglican', a term which has been shown to be inaccurate in a sixteenth-century setting. Norman L. Jones and Ethan Shagan, for example, both use 'conformists' as an alternative: Jones used the term 'conforming Protestants' to separate them from 'those who believed compromise with the devil was not permissible' and eventually became the puritan and separatist groups within the national church.⁴ Shagan uses it to distinguish defenders of the Church of England from their challengers.⁵ Thus, it seems to be the most appropriate term available to define a group that was so wide and varied.

Despite their different experience and beliefs, all the conformists found something in the established church that they could defend in good conscience, which formed the basis of their common culture. That culture revolved around a particular set of texts, which means that they can still be considered a textual community. However, their textual community was slightly different from that of the gossellers: rather than developing a method of interpretation based on the

³ Michael Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England 1580-1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 2; Peter Holmes, *Resistance and Compromise: The Political Thought of the Elizabethan Catholics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 11.

⁴ Norman L. Jones, *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1993), 52-53.

⁵ Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 113.

personal publications of their leader, their method of interpretation was inspired by the major defining texts of the Elizabethan church. This meant that Jewel could retain his position as the community's leader, because he had either written or helped to write most of those texts. They included the Elizabethan prayer book, the 39 Articles, the second *Book of Homilies*, and Jewel's own *Apology*, which was the standard source for the doctrine of the Church of England throughout the reign of Elizabeth. Also, the various texts he had written for his debate against Harding were in constant circulation, as were the printed texts of his Challenge Sermon. Jewel's thinking also influenced Alexander Nowell's widely used *Catechism*. Nowell was one of the strongest supporters of Jewel's work, and Jewel was on the committee that reviewed the catechism during the 1563 Convocation.⁶ It is arguable that Jewel, while not the only author who influenced the conformists, was certainly one of the most important.

It is harder to define the conformists' opposition as a textual community. The beliefs of these men were even more diverse: they ranged from a simple desire for further reform of the national church to a rejection of the national church altogether. Their only common ground is that their beliefs inspired them actively to oppose the Church of England. In this chapter, they will be called the 'puritans'. This choice was not made lightly: 'puritan' is a hotly debated term and there is neither the time nor space to fully engage with the vast historiography of puritanism in this chapter. As Patrick Collinson has noted, puritanism is in the eye of the beholder.⁷ It is that ambiguity that makes it necessary to clarify how the term will be applied in this context.

The most useful definition comes from Peter Lake's work *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church*. In it, Lake expanded upon a common definition of puritans as 'people who, with varying degrees of intensity, disliked the Elizabethan settlement' by including those who wanted to separate from the Church of England altogether. This inclusiveness meant that the common ground among puritans could be found in 'an intense vision of the reality and mutuality of the community of the godly and of the way in which that community could and should be called together

⁶ "Nowell, Alexander (c.1516/17–1602)," Stanford Lehmborg in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/20378> (accessed June 20, 2013).

⁷ For a good summary of the historiography of the word 'puritan', see Christopher Haigh, 'Introduction,' in *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, edited by Christopher Haigh (Hampshire and London: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1984), 19, 20.

through the word, particularly the word preached'.⁸ This definition is appropriate because it shows how the puritans were a distinct group despite their diversity, which reflects how the term was used in the Jewel-Harding controversy itself.

The first printed appearance of the term 'puritan' was in a work by the Louvainist Thomas Stapleton, *A Fortress of the Faith*. He used it to describe a dissenting group of men who existed within the Church of England and yet were not really part of it. He cited the example of the vestarian controversy to show how those men stood out from other church leaders: 'if these men do acknowledge and believe that the queen's majesty is supreme governor in all spiritual causes, why do they not obey her highness' commandment in the...wearing of vestments in the church?' Alternatively, 'if they...believe it not, why teach they the people so, why have they taken the oath so?'.⁹ By questioning what he saw as hypocrisy, Stapleton defined the puritans by their methodology rather than their doctrine.

This chapter takes a similar approach in its use of the term 'puritan'. It examines the puritans based on their shared system of interpretation, rather than their beliefs. The puritans were a community, in the sense that they recognized each other as different from the conformists and had a common culture that focused on further reform of the Church of England. The major characteristics of this culture, according to Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, were 'Bible study, sermon attendance and sermon-gadding, fasting and whole-day sabbatarianism'. Eager participation 'in a ceaseless round of such spiritual activities' identified someone as a puritan.¹⁰ Notably, this was not a textual community. It did not revolve around an individual leader or, despite the importance of Bible-reading, a particular set of texts. Puritans did produce texts to encourage the acceptance of their beliefs, which provide some of the sources for this chapter, but these works were the products of small groups within the community. They were not necessarily representative of the group as a whole, and indeed they were occasionally resisted by other members of the community.

Thus, it would be more appropriate to treat the puritans as an interpretive community rather than a textual community. Stanley Fish coined this term, defining interpretive communities as groups 'made up of those who share interpretation

⁸ Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 1, 3.

⁹ Thomas Stapleton, *Fortress of the Faith* (Antwerp, 1565), 134v.

¹⁰ Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, 'The Puritan Ethos,' in *Culture of English Puritanism 1560-1700*, edited by Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales (London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1996), 30.

strategies not for reading but for writing texts'. To him, the authors of a work established the strategies for interpreting that text, but the readers also played an active role.¹¹ This can be applied to sixteenth-century studies because, as William H. Sherman has noted, reading was neither a private nor a passive affair at this time. It was 'a process not only of reception but of appropriation', and this interaction between author, text and reader must be acknowledged.¹² The historian Andrew Cambers studies this interaction in more detail in his *Godly Reading*, which examines the interweaving of reading and the puritan religious culture in the seventeenth century. He notes the importance of similar source interpretations to the puritan religious culture, which did not necessarily reflect the intended interpretations of authors and printers.¹³

Such divergent interpretive strategies complicated the debate over the national universal church. This intensified the confusion and uncertainty of many English laypeople regarding religion. Both sides were aware of this, and seemed to follow Jewel's example in aiming to convince the waverers and the weary through polemic. As Arnold Hunt points out, it is evident from the early days of the Challenge Sermon that Jewel's strategy of allowing the audience to judge for themselves showed an awareness of the mixed nature of his audience. Jewel, unlike John Foxe, did not preach exclusively to a Protestant audience, but aimed to persuade a far more comprehensive group.¹⁴ This group was made up of rich and poor, educated and uneducated, conformable and hostile.

This concern for a mixed audience can also be seen in the work of both the conformists and their opponents. One of the puritans, Laurence Chaderton, said in a 1584 sermon that just as St Paul had spoken to all levels of society, so the message he himself provided was for everyone, 'whether you be pastors or teachers, elders, deacons... fathers, children, masters, [or] servants'.¹⁵ Similarly, conformists Richard Bancroft and William Fulke addressed their work to the whole population: Bancroft

¹¹ Stanley Fish, *Is There A Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 14.

¹² William H. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995), 54, 59.

¹³ Andrew Cambers, *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 31, 33-34.

¹⁴ Arnold Hunt, 'Preaching the Elizabethan Settlement,' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough et al (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 381.

¹⁵ Laurence Chaderton, *A fruitfull sermon, vpon... the Epistle of S. Paule to the Romanes* (London, 1584), 8.

specified that he spoke to both clergy and laity, and Fulke offered his work to anyone who might be deceived by false religion.¹⁶

Both conformists and puritans used many of the same strategies for influencing this audience as did the gossellers and Louvainists before them; strategies which arose out of the humanist education in rhetoric that continued to be part of university education. This included challenging their opponents, addressing the reader directly, and using emotional appeal. Because the use of these strategies has already been discussed in previous chapters, these next sections will focus on their effectiveness instead, by examining their purpose and addressing the question of impact.

Readers and Listeners

The intention of this chapter is to study Jewel's reception and significance. The first step, then, is to study the response which Jewel's work evoked, keeping in mind the mixed audience mentioned above. For the sake of clarity, this study will divide that audience into two parts: the clerics and the laity. There is very little scholarship on the response of these two groups to Jewel's work; even historians of the book have not yet studied the texts of the Jewel-Harding controversy. Arnold Hunt is one of the few who considers it. He touches on reception when studying the controversy's sermon support, but he does not study it in detail.¹⁷ Nor does Alexandra Walsham, who looks at the reception of Jewel's Challenge Sermon mostly by referring to other participants in the controversy. Her discussion of the wider circle of readers suggests that they were passive in the whole process; she says that they seemed to be 'merely eavesdroppers on a private shouting match conducted with the aid of megaphones from opposite sides of the channel'.¹⁸ This chapter will challenge this image, in part by taking a fresh approach to the Jewel-Harding controversy.

Many scholars look at Jewel's work from a theological perspective, rather than a historical one. They interpret Jewel's championing of the church as purely academic, which leads to an assumption that Jewel's influence was limited to the small group of divines who could appreciate the elegance of his apologetics. While

¹⁶ Richard Bancroft, *A suruay of the pretended holy discipline* (London, 1593), *2v; William Fulke, *Two treatises written against the papistes* (London, 1577), *2v.

¹⁷ Hunt, 'Preaching the Elizabethan Settlement,' 375.

¹⁸ Alexandra Walsham, 'The Spider and the Bee: The Perils of Printing for Refutation in Tudor England,' in *Tudor Books and Readers*, edited by John N. King (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 170.

is true that a major part of Jewel's audience were clerics, such a perspective does not consider Jewel's busy life as a tireless and energetic leader. Jewel was an active champion, not a figurehead. He was fully engaged in the defence of the church. Thus, Jewel's popularity among the clergy did not mean that his influence ended there. Rather, it began there. The upcoming section will discuss how Jewel's clerical audience provided multiple opportunities for his work to influence more people, because the divines' use of his work in their sermons and publications took it further than he could have taken it alone. Philip Hughes notes that the entire religious settlement was disseminated in such a way, being 'introduced to the country through the agency of a very small handful of clerics'.¹⁹

Such support was vital for Jewel's success, partly because the laity was not an easy audience to convince. This was not due to passivity on their part: as Patrick McGrath phrased it, in Elizabeth's England 'there existed an increasingly educated and self-conscious laity very ready to criticize defects in its ministers and determined to keep the church in its proper place'.²⁰ Ashley Null, in his recent study of the *Book of Homilies*, discusses differences between the Edwardian and Elizabethan audiences in more detail. He suggests that the Edwardian book succeeded in making people question the Roman Church, while the Elizabethan book focused on convincing people of the legitimacy of the Protestant Church of England. This task was made more difficult because of the Elizabethan emphasis on the value of individual conscience.²¹ Laymen felt more responsible for their own salvation, and thus responded critically to polemic instead of accepting particular points of view without question. This pushed polemicists into further discussion and altered the self-definition of the Church of England.

The following two sections will use a variety of sources, including sermons, treatises, tracts, epitaphs, letters, poetry, and parliamentary speeches, to show the great influence that Jewel, his allies and his opponents had on the Elizabethan concept of the church. They will both examine how far Jewel's re-definition of the 'catholic' church penetrated into English society, in a way that is similar to the approach of Alexandra Halasz in her book *Marketplace of Print*. She studies the pamphlets of the sixteenth century as 'a means of producing, disseminating, and mediating discourse independent of the sites and practices associated with and

¹⁹ Hughes, *Reformation in England* III, preface.

²⁰ Patrick McGrath, *Papists and Puritans Under Elizabeth I* (London: Blandford Press, 1967), 20.

²¹ Ashley Null, 'The Tudor *Book of Homilies*,' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough et al (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 363.

sanctioned by university, crown and church'.²² This chapter will also examine discourses that took place beyond the confines of royally sanctioned publications, which have been the focus heretofore. Although official responses to challenges to the church will be studied, such as those of John Whitgift and Thomas Cooper, so will such popular and unsanctioned works as the Marprelate tracts and the *Admonition to Parliament*.

After the discussion of reception, two sections will study the significance of Jewel and his re-definition of the universal church. Each will cover one time period, following the example of John Marshall's study of Richard Hooker. Marshall also divides Elizabethan reform into two parts: an earlier, defensive period, led by its 'chief architects' Jewel and John Whitgift; and a latter period, which Marshall sees as more constructive, led by Hooker, who 'built the cathedral-like structure of Elizabethan theology'.²³ Marshall's focus, however, seems to gloss over the greater part of the 1580s and 1590s. He also goes beyond the Elizabethan period, which this chapter will not, due to the difference in church leadership that emerged after the accession of James VI and I. James had a different idea of the royal supremacy than Elizabeth had, and that resulted in a further re-definition of the universal church that is beyond the scope of a single chapter. Thus, the dividing point for this chapter will be 1571, in order to fully explore the first years of the puritans, and the end point will be 1599, the year of Andrew Willet's response to Richard Hooker.

The first section, covering 1559-1571, will show Jewel and his fellow leaders of the Church of England in their role as the challengers to ecclesiastical authority. Elizabeth's first decade found them facing charges of novelty and questions about whether or not they were a legitimate church, and they responded by making their enemies face the same charges and questions. This had a twofold effect on many members of their audience. First, a long-standing distrust of the papacy rapidly solidified. As Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie have argued, Catholic and Protestant identities divided into 'clear, entrenched and mutually antagonistic camps' in the 1560s.²⁴ This antagonism extended into the later years of Elizabeth's reign, when both conformists and puritans identified with Protestantism in opposition to popery. Both sides looked back to the anti-Roman polemic of Jewel and Foxe and found

²² Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 3.

²³ John Marshall, *Hooker and the Anglican Tradition* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1963), 1.

²⁴ Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, 'Introduction,' in *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, edited by Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 6.

there common ground.²⁵ Wherever else they might disagree, they were unified in their hatred of popery.

Secondly, this hatred was often accompanied by the development of strong ties to the royal supremacy and the core doctrine of the English Church. Many people accepted Jewel's *Apology* and his defences of it as legitimate and authoritative representations of their beliefs. As Philip Hughes notes, the *Apology* became 'the pattern in all the party warfare for generations...the main source when men less learned [than Jewel] drew what argumentation or evidence they offered in disproof of the Catholic claims'.²⁶ The points of debate during these years, such as the crucifix and vestarian controversies, need to be seen in this context. Jewel provided a direction for the leaders of the church, and kept them focused on their main enemy, the Roman Church. Although there were still several internal conflicts within the church and its leadership during this time period, they were of short duration and small scale. This suggests that the majority of church leaders saw their external enemy as the greater problem.

The second section begins in 1572 and ends in 1599. During this time period, after the puritans' renewed efforts to force further reform in the 1571 Parliament, the leaders of the Church of England became the challenged ecclesiastical authority. Internal conflict between church members became as great a threat as external conflict, and the growing length and scope of polemic regarding the issues of church government and leadership reflect that change. At this point, Jewel's reputation became equally as authoritative as his works. His arguments regarding the royal supremacy and the episcopacy were taken out of their original context, and his work was used to discredit various questionable sources by both puritans and conformists. By the 1580s, however, the division between these two groups grew so wide that Jewel could not span the gap. Puritans occasionally referred to Jewel in his role as a historian of the early church, but they no longer accepted his interpretation of church doctrine. From that point, Jewel was used exclusively to defend the established church. The conformists consistently set him up as an ally, even in circumstances that made it difficult to identify who was the adversary.

²⁵ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England 1547-1603* (London: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1990), 78.

²⁶ Hughes, *Reformation in England III*, 97.

The Polarization of the Faith

As has been seen in the last two chapters, both the Louvainists and the gossellers used various methods to engage their audiences. We have also seen that they approached their audiences with very different points of view, which were influenced by how they defined the universal church. The Louvainists looked at their audience as a group of people who needed to return to the institution of the universal church, and submit to its authority, in order to be saved. John Rastell was typical of the Louvainists in that he emphasized uniformity, not unity, in his description of a true church. Also, he determined that people were either within the church, and therefore holy, or outside of the church and unholy.²⁷ This sort of polarized definition of the universal church parallels those of the French polemicists studied by Luc Racaut in *Hatred in Print*. Racaut suggests that Catholic authors polarized the issues in an attempt to convince their audience to ‘stay in the bosom of the Roman ... Church and close the dangerous debate initiated by the reformers’.²⁸

The English gossellers also employed this sort of polarization, but their poles were different. They saw their audience as people who needed to join the congregation of the universal church, and become one with the body of Christ, in order to be saved. For example, in Thomas Cooper’s 1562 contribution to the Jewel-Harding controversy, he established scripture as the ultimate authority for the universal church and rejected the authority of the Roman Church, creating a clear division between ally and adversary.²⁹ To Cooper, the name ‘Catholic Church’ did not a ‘catholic’ church make. Instead, the ‘catholic’ church was a ‘society of a company or multitude, which, by certain laws and covenants, are all partakers of one thing’. Cooper claimed that ‘all Christian men have a certain society or conjunction, which consists in this, that they are all partakers of one salvation, and all members of one mystical body, the head whereof is Christ Jesus’.³⁰

Such polarization was maintained in later Elizabethan debates about the national universal church. Both sides aimed to push their adversaries to an unbalanced and therefore immoderate position, even if it meant what Anthony Milton calls ‘the manipulation and assimilation of the opponent’s position into an

²⁷ John Rastell, *A replie against an answer* (Antwerp, 1565), 190-190v.

²⁸ Luc Racaut, *Hatred in Print: Catholic Propaganda and Protestant Identity During the French Wars of Religion* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2002), 46.

²⁹ Thomas Cooper, *An answer to an apologie of priuate masse* (London, 1562), 58v-59.

³⁰ Cooper, *Answer to an apologie of priuate masse*, 47v.

anti-type of either popery or puritanism'.³¹ The conformists mainly focused on defining the universal church in terms of church government and leadership, in opposition to the puritans' attempt to reform further the structure of the church. One definition that is representative of a conformist point of view came from William Fulke in 1579.

The universal church is a spiritual collection, of many members into one body, whereof Christ is the only head, both in heaven and earth... The unity hereof is maintained by following the direction of his word, and his Holy Spirit. The order of particular churches is maintained by the several government of them. But their whole church, although it be like an army of men well set in array, yet can it have no one chief Captain in earth to direct it, but he that is omnipotent, and sitteth in heaven, not only to overlook it, but to rule and order it. For no mortal man can look into all places, know all cases, provide against all mischiefs, nor give aid in all dangers.³²

There are several aspects to this definition that show how the concept of the national universal church changed after the Jewel-Harding controversy. It emphasizes the importance of unity in the universal church, an idea which became more and more important as the divisions between conformists and the puritans widened. It shows more clearly a visible and invisible aspect of the church, through its distinction between the 'spiritual collection' and particular physical churches. It also reaffirms the rejection of the papacy and any other single head of the universal church, but still allows particular 'orders' within the universal church to have their own government.

This could suggest a leaning toward self-government for individual churches, especially when Fulke's early years as a puritan are taken into consideration. However, by the 1570s, Fulke openly supported the legitimacy of national churches that were led by temporal leaders who could preserve good order. He claimed that 'the union and communion of our church with other particular churches of God throughout the world is spiritual, made by the workings of the Holy Ghost', and that the true English Church was 'honoured and nourished by the kings whom she honours as supreme governors, heads, or rulers thereof'.³³ This point of view parallels Jewel's portrayal of the Church of England as both universal and national, but Fulke takes it further than Jewel did by making his claims more overt. In

³¹ Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought: 1600-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 4.

³² William Fulke, *D. Heskins, D. Sanders, and M. Rastel...ouerthrowne* (London, 1579), 538.

³³ Fulke, *D Heskins...Overthrowne*, 566,569.

contrast to Jewel, Fulke did not attempt to let the audience draw their own conclusions, but simply stated what he saw as fact.

While the original polemicists in the Jewel-Harding controversy discussed the universal church in order to contrast between false and true churches, later defenders such as Fulke discussed the universal church in order to justify the existence of a national church, and argue against its dissolution into independent godly communities. Richard Bancroft, in a sermon preached in 1588, stated that the challengers to the established church, the puritans, had departed from ‘the congregations of the faithful’ that made up the Church of England because they considered those congregations ungodly. In that, they were in error. The Church of England had maintained the faith of Christ, formed correct doctrine and established the right uses of the sacrament. That made the Church of England ‘the mother of the faithful, the house of God, the Ark of Noah, the pillar of truth, and the spouse of Christ’.³⁴

Similarly, John Bridges wrote in defence of the government of the Church of England in 1587, hoping to end dissention and inspire ‘unfeigned love and reverence’ for God’s church. Bridges attacked several of the puritans’ arguments, but the central one was that of the authority of the church. He insisted that the Church of England was a part of the church universal, a true particular church, and derived its authority from that. In contrast, those who dissented from the Church of England were ‘neither the church universal, nor the whole state of the particular Church of England, but private members in the Church of England’. Thus, even though there might be enough of them to make up a few congregations, ‘yet are they not of sufficient authority...to collect themselves, or have any authority of making any assemblings’.³⁵

One way that many conformists gave authority to their definition of the ‘catholic’ church was through their interpretation of the Creed. In response to Romanist claims that the Creed demands belief in the Catholic Church, they emphasized the importance of individual faith for true catholicity. Thomas Cooper, Robert Horne and William Fulke all argued that the phrase ‘we believe in the one holy, catholic and apostolic church’ must be considered in light of the phrase that follows: ‘the communion of saints’. Fulke argued that the Catholic Church was just

³⁴ Richard Bancroft, *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse the 9 of February* (London, 1588), 11-12.

³⁵ John Bridges, *A defence of the gouernment established in the Church of Englande for ecclesiasticall matters* (London, 1587), 662-663.

catholic in the sense of being everywhere, whereas the ‘catholic’ church of the Creed was ‘not only of unity but of universality...catholic in all the parts of it being knit in one’.³⁶ Horne went so far as to say that the phrase ‘the communion of saints’ was put there specifically to clarify what was meant by ‘catholic’.³⁷ This picks up the argument of Peter Martyr first discussed in chapter two: Martyr included the ‘communion of saints’ in the definition of the true universal church because of the importance of the gathering of people to the right use of the Eucharist. Jewel also connected the universal church to the communion of saints, and he showed similar respect for the Creed. He actually went so far as to structure part of his *Apology* like the Creed, with the same rhythm and the same pattern of declarations.³⁸ In his *Defence*, Jewel argued that the relevance of the Creed to the Church of England was further evidence of its legitimacy and catholicity.³⁹

In contrast, the puritans did not often use the term ‘universal church’, unless in connection with the papal supremacy. They also divided the visible and invisible church differently than did the conformists. This can be most clearly seen in Thomas Cartwright’s arguments against John Whitgift during the Admonition controversy. Whitgift said that someone who is a member of the invisible church could be a minister of the visible, and Cartwright disagreed because the members of the church triumphant could not be members of the church militant. The church triumphant was the invisible church, and the ‘true members of the visible church’ made one mystical body of Christ with them.⁴⁰ This left very little room for a legitimate national church that could be considered part of the invisible universal church. Cartwright only allowed for a visible church that was made up of people who had been called to be members of the invisible church.⁴¹ He did not acknowledge any possibility of welcoming all people into the visible church, which was something that Richard Hooker would later promote.

These opposing definitions of the universal church affected how all of these polemicists addressed their audience. As their predecessors had, they all referred to their readers directly, asking questions and appealing to both their emotions and their

³⁶ Cooper, *Answer to an apologie of priuate masse*, 90v; William Fulke, *A reioynder to Bristows replie in defence of Allens scroll of articles and booke of purgatorie* (London, 1581), 268.

³⁷ Robert Horne, *An answeare made by Rob. Bishophe of Wynchester, to a booke entituled, The declaration of suche scruples* (London, 1566), 99.

³⁸ John Ayre, ed, *Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury* vol 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1835), 58.

³⁹ John Jewel, *A defence of the Apologie of the Churche of Englande* (London, 1567), A2v, 83. For Peter Martyr’s views on the communion of saints, see chapter two.

⁴⁰ Thomas Cartwright, *The second replie of Thomas Cartwright* (England, 1575), CLXX – CLXXI.

⁴¹ Cartwright, *Second Replie*, CCXXIX.

good judgement. Heidi Brayman-Hackel suggests that this was an attempt to construct the ideal reader: authors hoped to develop a sympathetic audience by treating them like intelligent and objective people who possessed the positive traits of discernment, humility, honesty and a sense of honour.⁴² Jesse Lander, in contrast, considers it just part of the public nature of polemic. ‘A private polemic would be oxymoronic...[so there is] an orientation toward an indeterminate body of readers... a vast and potentially distant readership.’⁴³ The polemicists’ true motivation may lie somewhere in the middle of these two explanations.

We have seen that some very specific expectations for the audience lay underneath the ambiguity of the ‘dear reader’ device. These writers knew whom they wanted to convince. Lander denies that polemic aimed to convert ‘the object of attack’, stating that the goal was only ‘to convince a wider audience that the case is so’.⁴⁴ Peter Matheson, however, suggests that polemic had to have a dual purpose in order to be effective, so it was ‘directed not only at corrupt institutions and threadbare belief systems but at those who personified them, or even profited from them’.⁴⁵ Of the two, Matheson’s analysis better suits the debates over the universality of the Church of England. The re-definition of the term ‘catholic’ involved challenging and defending not only visible ecclesiastical institutions but also the men who represented them. Thus, this polemic did indeed have a dual purpose, one which was thoroughly interwoven with the polemicists’ attitude toward the nature of the invisible universal church. With that in mind, the next sections will examine how the audience that the polemicists expected to reach reacted to this polemic.

Response of the Divines

In *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England*, Michael Questier focuses on the means of conversion and the effectiveness of polemic after the Jewel-Harding controversy ended. Questier recognizes that the ‘theological definition of the church’ became the most important question to be answered for polemicists, especially after the mid-1570s. They agreed that the true church was ‘one, holy, catholic and apostolic’, but they did not agree about how their church best

⁴² Heidi Brayman-Hackel, *Reading Material in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 17, 116.

⁴³ Jesse Lander, *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print and Literary Culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 16.

⁴⁴ Lander, *Inventing Polemic*, 11-12.

⁴⁵ Peter Matheson, *The Rhetoric of the Reformation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 3.

represented that definition. Thus, they had to determine ways to fit their own idea of the church into those criteria and so guide ‘the undecided man towards a particular expression of the true church on earth’.⁴⁶

How successful they were is difficult to determine. There has been no comprehensive study of the sixteenth-century reception of Elizabethan polemic, especially in relation to Elizabethan concepts of the true universal church. What is needed is a study similar to that of Peter Burke in his *The Fortunes of the Courtier*. In this book, Burke examines the influence Castiglione’s *Courtier* had upon the wider culture of Europe. He approaches this examination through the point of view of textual communities, and determines that ‘it is necessary to study the ways in which the recipients interpreted what they saw, heard or read’ in order to see to what use readers put Castiglione’s book. Their perceptions and expectations were very much a part of how the book was received and what influence it had.⁴⁷

A similar examination for the Jewel-Harding controversy would help determine who accepted the re-definition of the universal church and how they applied it to the newly established Church of England, which would help explain the progress of reform after the Elizabethan settlement. This chapter begins such a study, by approaching the topic from the point of view of the communities, the texts they produced, and their reaction to them. It examines the purchase of the controversy texts and the use of Jewel in clerical publications and sermons. First, however, it studies the marginalia of extant works of the Jewel-Harding controversy, because marginalia can be an excellent indicator of reader reaction.

Of the 163 extant copies of the works of the controversy, I examined approximately half of them. Initial research into the marginalia showed that the majority of these books have been re-bound sometime after the sixteenth century. This meant that many of the notes written in sixteenth-century secretary hand have been cut off or mangled, making it difficult to examine the writers’ thoughts in any great detail. Of the surviving notes, most were biographical, regarding figures named in the work, or cross-references, which put the work in context with others. On one copy of Dering’s *A Sparing Restraint*, for example, the reader wrote ‘vid M Hooker’ next to a passage that claimed that the Church of England service is good

⁴⁶ Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion*, 23-24.

⁴⁷ Peter Burke, *The Fortunes of the Courtier* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press, 1996), 4-5.

and godly.⁴⁸ Also common were organizational marks used to help make particular passages easier to find, such as chapter headings or a makeshift index. One reader seemed to be trying to keep track of the various works of the controversy, and had a numbering system for them: on the title page of a 1568 copy of *A Sparing Restraint* was written ‘this answer is to the book 34.9’.⁴⁹ Such cross-referencing and organizational notes show that these books were read actively, that the readers evaluated and internalized what they read, and that they tried to study them in order.

It is not possible to know whether these notes were taken by clerics or laypeople. Many of the works came from bishops’ libraries, however, and a lot of the notes seem to be concerned about the authority of priests. This suggests that at least some of the readers were clerics, which is why they are discussed in this section rather than the next. They are particularly relevant because they show which aspects of the debate most concerned the readers. Consistently, the sections which were most heavily annotated were the anti-papal passages and arguments about the real presence. This suggests concern about the core claims of the Churches of England and Rome, and an active attempt to evaluate their views.

One of the most detailed examples can be found in a 1564 copy of *An Answer to Master Jewel’s Challenge*, by Thomas Harding. There were no overt statements that the notetaker was a member of the clergy, but the possibility is strong that he was, based on his knowledge of divinity and his grasp of Latin.⁵⁰ This is further supported by the detail with which he annotated sections about the role of clergy, especially in regards to the sacrament. He seemed to feel actively, almost personally, connected to the debate: he underlined a passage by Harding that disagreed with Jewel’s article rejecting the mass as a sacrifice, and wrote next to it: ‘I fear you will be blamed for so saying’.

The communion, and specifically the real presence, was one of the topics on which this notetaker spent a considerable amount of time and ink – not to mention humour. Next to a passage supporting communion in one kind, he wrote ‘that makes a dry feast!’, suggesting that he found the idea somewhat ridiculous.⁵¹ He also cross-referenced Harding’s claims about the real presence with other Romanist sources,

⁴⁸ Dering, *A sparing restraint, of many lauishe vnruthes* (London, 1568), 5 (Bodleian Library Tanner Shelfmark 255 (2)).

⁴⁹ Dering, *A Sparing Restraint*, title page (British Library Shelfmark C. 143.c.3).

⁵⁰ Harding, *An Answere to Maister Iuells Challenge* (Louvain, 1564), 40v-41. (Bodleian Library Shelfmark 4° H 45 Th). There is no proof that this reader was a male, either, but for the sake of simplicity I will use the pronoun ‘he’ anyway.

⁵¹ Harding, *An Answere* (Bodleian 4° H 45 Th), 173v-174, 40v-41.

making note that Harding's words were very similar to those of 'his master'. Who this master was is uncertain. However, another note mentioned Wykeham, the founder of New College, as a common source between Harding and his 'master', so the notetaker could have been referring to other members of Harding's college at Oxford.

He could also have been referring to Harding's sources. In another passage about the mass, the notetaker suggests that Harding might be forgiven for his errors, since he was basing them on the writings of the scholastic doctors. Evidently the notetaker considered corrupted sources an excuse for corrupted ideas, but only to a certain extent. It was still not acceptable to perpetuate such corruption, as could be seen when the notetaker rejected Harding's interpretation of the mass's role in salvation. He based his rejection on his own studies of the scholastic doctors, because he could not find where they had written anything that agreed with Harding on this point.⁵²

It must be said that many of the books were free from marginalia, which at first seemed to indicate that they had never been put to extensive use. There is another possibility, however: that notes were placed in commonplace notebooks instead of in the margins. William H. Sherman, in his work on the notation styles of Renaissance readers, suggests that by the end of the sixteenth century it had become common for students to take notes in bound or looseleaf notebooks.⁵³ These were often maintained as private documents, but the example of one such book that was published in 1581 suggests great possibilities for further study: John Merbecke's *A Book of Notes and Commonplaces*.

Merbecke, who was an organist and a chaplain, published his commonplace book with the intention of helping others understand the Bible. He addressed a wide variety of questions about the Christian faith, and frequently recorded not only an answer but common objections to his answer. Then he responded to those objections using both Biblical and contemporary sources. Jewel's work appeared regularly, answering such questions as whether the priest had the authority to absolve sins, what it meant to eat the body of Christ, and what made a martyr. It is evident that Merbecke read widely in Jewel's works, and based his own faith on the core beliefs

⁵² Harding, *An Answer* (Bodleian 4° H 45 Th), 173v-184.

⁵³ William H. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 7.

reflected in Jewel. This suggests that he both received and internalized Jewel's message.⁵⁴

From this (necessarily limited) study of marginalia, it is evident that Jewel was honoured as an authority on the church. Readers accepted his scholarship of the primitive apostolic church and his claim that the Church of England was the inheritor of that church. Further proof of his authority in religious matters can be found through an examination of some of the private libraries of the 1560s and 1570s, particularly the inventories of scholars at Oxford and Cambridge. In the mid-1570s, many young men at the universities died due to an epidemic, and their private libraries were itemized after their deaths. The records of these libraries show, first, that students of this time period had the opportunity and inclination to purchase far more books than their predecessors, since many of these young men had hundreds of books. Second, they show that owning Jewel's works was popular with the divinity students.

The most popular work for divinity students to have was the *Apology*, closely followed by the *Reply*. Several students had an assortment of Jewel's works, and a few of them also had copies of other works from the controversy. Notably, the most common were James Calhill's work against Martial's *The Treatise of the Cross*, and Nowell's *Reproof* against Thomas Dorman.⁵⁵ These two divines were constantly preaching at Paul's Cross: Calhill had prefaced his work against Martial with a sermon that was, if not famous, at least notorious, and Nowell was well-known for his disastrous sermon before the queen which was mentioned in the previous chapter. That it was Nowell and Calhill's books that could be found most often in these libraries suggests a connection between the verbal aspects of the controversy and its written counterparts. Perhaps those books were purchased after the students had listened to Calhill or Nowell preach, or because they had heard about two men's sermons.

Two examples show that divinity students not only purchased Jewel's books, but read them. In 1578, the divinity student William Watkinson published a translation of the work of the German humanist theologian Johan Rivius. In his dedication, he rejected the Roman church's claim to be catholic, and claimed that 'we will never believe Antichrist, nor run to Rome...to inquire after our faith',

⁵⁴ John Merbecke, *A booke of notes and common places* (London, 1581), 59, 63, 168, 215, 228, 482.

⁵⁵ See: R.J. Fehrenbach and E.S. Leedham-Green, eds. *Private Libraries in Renaissance England* vol 4, 5. (Marlborough: Adam Matthew Publications, 1992).

because England had been brought out of such darkness by such great captains of the faith as John Jewel.⁵⁶ In 1592, the religious writer and clergyman Adam Hill was engaged in an argument with the exiled Scots presbyterian Alexander Hume, which centred around Christ's descent into hell. Hill justified his position by referring to his early years as a divinity student: 'indeed I was brought up under Bishop Jewel, who catechised me in this faith, and therefore I will not easily or rashly depart from it'.⁵⁷ This suggests that Jewel's influence with the younger generation of clerics may have been equally as intense as his influence with his fellow church leaders. This would explain, at least in part, why his works continued to be part of ecclesiastical culture so long after his death.

Marginalia and library inventories show how clerical readers absorbed and interpreted the works of the Jewel-Harding controversy. Published works show how they then attempted to convince others of the truth of their interpretations, which aligned with either the defenders of the Church of England or its challengers. In 1566, Robert Horne published *An Answer Made by Robert Bishop of Winchester*, in response to a book that Abbot John Feckenham wrote to justify his own refusal to swear the oath of supremacy. Horne defended the royal supremacy and the legitimacy of the oath, using all of his evidence to prove that Feckenham was in error and seditious. Although Horne never quoted Jewel or the other works of the gospellers as supportive evidence, it is clear nevertheless that Horne considered Jewel an authority on this issue. At the end of the work, Horne referred to a meal at his home with Feckenham that took place in 1565, where Feckenham 'railed' against Jewel and declared that he was unlearned and could not win against Harding. That outburst was the final straw for Horne: he put Feckenham under house restraint until he could be transferred to the Tower, taking Feckenham's rejection of Jewel as final damning proof that Feckenham was sunk deep in error and planned to subvert the power of the queen's majesty.⁵⁸

A further example can be provided by a mysterious publication of 1567. In that year, J. Sutton published *A New Revenge for an Old Grudge*, a single battered copy of which is available in the Lambeth Palace Library. J. Sutton's identity is not entirely clear, but he may have been the John Sutton who was listed as a rector of Oddington, Gloucestershire from 1561 to 1566. Sutton's work was sponsored by

⁵⁶ William Watkinson, *A notable discourse of the happinesse of this our age* (London, 1578), A4, B1.

⁵⁷ Adam Hill, *The defence of the article: Christ descended into Hell* (London, 1592), 69.

⁵⁸ Horne, *An answeare made by Rob. Bishophe of Wynchester*, 129.

Frances Coldocke, who also sponsored the printing of some commentaries and histories in the 1570s. It was printed by Henry Wykes, who also printed Jewel's *Defence and Reply*, suggesting that Coldocke (or possibly Sutton himself) had some small influence with London printers.

The *New Revenge for an Old Grudge* is a vehement diatribe against Thomas Harding. Sutton was disgusted not only by Harding's works but by Harding's recantation at the accession of Mary, because it meant that he had forgotten that he once wore Christ's badge and was 'clad in the glittering garment of the glorious gospel'. Mention of Jewel's recantation is conspicuous by its absence. Instead, Sutton praised Jewel as a champion appointed by the Lord of Hosts to defend his church and 'revenge the great blasphemy of this arrogant papist, [Harding]'. Significantly, Sutton pointed out that by defending the Roman Church, Harding was no longer a member of the apostolic church.⁵⁹ This suggests that Sutton had accepted Jewel's portrayal of the reformed English Church, to which Harding had once belonged, as the inheritor of the primitive church.

Other publications, such as sermons, show that Jewel himself became a symbol of a correct interpretation of the legitimacy of the church. In one such sermon from 1563, Bishop James Pilkington used Jewel to support his argument that the traditions of the Roman Church, especially the use of relics, had no foundation in the Christian faith. He referred first to the correspondence between Jewel and Dr Cole, where Jewel 'that learned father lays to their charge...that they have neither scripture, ancient writer, doctor nor general council to defend their doings'. Then he provided examples from 'good Cranmer' and other learned bishops as further proof.⁶⁰ This placed Jewel on par with earlier reformers and fathers of the Church of England, and showed that his authority as a learned divine had been accepted by his fellow clerics. It also suggests that Pilkington expected his audience to accept Jewel's authority as well. The next section will examine whether this was a reasonable expectation.

Response of the Laity

As we have seen, Jewel's Challenge Sermon caused a commotion. However, the credit for that cannot be given entirely to Jewel. As John Craig points out, the

⁵⁹ J. Sutton, *A newe reuenge for an olde grudge* (London, 1567), B1, B2v.

⁶⁰ James Pilkington, *The burnynge of Paules church in London* (London, 1563), C5v.

preacher and the laity were equally involved in the success of a sermon.⁶¹ Jewel himself was aware of this: he once commented that: ‘either the people judge too much of the preachers of God’s word, or else they judge too little...sometimes they credit them too much, sometime they believe them nothing at all. So are the people always inconstant; so are they moved on either side’.⁶² Arnold Hunt argues that this was not a complaint on Jewel’s part but a comment on the ‘complex and unpredictable nature of popular allegiance’. It showed Jewel’s awareness of his lay audience, which inspired his strategy of persuasion that presented both opposing arguments, ‘inviting his audience to choose between them’.⁶³

Evidently, the audience engaged with this choice, since they met the resulting controversy with enthusiasm. It became common among Elizabethan preachers to expect their audience to be aware of the works of this controversy, and not only the gossellers’ part. As Hunt has noted, preachers also ‘took it for granted that many members of their audience would be familiar with the latest Catholic publications’.⁶⁴ Considering the complexity of these publications, it is certainly a sign of the controversy’s popularity that the clergy felt that they could make such an assumption. A.C. Southern calls that popularity nothing short of remarkable, especially since the custom of printing all of the opponent’s book with the response to it resulted in massive tomes that would have been expensive and cumbersome.⁶⁵ Nonetheless, the works were printed, and on a large scale. Cardinal William Allen once guessed that 20,000 copies of the Louvainists’ works were smuggled into England.⁶⁶ That seems like a reasonable number, considering how many different works were published by the Louvainists and the size of the average print run, and yet it still only represented one half of the controversy.

Religious works made up approximately half of a printer’s trade in Elizabethan England, illustrating their significance in sixteenth-century literary culture.⁶⁷ It also supports the argument for the popularity of the works of the Jewel-Harding controversy, because with a plethora of religious works available for publication, the Jewel-Harding works continued to be printed. As Jesse Lander

⁶¹ John Craig, ‘Sermon Reception,’ in *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough et al (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 180.

⁶² John Ayre, ed, *Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury* vol 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1835), 1047.

⁶³ Hunt, ‘Preaching the Elizabethan Settlement,’ 367, 371.

⁶⁴ Hunt, ‘Preaching the Elizabethan Settlement,’ 375.

⁶⁵ A.C. Southern, *Elizabethan Recusant Prose, 1559-1582* (London: Sands and Co, 1950), 43.

⁶⁶ Marvin O’Connell, *The Counter Reformation* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1974), 235.

⁶⁷ H.S. Bennett, *English Books and Readers 1558-1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 112.

notes, printers had to be able to anticipate the market in order to stay in business; even a limited print run required an investment of capital, which would have been made cautiously.⁶⁸ The Jewel-Harding controversy was the first of its kind to receive this investment of capital, but it was not the last. Patrick Collinson notes that the later Elizabethan presses saw an entire generation of controversies being published, both those between Catholics and Protestants and those amongst the Protestants themselves.⁶⁹

Jewel's works were given further significance when the *Defence of the Apology* became one of the four religious works ordered to be placed in parish churches so that they would be available for everyone, including the laity. These 'four chained books' were studied by Henry Cowell in a work published in 1938 to celebrate the four hundredth anniversary of the Great Bible. Cowell claimed that the significance of the *Defence* being placed in the churches is that it was a justification of the form of English religion. It answered the Roman charges that the English were heretics and schismatics and that they had separated from the faith, which was influential in 'settling the Protestantism of England'.⁷⁰ Similarly, Alexandra Walsham sees this placement as proof that Jewel's work was treated as the 'bulwark of the legitimacy of the established church', and an effective defence against Roman detractors.⁷¹

This may have been the motivation behind the placement of the *Defence*, but further study is needed on the question of whether or not the *Defence* was actually purchased by parishes, and whether or not the *Defence* was the only copy of Jewel's works found in parish churches at this time. John Craig found that there was a copy of the *Apology* and the *Defence* in Mildenhall parish by 1578, and Robert Whiting reports a copy of the *Apology* in the Devon parish of Alphington by 1567.⁷² However, an examination of approximately forty printed churchwardens' accounts does not record any specific purchases of Jewel's works between 1560 and 1599. At least sixteen of these accounts did not cover those years, and the rest of them proved

⁶⁸ Lander, *Inventing Polemic*, 15-16.

⁶⁹ Patrick Collinson et al, 'Religious Publishing in England 1557-1640,' in *History of the Book in Britain* vol 4, edited by John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 35.

⁷⁰ Henry J. Cowell, *The Four Chained Books: Being the Story of the Four Books Ordered to be Set Up in the Parish Churches of England* (London: The Kingsgate Press, 1938), 32-33.

⁷¹ Walsham, 'Spider and the Bee,' 172.

⁷² John Craig, *Reformation, Politics and Polemics: The Growth of Protestantism in East Anglian Market Towns* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001), 53; Robert Whiting, *The Blind Devotion of the People: Popular Religion and the English Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 189.

very vague in their descriptions. Parishes did frequently record the purchase of ‘a book’ or ‘two books’ for the church, which were listed separately from any purchase of service books or sermon collections. The titles are rarely included, but there are occasional hints that the books may have been Jewel’s when the accounts point out that the books were ones that they were required to buy.⁷³ St Mary’s Cambridge, for example, recorded that the church purchased ‘the bishop’s book’ in 1572, the year that Jewel’s *Defence* was supposed to be purchased by parishes. However, the account does not specify which bishop or what book.⁷⁴

One book is frequently recorded as being purchased by parishes very soon after it was published: the 1563 *Book of Homilies*. Whether or not they had access to Jewel’s polemical works, the laity of the parishes could have become familiar with Jewel as a religious authority through the *Homilies*, since he was the general editor and a contributing author. As John P.D. Cooper argues, the *Homilies* were a central feature of English parish religion, used as royal propaganda that ‘was directed at a mass audience’.⁷⁵ It is not clear whether or not people would have been aware of Jewel’s authorship, but the involvement of Jewel in the *Book of Homilies* suggests that there is further progress to make in this area of inquiry.

It is not as easy to track the laity’s response to Jewel through published works as it is to track the response of the divines, since there are far fewer sources. However, what sources there are can provide considerable insight into how the laity interpreted Jewel and attempted to convert others to those interpretations. As with the clergy, Jewel was generally perceived as victorious, and his victory was the inspiration for laypeople’s participation in the campaign against both papist and puritan enemies of the church. The poet Richard Robinson, who worked for the Earl of Shrewsbury during the years that the earl acted as guardian for Mary Queen of Scots, published a poem in 1574 as a contribution to the anti-Catholic polemic of the day. That poem described various events that Robinson felt were proof that the Roman church would one day be defeated, and one of them was the Jewel-Harding controversy.

A Jewel of Christ Jesus gave Harding the blows,
Confuting his fables in spite of his teeth,
He feeds the poor flock with Christian belief.

⁷³ For example, Henry James Fowle Swayne, ed, *Churchwardens’ Accounts of St Edmund and St Thomas, Sarum* (Salisbury: Printed by Bennet Brothers, 1896), 109.

⁷⁴ J.E. Foster, ed, *Churchwardens’ Accounts of St Mary the Great Cambridge* (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co, 1905), 177.

⁷⁵ John P.D. Cooper, *Propaganda and the Tudor State* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003), 221.

Squenched is the confidence I say of our Harding,
There's none young nor old that esteems him a farthing.⁷⁶

Robinson's poetical skill is not particularly impressive, but his estimation of Jewel is clear. He suggested that Harding had lost all credibility, and that Jewel's works had effectively converted 'the poor flock'. Not all of the laity were so confident that the battle was already won, however. In 1570, William How published a document 'for Dionis Emilie'. How was a publisher of small works, usually on behalf of individuals rather than for the crown or the church. He did mostly ballad-sheets and interludes, with some cookery books and one translation of Beza, again published for an individual. Dionis Emilie, or Dennis Emsley as he is most often called, seems to have been a man who published his will, to make sure that his intentions for his money were followed.

There is very little information about Emsley: he does not have an entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, and he did not author any other documents in the sixteenth century. He was mentioned in Lawrence Ryan's 1953 article regarding the controversy between the reformer Walter Haddon and the Portuguese priest Jerome Osorius, but Ryan did not discuss Emsley's identity. He did refer to the document as Emsley's book, not his will, which suggests that the structure of the work was for rhetorical purposes, and it was not representative of an actual will. Aside from that reference, Ryan's only comment about Emsley is that Emsley's effort contributed little to the Haddon-Osorius controversy.⁷⁷

Fortunately, for our present purposes Emsley's effort contributes rather more, due to Emsley's motivation for writing. He stated that he planned to give a large portion of his money toward the cause of educating people in the faith of the Church of England. This decision was inspired by the Jewel-Harding debate: Emsley wanted to educate people so that he could prove false what Harding had said about the neglected moral and religious life of the English. He showed himself an advocate of Jewel by connecting the church with the commonwealth and the royal supremacy, claiming that the Roman Church brought in novelties, not the Church of England, and referring to the members of the English Church as Protestants.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ Richard Robinson, *The rewarde of wickednesse* (London, 1574), N3.

⁷⁷ Lawrence Ryan, 'The Haddon-Osorio Controversy (1563-1583),' *Church History* vol 22, no 2 (1953), 151.

⁷⁸ Emsley, Dennis. *An answer in action to a Portingale pearle, called a pearle for a prince Geuen by a laye man in a legacie, which legacie he desireth to se executed before his death* (London, 1570), B1, B4v.

Emsley was passionately supportive of Jewel's point of view, and accepted Jewel's authority as a defender of the Church of England.

The greatest example of the influence of the Jewel-Harding controversy over the laypeople occurred during the one major Romanist reaction of Elizabeth's reign, the Northern Rebellion. This rebellion was led by the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland, who were motivated to do so by many factors. Krista Kesselring notes that 'economic grievances and a sense of diminishing power cannot be separated from their commitment to Catholicism...for Northumberland and his fellows, attacks on the old faith and the old ways were part and parcel of the same problem'.⁷⁹ Essentially, their religious motivation was as important as any other, and the events of the rebellion must be considered in that light.

The rebellion began on November 14, 1569, when the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland took over Durham Cathedral. They destroyed the communion table, set up an altar and celebrated mass, and were reconciled to Rome when the priest William Holmes pronounced a *forma absolutionis* in Latin to the congregation, in the name of Christ and the pope.⁸⁰ All the Protestant books that the rebels considered representative of the religion they had rejected were burned, which included Jewel's *Apology* and the second *Book of Homilies*.⁸¹ The crown responded to this uprising quickly, and after peace had been restored Northumberland confessed that the works of Thomas Harding and the other Louvainists influenced his decision to rebel.⁸² They had helped him to see that the Protestants 'misconstrue the word of God, and abuse and falsify the ancient writers'.⁸³ This suggests that the controversy was indeed persuasive, and influenced people from several levels of the social hierarchy.

Jewel's role in the official response to the Northern Rebellion was, once again, that of champion. By that time, his *Apology*, *Reply*, and *Defence* had become central to the definition of the national universal church, which may well be why Jewel was chosen to preach the sermon at the celebrations when the Northern Rebellion was put down. He chose for his text Joshua 6, which describes the fall of

⁷⁹ Krista Kesselring, *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics and Protest in Elizabethan England* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), 8-9.

⁸⁰ Christopher Haigh, 'The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation,' in *The English Reformation Revised*, edited by Christopher Haigh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 185.

⁸¹ Hughes, *Reformation in England* III, 269.

⁸² Christopher Highley, *Catholics Writing the Nation in Early Modern Britain and Ireland*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 49.

⁸³ Kesselring, *Northern Rebellion*, 53.

Jericho. William Haller claimed that the choice of this text shows that Jewel was the master of ‘bringing biblical legend to bear upon the spiritual exigencies of national life’.⁸⁴ This is a similar argument to that of Rosemary O’Day, who suggests that this choice of text provided fodder for the portrayal of the Church of England as the church of God’s chosen people. After this sermon, ‘there was no doubt that God was English, or that Elizabeth was identified with the cause of Protestantism in Protestant minds’.⁸⁵ Such an identification also strongly contrasted their national universal church with the Roman Church, further encouraging a sense of unity amongst members of the English Church.

Jewel used the text to parallel the people of England with the brave band of Israelites who conquered an enemy, and promoted ‘comeliness and good order’ in England by discussing what the Israelites took out of Jericho and their methods of retrieval. He also acknowledged that people were uncertain as to which religion was the right one, and reassured them by returning once again to the theme of the true church. They could know which was the true church of Christ through reading the scriptures and seeing how the Church of England conformed to the primitive church, and they could be grateful that God had sent them ‘his handmaid’ to guide them.⁸⁶ Jewel’s use of this term was significant: he referred to Elizabeth using a image that she often presented, and did so in a way that showed that he assumed his audience would understand the analogy.

In this sermon, Jewel presented himself as a messenger for God, just as he had during the Challenge Sermon ten years before. He also spoke without recourse to complicated patristic sources or the opposing views of reformers. This shows that he was aware of his audience and deliberately seeking to connect to them, and the response to this and his other sermons seem to have been positive. John Garbrande, who was one of Jewel’s protégés at Oxford before he became a prebend of Salisbury cathedral, later recorded that this sermon, as well as several others, was heard ‘in good attention’, and that Jewel’s listeners accepted that he spoke ‘uprightly and with good zeal...like a wise builder of the house of God’.⁸⁷

Soon after the rebellion, Pope Pius V issued the bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, which excommunicated Elizabeth and released English Catholics from obedience to

⁸⁴ William Haller, *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963), 98.

⁸⁵ Rosemary O’Day, *The Debate on the English Reformation* (London: Methuen, 1986), 22.

⁸⁶ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 2, 985.

⁸⁷ John Jewel, *Certaine sermons preached before the Queenes Maiestie, and at Paules crosse, by the reuerend father Iohn Jewel late Bishop of Salisburie* (London, 1583), ¶4v.

her. This resonated on several levels in Elizabethan society, not the least of which was in the definition of the national universal church. Grindal, Cox and Jewel were asked to respond in print, which shows how these men had become authorities of the faith in their country. Interestingly enough, they suggested that a more famous reformer, with the weight of the continental reformation behind him, might be the wiser choice. This emphasizes their connection to the continental Protestants and shows how they felt about the catholicity of the Church of England. It also shows that they acknowledged how great an effect this papal bull might have on the laity. Thus, although Jewel did preach against the bull, Heinrich Bullinger was given the task of responding in print. His translated work was published in England in 1572.

Bullinger has been overlooked in many studies of the influence of continental reformers on the English Reformation. Cornelius Venema, in his examination of Bullinger's work on predestination, does not mention his connection to the English Church at all. Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi's study of Bullinger as an 'architect of reformation' is also surprisingly silent on this issue. Perhaps most surprisingly, Mark Taplin has little to say, even though he discusses the importance of catholicity to Bullinger, and how Bullinger used the catholicity of the Reformed faith to distance the Zurich church from the taint of Anabaptism.⁸⁸ Eleanor Rosenberg is one of the few who sees the significance in the request for Bullinger to answer the papal bull. She suggests that Bullinger 'intended to persuade readers that the reformed faiths were united in support of Elizabeth and against Roman Catholicism, and at the same time to draw English Protestants closer to the churches of Switzerland'.⁸⁹

As Rosenberg notes, it is in the dedication that the significance of this event is revealed. Bullinger emphasized the connection between the Church of England and the continental reformers, claiming that former Marian exiles like Cox, Grindal and Jewel 'maintain, preserve, yea and by daily increasing, more and more advance the friendship and brotherhood long ago begun between us'. He also sent greetings to all the former exiles, and offered the support of his colleagues: 'all the ministers and brethren that be here, wish all prosperity to you all, in our Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord Jesus bless the ministry of your good lordships, and preserve you from all evil'.⁹⁰ This expression of solidarity was very important for the defenders of the

⁸⁸ Mark Taplin, *The Italian Reformers and the Zurich Church 1540-1620* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2003), 298.

⁸⁹ Eleanor Rosenberg, *Leicester, Patron of Letters* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), 213.

⁹⁰ Heinrich Bullinger, *A confutation of the Popes bull* (London, 1572), A1-A1v.

national universal church. It contrasted their unity with the uniformity of the Roman Church, and provided additional proof of the Church of England's inclusion in the universal church. Its timing was also important: by the time the work was translated into English, the puritans had begun a new assault on the structure of the Church of England. As the next sections will show, support for the church's catholicity was badly needed.

Internal Conflicts 1559-1571

The evidence thus far shows that both clerics and laypeople received and internalized the message of the Jewel-Harding controversy. This next section will begin to discuss the significance of the controversy, especially in connection to the definition of the national universal church. It shows that this definition was at first quite tentative, because during the 1560s the gossellers of the Jewel-Harding controversy were defending a church that they were still in the process of defining. They were the challengers of a larger authority in the form of the Roman Church, and as part of their challenge to papal authority they supported the authority of the monarch as the Supreme Governor of the Church of England. Their adversarial mentality marked out quite clearly the lines between 'us' and 'them' regarding this issue, with the Roman Church set firmly opposite. However, almost immediately after this was established, internal conflicts arose that forced them to define this concept further, and Jewel's expertise on the nature of the primitive church and its leadership came into play.

This can be seen first during the crucifix controversy of 1560. Much of this controversy is now shrouded in mystery, since there are several large gaps in the records, but the basic debate was whether or not the supreme governor of the church could retain a crucifix in her own chapel, and yet have them removed from all the churches in the kingdom. This debate has already been discussed to some extent in previous chapters, because it inspired part of the exchange between John Martial and James Calphill. However, a different aspect of this controversy is important in this section: the beginnings of division amongst the leaders of the church. Elizabeth clashed with her bishops over the issue, and for several months it seemed possible that this 'ill-omened silver cross', as Jewel called it, would result in episcopal resignations or dismissals. He was astonished at the levels of dissent displayed,

suggesting in a letter to Peter Martyr that some of the bishops were taking things too far.⁹¹

In February 1560, the bishops participated in a disputation over the issue, with Jewel and Edmund Grindal arguing for the removal of the crucifix against Matthew Parker and Richard Cox. Less than a month later, the conflict was over and the bishops were once again focused on the fight with the papal church. Despite the passion that so surprised Jewel, and the worried letters several divines sent requesting advice from foreign reformers such as Martyr and Gwalter, the dissent was brought under control with relative ease and quickness. Jewel seemed content with the result, writing calmly in a letter to Martyr soon after the controversy that ‘religion is now somewhat more established than it has been’.⁹²

To argue against the queen’s right to retain the crucifix could have resulted in a total loss of her favour for Jewel, but in fact it had the opposite effect. He was asked to preach his Challenge Sermon at court less than a month after the disputation ended, and soon after that that he was commissioned to write the *Apology*. It seems that Jewel had proven himself a learned divine who could be relied upon to safely represent the Church of England against any adversary. Even when he disagreed, his commitment to the royal supremacy meant that he would offer the support that the fledgling church needed, making him its preferred champion.

This reliability became part of the defence of the church in the second internal conflict of this time period, the vestarian controversy. As noted in chapter three, this controversy has received the lion’s share of attention in studies of the early Elizabethan church, so it is not necessary to go into the details of the debate. Suffice it to say that on this issue the bishops were far more divided than they had been in the matter of the chapel royal crucifix, making this the first time that the lines between ally and adversary blurred. Their divisions were not, however, as deep as they would be a decade later, and for this reason determining who was an ally was easier than it soon would be.

The first publication of the vestarian controversy, Robert Crowley’s *A Brief Discourse Against the Outward Apparel*, appeared in 1566. Crowley argued that the vestments caused the clergy to be ‘despised and brought into contempt’, and attempted to justify his refusal to wear the garments because of their connection to

⁹¹ Hastings Robinson, *The Zurich Letters* first series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842), 54, 67-69.

⁹² Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 71.

the pope's church, which he feared would encourage people to slide back into popery. Crowley used Jewel's work to support his point of view, arguing that: 'Bishop Jewel in his reply to Dr Harding...has these words: 'verily in the house of God, that thing is hurtful that does no good. All the ceremonies of the church ought to be clear and holy, and able to edify'''.⁹³ Crowley acknowledged that Jewel was referring to the sacrament in that passage, not the vestments or any other expectation for clergy, but he still used that passage to make the importance of edification a central part of his argument. Jewel, to Crowley, was enough of an authority to make the use of his work helpful for his own cause regardless of whether or not it was directly applicable. Jewel's work represented the Church of England, of which Crowley evidently considered himself to be a part despite his dissenting views.

Archbishop Matthew Parker responded to this discourse himself, publishing *A Brief Examination for the Time* in the same year. He put distance between the leaders of the church and people of Crowley's opinion, claiming that the people who were against vestments were not among 'the sincere and learned protestants'.⁹⁴ This suggests that they were on the edge of acceptable behaviour; an edge that brought not only their learning and their faith into question but also, significantly, their Protestantism. Parker expressed hope that they did not continue to slide, and find themselves among the Anabaptists or Libertines, which would have taken them out of the church altogether.

Evidently, Parker considered Crowley and his fellows to be out of balance in their faith. This distanced them from the properly moderate English Church, while Jewel was most decidedly claimed for it. In *A Brief Examination*, Parker said that 'all men that know [Jewel] see, and further understand that he is not of your mind'. He pointed out that Jewel was one of the learned ministers who had originally determined what 'will do good and not hurt in this church at this season', so it was misinterpreting Jewel to take his words out of context and claim that he would say that the vestments hurt the church.⁹⁵

Parker placed Jewel on the side of the established church so effectively that he ended any reliance on Jewel by Crowley or any other person who spoke against the vestments. The rest of the controversy's authors did not use Jewel or his works.

⁹³ Robert Crowley, *A briefe discourse against the outwarde apparel and ministring garmentes of the popishe church* (London, 1566), Ciiv. See also John Jewel, *A replie vnto M. Hardinges answeare by perusinge whereof the discrete, and diligent reader may easily see, the weake, and vnstable groundes of the Romaine religion* (London, 1565), 442.

⁹⁴ Matthew Parker, *A briefe examination for the tyme* (London, 1566),*4.

⁹⁵ Parker, *A Briefe Examination*, *****2v.

Only one, the author of *An Answer for a Time* (1566), mentioned Jewel's *Apology*. He treated it as representative of the Church of England, but significantly did not attempt to apply any of Jewel's views to his own arguments.⁹⁶ This shows that the division was widening, and that by 1566 Jewel had been aligned more firmly with one side than the other. The continued use of Bucer and Martyr to defend the anti-vestments point of view makes this all the more evident: although Jewel's doctrine aligned with that of those two reformers to a great extent, the men of the anti-vestments party saw a difference.

The vestarian controversy engendered far more dissention than did the question of the crucifix, and it lasted longer. However, it still involved a relatively small number of clerics and was settled quite firmly by the end of 1566. In that same year, the puritans in Parliament were stopped by the queen's refusal to allow the alphabetical bills, and the problem seemed to be over. For the time being, the unity of the church against the external enemy still took priority. This would all change in 1571.

The Parliament of 1571 and its Results

The Parliament of 1571 saw some bitter conflict. In Convocation, Parker and his fellow conformists were growing angry at the attacks on the prayer book, so they began actively working to enforce conformity. All of the clergy were required to subscribe to the 39 Articles, which Collinson calls 'the critical point' in the estrangement between the conformists and the puritans. As a consequence, the articles became part of a major disagreement. The conformists had been promoting the Articles since they had first been written in 1563, and had already tried getting them passed into law in 1566. They had failed due to the queen's veto, and there seemed to be some hope that their second attempt might succeed. However, some of the puritans were causing conflict because they wanted to restrict the articles that were not entirely doctrinal.

After the debates over this issue had ended, Jewel was tasked to oversee the final editing of the articles and get them into publication. Once again, he was cast as the church's champion, with the learning and skill to accomplish a necessary task of self-definition for the English Church. He was also chosen, along with Horne and Cox, to make an attempt at restoring unity through the pulpit. The three of them, described by Collinson as 'three émigrés who had now lost all sympathy for radical

⁹⁶ Anonymous, *An Answer for a Tyme* (Rouen, 1566), 128.

Protestantism', thus preached against the puritans in a series of sermons.⁹⁷ They faced new adversaries in this conflict, including Thomas Cartwright, John Field, William White and Thomas Wilcox, who represented a different direction for the puritans. According to Trinterud, to these men 'the disputes over vestments, rites and other "abuses" were merely symptoms of more fundamental problems. They demanded far reaching structural changes in the church...and in the relation between church and state'.⁹⁸ Once again, it is possible to see the development of the division between 'us' and 'them' within the Church of England.

For the conformists, this development meant that they had to defend and protect the institution of their church, rather than spend the majority of their time attacking the errors and abuses of the Roman Church. Suddenly, the challengers of authority became the challenged authority. Peace and order became more important than personal opinions. Jewel led the defence in his 1571 sermon by firmly supporting the vestments, the episcopacy and ordination. Using his extensive knowledge of the early church, he provided a short and pointed summary about the roles and titles of its early leaders. He also limited his opponents' use of Biblical parallels, arguing that they were identifying the Church of Christ too closely with the Jewish synagogue in wanting to imitate its structure. Instead, they should look to the early church, and if they did, they would find that 'the substance of religion is the same now, that it was then'.⁹⁹

The underlying theme of Jewel's sermon was that the puritans were wrong to break the unity of the church over such trifles, and the conformists would repeatedly return to that theme in various controversies for the rest of Elizabeth's reign. John Whitgift later said that the English Church was in danger of losing its unity just as it had achieved fellowship with the universal church. Therefore, 'let none trouble the gospel amongst you, or set you at strife and variance'.¹⁰⁰ More than twenty years later, Hooker maintained much the same message: in the preface to his *Laws*, he said: 'Let not the faith which you have in our Lord Jesus Christ be blemished with partialities'.¹⁰¹

The puritans did not take kindly to Jewel's sermon. John Field and Robert Wilcox were especially offended, and yet they still respected him. This made their

⁹⁷ Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967), 117.

⁹⁸ Leonard Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 13.

⁹⁹ Ayre, *Works of John Jewel* vol 4, 1300.

¹⁰⁰ John Whitgift, *The defense of the aunswere to the Admonition against the replie of T.C.* (London, 1574), A3v.

¹⁰¹ Richard Hooker, *Of the lawes of ecclesiasticall politie eight bookes* (London, 1604), A1.

response to his sermon oddly contradictory. They acknowledged Jewel's learning and addressed him as a 'beloved father in Christ Jesus', but at the same time refused to acknowledge his status as a bishop and openly blamed the bishops for all that was wrong in the church. They decreed that Jewel was no longer a reformer, and that while he had done well in his works against the papists, he was now in error. 'Even so Mr Jewel, in defending Christ's church against the open papist... is much to be commended, but now, being an enemy to sincerity and the truth of Christ's gospel, he does evil and is worthy to be reprov'd.'¹⁰² This shows a blatantly dualistic mentality, and a willingness to create a new enemy. Evidently, these men had decided to challenge the champion.

It is not certain what Jewel's response to this challenge would have been, because he died during a preaching tour around his diocese a few months later. The popular balladeer William Elderton immediately published an epitaph to Jewel's memory, which mourned his loss in intensely dramatic terms. He proclaimed that 'the jewel of our joy is gone', compared the tears of the grieving to running streams, and decided that Jewel's death was akin to the worst plague England had ever seen. Beneath the flowery language lay an underlying message of true concern that the church had lost its best defender and there was no one who could take his place. One line especially brings that poignantly home: 'that we have such a shepherd gone... God help the silly sheep'.¹⁰³

The question of who would defend the church seemed to be at the forefront of many minds soon after Jewel's death. When Grindal informed Bullinger of the news, he called Jewel the 'singular ornament of the church, as his name implies'.¹⁰⁴ Richard Cox wrote to Rudolph Gwalter in 1573 to tell him that a new collection of articles had been published which required an official response, but 'our friend Jewel is dead, and has left among us but few equal to him'. The only answer was that they themselves would have to do the best they could: 'it is therefore both your concern and mine, to cut off the heads of this hydra'.¹⁰⁵

These men were concerned mainly about the consequences for the Church of England because of Jewel's loss. Laurence Humphrey, in contrast, took his concerns to the extreme and wondered what it meant for the state of the world. He said to

¹⁰² Albert Peel, *Second Parte of a Register* vol 1 and 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915), 79-81.

¹⁰³ William Elderton, *An epytaphe vppon the death of the right reuerend and learned father in God I. Iuell, doctor of diuinitie and bishop of Sarisburie* (London, 1571).

¹⁰⁴ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 260.

¹⁰⁵ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 281-282.

Gwalter in 1578 that the deaths of so many good men and leaders of the church in so few years were part of ‘the signs preceding the end of the world...on which this our age has fallen. Satan is roaring like a lion, the world is going mad’.¹⁰⁶ Humphrey was a Marian exile who had lived with Jewel in Zurich. He was a noted Latin scholar, and he respected Jewel’s scholarship enough to convince Magdalen College Oxford to buy Jewel’s library, soon after Jewel’s death.¹⁰⁷ He also had a reputation as a puritan. His opinions on the vestarian controversy nearly cost him his position as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and Jewel himself refused him a benefice in the diocese of Salisbury because of his non-conformity.¹⁰⁸

These opposing sides to Humphrey’s personality makes Archbishop Parker’s decision to choose Humphrey to write Jewel’s *Vita* somewhat puzzling. Hastings Robinson suggests that the decision was made due to Humphrey’s reputation as a scholar.¹⁰⁹ Janet Kemp, the author of an unpublished 1978 doctoral thesis on Humphrey, suggested that Humphrey had fully conformed in the years immediately preceding Jewel’s death, which led to Parker rewarding him with the commission. To Kemp, Jewel himself influenced Humphrey’s change, making him ‘an upholder of the established Church of England’ by 1570.¹¹⁰ In contrast, Wyndham Southgate insisted that Humphrey was a puritan throughout his career, and deliberately tried to make Jewel look like a secret puritan.¹¹¹

The subtle alteration in the nature of Jewel and Martyr’s relationship, which was discussed in chapter two, makes it seem likely that Humphrey did continue to be part of the puritan interpretive community past 1570, even if he did not openly participate. At the same time, Jewel may have influenced Humphrey to submit to the queen as supreme governor, and temper his desire for further reform. This would explain how Humphrey could produce a thoroughly positive account of Jewel despite their differences. His *Iuelli...Vita et Mors* praised Jewel heartily as a teacher, writer and pastor. Wyndham Southgate suggested that this work was not received with any enthusiasm, citing as evidence the fact that it did not have a second edition,

¹⁰⁶ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 324.

¹⁰⁷ C.Y. Ferdinand, ‘Library Administration in 1475-1640,’ in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland* vol 1, edited by Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 579.

¹⁰⁸ Wyndham Southgate, *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), 97.

¹⁰⁹ Robinson, *Zurich Letters* first series, 310.

¹¹⁰ Janet K. Kemp, ‘Laurence Humphrey, Elizabethan Puritan,’ (Ph.D. Thesis, University of West Virginia, 1978), 39, 44.

¹¹¹ Southgate, *Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*, VIII-IX.

and it was never translated from Latin into English.¹¹² However, Southgate did not take into consideration the work's reception among both Elizabethan and Jacobean clerics. Sermon texts show that Humphrey's work, and especially his description of Jewel's death, had a wide influence. It was the source for Jewel's famous saying that it was appropriate for a preacher to die in the pulpit, which became part of the common culture of the conformist textual community.¹¹³ In 1599, for example, the preacher John King referred to his own dedication to preaching through a subtle reference to Jewel. He said in his sermon that he frequently took a saying 'from a famous light of this land...a Jewel of his age: where should a preacher die but in the pulpit?'¹¹⁴

The choice to publish Jewel's *Vita* in Latin does not suggest a lack of interest, but rather that the men involved in the project had a specific audience in mind. The *Vita*'s main audience would have been an international community of the learned and Jewel's fellow divines, both those who opposed Jewel and those who supported him. It may well have represented an attempt to show other divines an example of a truly reformed (and conformed) bishop. There was, after all, a precedent for sixteenth-century Lives to be published to provide an example for others, and by 1571 Jewel was already a symbolic champion of the church. To set him up as the exemplar for all bishops after him was only the next step in that process.¹¹⁵ Also, Jewel had established the standard definition of the national universal church. Kevin Sharpe and Steven Zwicker suggest that, in England, 'the course of the Reformation is inseparable from the story of nationhood; and English modes of life-writing cannot be separated from emergent notions of the Elect Nation'.¹¹⁶ Jewel seems the ideal subject for a genre of writing that attempted to blend nationhood and religion. He represented, in some ways, the church itself.

¹¹² Southgate, *Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*, VIII.

¹¹³ Gary Jenkins, *Jewel and the English National Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006), 225; see also Jessica Martin, *Walton's Lives: Conformist Commemorations and the Rise of Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 149.

¹¹⁴ John King, *Lectures upon Ionas deliuered at Yorke* (London, 1599), 681.

¹¹⁵ It proved an effective one: Kenneth Fincham points out that Jewel 'became the prototype for Jacobean episcopal lives'. Kenneth Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 275.

¹¹⁶ Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, 'Introduction,' in *Writing Lives: Biography and Textuality, Identity and Representation in Early Modern England*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 2.

Internal Conflicts 1572-1599

In the last thirty years of Elizabeth's reign, further conflicts developed between members of the Church of England, and the division between the puritans and the conformists continually widened. Jewel could no longer be there in person to defend the doctrine and structure of the church. He still embodied to a certain extent the authority and orthodoxy of the established church, but his main weapon as their champion had to shift from sword to shield. This shift led to some distortion, as various writers applied Jewel's arguments to circumstances for which they were never intended.

Some of this distortion occurred in the attempts of the puritans to force further reform. Henry Barrow, a prominent congregationalist, applied Jewel's argument that a bishop could not be both a successor of the apostles and a lord to his own arguments against the episcopacy. This took Jewel's argument out of its context, because Jewel had actually used that example in his discussion of the separate roles of priests and kings, and did not intend for it to be used to challenge clerical hierarchy.¹¹⁷ Conformist Matthew Sutcliffe responded to Barrow's work, and rejected this interpretation of Jewel's views of the role of bishops. He approached the argument from a logical point of view, much as Jewel had in response to Harding's interpretations, and came to the conclusion that Barrow's argument was absurd. Not only was Barrow wrong in his opinions, but in his sources. Sutcliffe then further clarified Jewel's work, and put it into context with the work of other reformers, such as Zwingli and Bullinger.¹¹⁸ For Sutcliffe, the division was clear. Any proper interpretation of Jewel aligned him with the conformist side.

Puritan references to Jewel became less and less common as the years progressed, and their purpose also changed. This can be clearly seen in the works of John Rainolds and Anthony Gilby. These men used Jewel exclusively as a historian, basing their rejection of particular sources on his scholarship, and using his knowledge of the early church to support their own. Gilby, for example, acknowledged that his knowledge of the first idolatrous treatment of the sacrament came from Jewel's first book against Harding.¹¹⁹ John Rainolds discussed Jewel's correction of a mistranslation by Optatus and Fulgentius, two bishops from antiquity

¹¹⁷ Henry Barrow, *A petition directed to Her Most Excellent Maiestie* (London?, 1591), 10.

¹¹⁸ Matthew Sutcliffe, *An answer to a certaine libel* (London, 1592), 57.

¹¹⁹ Anthony Gilby, *A Pleasant Dialogue* (Middelburg?, 1581), N1.

who had written against the heretics of their day. Rainolds did not fully agree with Jewel's interpretation, but he did give him credit for correcting the error.¹²⁰

Some of the gossellers who later aligned with the puritans, including Dering and Calhill, no longer referred to Jewel at all. Dering actually tried to distance himself from his work for the Jewel-Harding controversy. He was called before the privy council to answer for some of his beliefs in 1573, and his examiners tried to force him to subscribe to a line from his own work, *A Sparing Restraint*, which had supported Jewel's assertion that the Church of England's services were in alignment with the primitive church. It is not entirely clear whether Dering gave in and did so or not, but the council did stop him from preaching soon after, which suggests that he refused.¹²¹

The conformists started emphasizing the visible and invisible churches as a way of explaining how particular churches within the universal church could have different structures and still be legitimate heirs of the primitive church. The puritans focused instead on the concept of the body of Christ, and in many of their writings they seemed to blend physical congregations with the mystical union between believers and Christ. This division can be clearly seen in the work of conformist Richard Alison. He summarized the argument of the separatist Brownists as follows: 'The true planted and right established church of Christ is a company of faithful people, but the Church of England is not a company of faithful people. Therefore it is not a true planted and rightly established church'.

Alison found that argument insulting, and answered that the Brownists did not have the right to imply that the 'magistrates, ministers and people' of the Church of England were nothing but 'a flock of goats'. He declared that the acceptance of all people into the Church was actually evidence that it was a true church, because they attempted to bring the unfaithful to repentance instead of rejecting them outright. He expanded on this point for some time, then compared the Brownist argument to that of Pope Pius in his *Regnans in Excelsis*. His last word on the subject was that there was no need to discuss it further, because 'the calumination is the same in both, and ...Master Jewel has framed an answer meet for both'.¹²² To

¹²⁰ John Rainolds, *The Summe of a Conference* (London, 1584), 472.

¹²¹ Patrick Collinson, *A Mirror of Elizabethan Puritanism: The Life and Letters of Godly Master Dering* (London: Dr William's Trust, 1964), 14. See also "Dering, Edward (c.1540–1576)," Patrick Collinson in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, eee online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, Oxford: OUP, <http://www.oxforddnb.com. ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/7530> (accessed March 17, 2013).

¹²² Richard Alison, *A plaine confutation of a treatise of Brownisme* (London, 1590), 123, 132.

Alison, Jewel's authority ended all need for further debate, and his definition of the Church of England remained sufficient.

Despite the best efforts of men like Alison, the division between definitions continued to underscore all the debates about bishops, the royal supremacy, and further reform after 1572. Unlike the simple polarization of the Jewel-Harding controversy, it was a subtle division, with common elements and common sources from which to draw evidence. Thus, it thoroughly blurred the line between ally and adversary for the religious leadership of the Church of England. This can be seen in the Admonition controversy, during which both sides expressed regret that they were forced to engage in polemic against their brethren. Whitgift rebuked Cartwright and his fellows for it, asking how they could speak so spitefully against their brothers 'whose doctrine is pure, whose zeal is fervent, whose suffering for the Gospel has been in time of trial comparable with any man's that now lives: who have also painfully taught the word of God in this realm...and by whose ministry the Gospel hath taken root'.¹²³ Cartwright responded by pointing out that 'I would have wished that this controversy had been with the papists or with other...pestilent and professed enemies of the church: for that should have been less grief to write and more convenient to persuade that which I desire'.¹²⁴

What Cartwright desired was further reform of the Church of England, by which he meant a stricter alliance with the primitive apostolic church. This would remove all ceremonies or leadership structures that did not correspond with the ceremonies and structures evident in the Bible. Without that alliance, Cartwright did not think that the Church of England was fully part of the church of God. This was an unusual argument, because Cartwright placed the Church of England outside the universal church due to its incomplete reform, even though he agreed that the doctrine of the church was correct. Whitgift, however, felt that the Church of England was already in alignment with the universal church: 'I dare boldly affirm that all points of religion necessary to salvation...are as purely and perfectly taught and by public authority established in this Church of England at this day as ever they were in any church since the apostles' time, or now be in any reformed church in the world'.¹²⁵

¹²³ John Whitgift, *An answer to a certain libel intituled, An admonition to the Parliament* (London, 1572), 11.

¹²⁴ Thomas Cartwright, *A replye to an answer made of M. Doctor Whitgifte* (England, 1573) 1.

¹²⁵ Whitgift, *The defense of the aunswere*, A2.

The Admonition controversy has been studied by many major historians of the Elizabethan era, including Peter Lake, Claire Cross, Leonard Trinterud and Philip Hughes. Consistently, they point out the importance of the national church in this argument. Cross noted that Cartwright never actually left behind the necessity of a state church, although he did qualify his support of the royal supremacy. Trinterud, in contrast, suggested that it was Whitgift who wrote with a sense of the connection to the national consciousness. Lake's analysis follows best with Cross, but he takes it a step further by explaining Cartwright's belief that establishing church government along presbyterian lines would mean a vast blessing for the national church, 'a virtual covenant being set up between God and England'.¹²⁶ None of those three historians connect either Cartwright's or Whitgift's interpretation of the national visible and invisible church to the debates over the national universal church that took place in the 1560s. Hughes came the closest by discussing the issue of authority in general rather than church government specifically, but he still did not approach the Admonition controversy in a way that fully considered its polemical background.¹²⁷ It is perhaps for this reason that Cartwright and Whitgift's use of Jewel's works has gone unnoticed in the majority of the historiography.

In Whitgift's first response to Cartwright, he suggested that Cartwright and his fellows were skirting dangerously close to agreement with the Louvainists, and proved his point by writing out a list of the puritans' claims that were similar to those of the papists. In his second response, Whitgift brought Jewel himself into the argument, by using Jewel's work as evidence for his points and publishing Jewel's sermon against the puritans along with his own text. Cartwright's response reflects both the division between the conformists and their challengers, and the common ground which made that division so indistinct. He challenged Jewel's sermon against the puritans directly and with vehemence, in a passage so tightly packed with denials that the sentences tumble over themselves. However, despite his evident dislike of Jewel's sermon, Cartwright did not entirely reject Jewel himself. He even suggested that he might have been less direct if he had been speaking to Jewel: 'if he had lived, for his learning and gravity and otherwise good deserts of the church in defending the cause thereof against the papists, we could have easily borne it at his

¹²⁶ Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), 31; Claire Cross, *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1969), 52; Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism*, 386.

¹²⁷ Hughes, *Reformation in England III*, 170.

hands: now he is dead and laid up in peace, it were against all humanity to dig or break up his grave'.¹²⁸

After this, Whitgift made Jewel all the more important to his argument. He started his next publication, in 1574, with the disclaimer that there was really no need to go into all of this, since it had already been admirably dealt with in the *Apology* and the *Defence*. Then he proceeded to answer it all again, and in the process he showed how the definition of the national universal church was changing. He developed the idea of the particular churches within the universal church, and established the Church of England as one of them. He also developed the idea of the invisible church, arguing that 'You must of necessity admit this distinction (some be of the church, and some be only in the church) else can you not make any visible church, for we only know, who be in the church: but who be of the church is known to him alone, who knows those that be his'.¹²⁹

Cartwright's *Second Reply* (1575) responded to this by redefining the invisible church: 'the invisible church upon earth is of those only which either are not called or lie hid and ungathered unto any known fellowship where the word of God is preached and the sacraments administered'.¹³⁰ Essentially, the invisible church on earth was made up of those who were not yet part of the communities of the godly on earth, but would be, and those people were not part of the visible institutional church. This neatly included Cartwright and his fellows in the mystical body of Christ, and excluded the conformists. For the first time the Church of England was exiled from that mystical body purely on grounds of its institutional structure. Like the Roman Church had been for the gossellers of the 1560s, the English Church had become the symbol of institutional authority for the puritans of the 1570s, and the puritans questioned that authority just as the gossellers once had.

The Admonition controversy ended in 1575 with Cartwright's *Second Reply*, but the puritan threat continued into the 1580s. More and more puritans considered separating from the Church of England altogether. As Collinson notes, two key ideas emerged: first, that the church should be made up of the visibly godly, 'be they never so few'. Second, it should be reformed at once, 'not tarrying for the magistrate'.¹³¹ The popularity of these two slogans may have fuelled the persistent

¹²⁸ Cartwright, *Replie to an Answere*, 118-119.

¹²⁹ Whitgift, *The defense of the aunswere*, 179.

¹³⁰ Cartwright, *Second Replie*, CLXXI.

¹³¹ Patrick Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 29.

rumours that there was about to be a major change in religion, which Peter Holmes suggests began in 1580. Michael Questier also considers this year a significant one: it saw the beginning of the Jesuit missions, which affected the crown's fight against recusancy. This threat to the English Church would continue into the 1580s, with the trial and execution of Edmund Campion and other Roman priests.¹³²

Considering this tense religious atmosphere, it is perhaps not surprising that John Whitgift was chosen as the Archbishop of Canterbury on the death of the disgraced Edmund Grindal. Kenneth Fincham has noted that Whitgift's appointment 'signalled a renewed drive for conformity', which fits with Trinterud's suggestion that Whitgift was firm in his belief that the English Church had been 'rightly ordered' in 1559 and intended to convince others of that.¹³³ Trinterud argued that Whitgift applied most of his zeal to ridding the church of its internal threat, namely the puritans who intended to separate.¹³⁴ This is not to say that he ignored the external threat. Before he was even enthroned, Whitgift drew up articles that aimed to force both puritans and Romanists into compliance with the national church. These articles enforced the laws against recusants, forbade meetings outside the church, enforced the wearing of the vestments, and limited the people allowed to preach. Within a year, Whitgift had advanced his quest for conformity through the establishment of the Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes. It extended his power as archbishop and enforced the subscription of preaching ministers, leading to the subscription crisis of 1583-1585 in which the prominent puritans Field and Wilcox were deprived.¹³⁵

During this drive for conformity, various editions of Jewel's works were published, using a lot of material that had never been published before. All of them were printed by the queen's printer, Christopher Barker, or one of the printers with whom he partnered, such as Ralph Newbery.¹³⁶ Also, some of them were dedicated to important members of the court, such as the Earl of Leicester, William Cecil (by

¹³² Holmes, *Resistance and Compromise*, 35; Michael Questier, 'Elizabeth and the Catholics,' in *Catholics and the Protestant Nation*, edited by Ethan Shagan (Manchester: Manchester University Press), 76.

¹³³ Kenneth Fincham, 'Clerical Conformity from Whitgift to Laud,' in *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, 1560-1660*, edited by Peter Lake and Michael Questier (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2000), 130; Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism*, 384.

¹³⁴ Trinterud, *Elizabethan Puritanism*, 386-387.

¹³⁵ V.J.K Brook, *Whitgift and the English Church* second ed (London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1964), 81, 83.

¹³⁶ "Barker, Christopher (1528/9–1599)," David Kathman in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, September 2013, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/1390> (accessed March 4, 2014).

then Lord Burghley), and Francis Walsingham. This suggests that they had official approval, although there is no direct evidence that they were commissioned by Whitgift, or any other crown representative. It could be that the editor of the works simply took advantage of the uproar of Whitgift's early years to gain patronage through the memory of the church's champion.

However, this is not likely. The editor was John Garbrande, a loyal, conforming member of the Church of England. He was the son of Harks Garbrande, a Dutch Protestant refugee who had become a successful bookseller in London and a friend of Jewel's. Jewel had encouraged the young Garbrande's education at Oxford, and once Garbrande had earned his divinity degree, Jewel appointed him to a living in Buckinghamshire. He also left all his papers to Garbrande, who took on the task of editing and publishing them.¹³⁷ It seems that he quickly developed a determination similar to Jewel's: to protect the church from both internal and external threats.

This determination can be clearly seen in the prefaces he attached to his editions. In the first, *A View of a Seditious Bull* (1582), Garbrande emphasized that he was publishing it to remind people how to walk in obedience to God and to the queen, because of 'the present state' of the realm.¹³⁸ Garbrande set Jewel up as a model to emulate, due to 'the great care he had to do his Master's service, and to keep the people committed to his charge from incurring such offence to God, or undutifulness to her majesty, to their own everlasting damnation'.¹³⁹ Garbrande focused on a lay audience in this work, and showed a concern for the individual that is similar to that of Jewel. He also echoes Jewel's warnings about the dangers of causing dissention in the church.

This became clearer in the next two publications: the *Exposition on...Thessalonians*, and *Certain Sermons Preached before the Queen's Majesty*. The *Exposition on...Thessalonians* proved quite popular: it was first published in 1583, and a second edition immediately followed in 1584. Garbrande suggested that it had been an important work for Jewel, saying that Jewel would have published the work himself had he lived to do so, rather than suffer the men who were 'troubling

¹³⁷ Rosenberg, *Leicester, Patron of Letters*, 224-225.

¹³⁸ John Jewel, *A View of a Seditious Bull* (London, 1582), A2-A3. PLEASE NOTE: Jewel's 1551 sermon, which he preached at Oxford, was published in 1581 under the title *A Learned and Godly Sermon*. However, it was taken directly from Humphrey's *Iuelli...Vita et Mors* and translated by 'R.U.', not Garbrande. I have not yet made a connection to Garbrande, or identified 'R.U.'. Notably, this sermon was the only publication during this time to be printed by Thomas Purfoote, who did not work as or for the queen's printer.

¹³⁹ Jewel, *View of a Seditious Bull*, A2v.

the church of God with their writings against the truth'. In this publication, Garbrande spoke directly against the men who would not 'forsake the way of contention' despite 'the weakness of their own cause'.¹⁴⁰

In *Certain Sermons*, Garbrande took it further still. Significantly, the sermons he chose to include had one common theme, which was the importance for both the laity and the clergy to support the church. The first was the Jericho sermon, preached after the 1569 Rebellion. The next two were focused on building up the church of God, and the final three were aimed at ministers of the church, exhorting them to work in unity for the benefit of the faithful and the institution of the universal church.¹⁴¹ Garbrande acknowledged that he had been partial in his choice of each of the six sermons, and justified himself by saying: 'why I make choice of these, among so many his sermons...if any be curious to ask, let him advisedly consider the state of God's church amongst us in these days, and bestow his pains to read these, which are offered to his Christian judgement'.¹⁴²

Some might argue that the 'state of God's church' to which Garbrande referred was the lack of preachers and the need for further reform, not the threat from dissenting puritans or papists. There are passages that support this interpretation, but when the *Certain Sermons* is placed in context with the other works, a certain continuity emerges. Although he addressed different audiences in order to respond to different concerns between 1581 and 1585, Garbrande consistently used Jewel's writings to uphold the Church of England against various external and internal threats. This aligns with Garbrande's own attitude toward the church, which was firmly Protestant but did not show any particular inclination toward the puritan emphasis on preaching.¹⁴³

The questioning of authority by the puritans of the 1570s, and the push for conformity in the early 1580s, resulted in a brazen challenge to authority in the publication of the Marprelate tracts, which were written between October of 1588 and September of 1589. The puritans who collaborated on the tracts redefined the universal church in their work, consistently referring not to the Church of England or even the church of God, but to 'the body of Christ'. They insisted that the queen and

¹⁴⁰ John Jewel, *Exposition on...Thessalonians* (London, 1583), A2v.

¹⁴¹ More of Jewel's sermons would be published in 1607, during the next great push for conformity under James VI and I. This will be discussed further in the conclusion.

¹⁴² Jewel, *Certain Sermons*, ¶3.

¹⁴³ "Garbrand, John (1541/2–1589)," Stephen Wright in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, January 2008, <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/10342> (accessed March 3, 2014).

council did not have the right to control the body of Christ, and only pastors, elders, doctors and deacons had a Biblically-based role in its function. Their roles were legitimate because they were members of the body, while bishops and civil magistrates were not, and ‘maim and deform the body of Christ’ by keeping out lawful officers and putting the episcopacy in their place.¹⁴⁴ The institution of the church as it had been established in 1559 was rejected by these men as thoroughly as it had been by Cartwright. They, like him, considered the visible church to be the communities of the godly who made up the invisible church on earth.

The Marprelate tracts are not often discussed in terms of their contribution to the re-definition of the national universal church; most often, they are examined as contributions to Elizabethan satirical literature.¹⁴⁵ When they are considered as polemical tracts, they are usually part of the examination of Marprelate’s most enthusiastic opponent, Richard Bancroft.¹⁴⁶ However, if they are placed in context as a product of a distinct interpretive community, an interesting picture emerges. Joseph Black, in his 2007 annotated edition of the Marprelate tracts, points out that Martin Marprelate attempted to claim the support of many reformers, including not only well-known puritans such as Dudley Fenner and Thomas Cartwright, but earlier reformers such as William Tyndale, John Frith, Robert Barnes, John Hooper, James Pilkington and John Foxe.¹⁴⁷ At the same time, Marprelate attacked two specific works by reformers John Bridges and Thomas Cooper. This selection of English reformers who were considered allies and those who were treated as enemies shows a distinctly adversarial mentality, one with very different dividing lines than that of the earlier reformers.

Notably, Jewel is not in the list of reformers whose support Marprelate tried to claim, but neither did Marprelate openly attack Jewel, as he did Bridges and Cooper. Instead, Marprelate’s rejection of Jewel in the tracts is oddly subtle. In the first tract, the *Epistle*, Marprelate takes a quotation from the *Apology*, although he calls it ‘the English confession, written by a bishop’. The quotation used was the statement by Pope Gregory that anyone who attempted to put himself above his

¹⁴⁴ Martin Marprelate, *Hay Any Work for Cooper* (London: John Petherham, 1845), 30, 33.

¹⁴⁵ For example, see Helen Smith, ‘Imprinted by Simeon Such a Signe’: Reading Early Modern Imprints,’ in *Renaissance Paratexts*, edited by Helen Smith and Louise Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Antonina Bevan Zlatar, *Reformation Fictions: Polemical Protestant Dialogues in Elizabethan England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

¹⁴⁶ For example: Stuart Barton Babbage, *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft* (London: S.P.C.K., 1962); Collinson, *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-puritanism*.

¹⁴⁷ Joseph L. Black, *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), xxix.

brethren was not faithful to the church, but the forerunner of Antichrist. Jewel had used that statement to disprove the legitimacy of the papal supremacy; Marprelate twisted it to disprove the ecclesiastical hierarchy, with a further ironic touch when he pointed out that the statement had been said by a pope and written by a bishop. He did not take the quotation directly from the *Apology*, but from the 1586 English translation of the 1581 *Harmonia Confessionum Fidei* by the Reformed theologian Jean-François Salvard. This work was an attempt to show how the various Protestant confessions of Europe agreed with each other, and used Jewel's work as the English confession.¹⁴⁸ By using this as his source, Marprelate avoided any suggestion that he was using Jewel's works as an authority or standard, and attempted to discredit Jewel using Jewel's own words.

Thomas Cooper, who had become Bishop of Lincoln by the time of the first appearance of the tracts in 1588, responded to the Marprelate tracts a year later. He took on the same rebuking tone as Whitgift had, asking how the men involved in the tracts could speak so vehemently and so cruelly. Then he followed Jewel's negative method by pointing out not why he was right, but why Marprelate was wrong. 'Why we be with such spite and malice discredited? ...because as the duty of faithful subjects does bind us, living in the state of a church reformed, we do endeavour to preserve those laws which her majesty's authority and the whole state of the realm has allowed.'¹⁴⁹ Cooper sorrowfully asked how the Marprelate men dared to disparage the leadership of the church, considering that they had the example of such good leaders to show them the right way: Cranmer, Ridley and Jewel.¹⁵⁰ This places Jewel once again in the position of champion of the established church.

Cooper did not go into a definition of the national universal church in his *Admonition*. Instead, he referred Marprelate to Nowell's *Catechism*, where he could 'see all the parts of true religion received, the difficulties expounded, the truth declared, [and] the corruptions of the Church of Rome rejected'. Then, he suggested, they should go further by reading a sound and true confession of the faith of the Church of England, Jewel's *Apology*.

Wherein they shall find all parts of Christian religion confessed and proved, both by the testimony of the canonical scriptures, and also by the consent of all learned and godly antiquity for the space

¹⁴⁸ Black, *The Marprelate Tracts*, 11-12.

¹⁴⁹ Thomas Cooper, *An admonition to the people of England wherein are answered, not onely the slaundersous vntruethes, reprochfully vttered by Martin the libeller, but also many other crimes by some of his broode* (London, 1589), A2v.

¹⁵⁰ Cooper, *An admonition to the people of England*, 11.

of certain hundred years after Christ. For the integrity and soundness, for the learning and eloquence shown in the same *Apology*, they (that condemn that notable learned man because he was a bishop) may have very good testimony in a little Epistle, written by Peter Martyr unto the said bishop, and now printed... where they shall find that he speaketh not for himself only, but for many other learned men of the church of Tygure, and other places.¹⁵¹

This passage shows the catholicity of Cooper's definition of the Church of England, because he considers Martyr's letter to be a legitimate support for the *Apology* if it is questioned, and representative of the support of many 'learned men' of the continental reformers. In this, Cooper was continuing a tradition of identifying the Church of England with the reformed churches on the continent, emphasizing its universal nature.

A final example of the blurred adversarial mentality of the later Elizabethan years was published in 1599. This was the *Christian Letter* of Andrew Willet, written in response to Richard Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Willet was a fellow at Christ's College Cambridge, and a popular rector of Barley in Herefordshire. By 1599 Willet had already published several anti-Roman works, one of which clearly showed his own protestant identity. His *General View of Papistry* (1592) proudly claimed the title of 'Protestant' for the members of the Church of England, because 'a papist is he that cleaves to the pope in religion... a Protestant is he that professes the gospel of Jesus Christ, and has renounced the jurisdiction of the see of Rome'.¹⁵² Much of the evidence for Willet's argument in this work was based on the scholarship of Jewel, as was his other major work, *The Four Principal Pillars of Papistry*. He fully engaged with the Jewel-Harding controversy, and seemed to consider Jewel triumphant due both to his superior style and wit and his superior scholarship and faith.¹⁵³

Willet was known to be both violently anti-papal and anti-presbyterian, a passionate defender of the established Church of England.¹⁵⁴ This may be why he reacted to the *Laws* so strongly. In the *Laws*, Hooker took the national universal church that Jewel had defined and Whitgift had clarified, and brought into it his idea of the visible and invisible churches. To Hooker, the visible church was made up of the community of participants in the Christian faith, and the invisible church was

¹⁵¹ Cooper, *An admonition to the people of England*, 66-67.

¹⁵² Andrew Willet, *A General View of Papistry* (London, 1592), B2.

¹⁵³ Andrew Willet, *The foure principal pillers of papistrie* (London, 1593); see especially 3-4, 19, 124.

¹⁵⁴ C.W.R.D. Moseley, 'Andrew Willet's Emblem Book: A Reconsideration,' *The Yearbook of English Studies* vol 20 (1990), 183.

God's faithful and elect people.¹⁵⁵ Hooker included all people saved by Christ, past and present, in the mystical invisible body of Christ, and made the people on earth who professed the faith of Christ the visible church.¹⁵⁶ His definition moved away from the 'universal' church, and emphasized the invisible 'body of Christ', much as that of the puritans did.

The most significant difference between the definition of Hooker and that of the puritans was that to Hooker the Church of England had a clear history that stretched back to the primitive church. Hugh Trevor-Roper notes that this was more similar to Jewel and Whitgift than the puritans, who were 'essentially unhistorical'. Hooker accepted the church's heritage; he saw that like secular society, the church changed its form but retained 'a lasting obligation to the original terms of its existence'.¹⁵⁷ Hooker did not separate the Church of England entirely from the Church of Rome, because he found in it common history that should not be rejected.¹⁵⁸

Perhaps it is understandable that Willet considered this a betrayal of the basic foundation of the Church of England. His letter of response showed an outrage that was based equally on what Hooker had said, and on how he had the effrontery to say it in the guise of being a defender of the church. He called Hooker a wolf in sheep's clothing, because 'under the show of inveighing against [the puritans], the chiefest points of popish blasphemy are... broached both in sermons and in writings, to the great grief of many faithful subjects, who pray for the blessed and peaceable continuance of ... the estate of the church of Jesus Christ as it is now established'. Willet demanded that Hooker show how his works followed the 39 Articles and the *Apology*, and so prove their legitimacy.¹⁵⁹

Hooker vehemently denied Willet's arguments, and peppered his copy of the *Letter* with comments such as 'you lie, sir' and 'ignorant ass'.¹⁶⁰ He did not see his work as a complete departure from the Church of England as Jewel had established it: Jewel was still a champion to him. He called Jewel 'the worthiest divine that Christendom has bred for the space of some hundreds of years', and used him as an

¹⁵⁵ Marshall, *Hooker and the Anglican Tradition*, 156.

¹⁵⁶ William Harrison, 'The Church,' in *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by Torrance Kirby (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 306.

¹⁵⁷ Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Renaissance Essays* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1985), 109.

¹⁵⁸ Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, 175.

¹⁵⁹ Andrew Willet, *A Christian letter of certaine English protestants, vnfained fauourers of the present state of religion, authorised and professed in England: vnto that reverend and learned man, Mr R. Hooker* (London, 1599), 4, 5.

¹⁶⁰ Lee W. Gibbs, 'Life of Hooker,' in *A Companion to Hooker*, edited by Torrance Kirby (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 17.

example of learning and piety in contrast to the apostasy of Harding. He also used Jewel as an authority on the use of arguing from the negative, and referred to the *Apology* when discussing the nature of the sacraments and the early church.¹⁶¹ That Willet could also consider Jewel a symbol of ‘us’ and yet disagree with Hooker so completely shows the extent of Jewel’s reputation and status, and how blurred the lines between ‘us’ and ‘them’ had become by 1599.

Conclusion

Later defenders of the Elizabethan Church of England had to step away from the simple polarization of describing the universal church as one ‘true’ church that stood in opposition to one ‘false’ church. Conflicts within the Church of England forced them to expand the definition of the national universal church as it had been established by Jewel and his fellow gospellers. Most of these later defenders included the concepts of the visible and invisible churches in their definition, and argued for the rights of particular churches within the universal church to differ in their leadership and structure. Their definitions of the national universal church grew continually more detailed, in response to the efforts of their challengers, who did all they could to discredit the legitimacy of a national church, especially one led by an episcopate. The result was great internal dissention for the Church of England, and the dissolution of the unity that Jewel had worked so hard to establish.

Notably, Jewel was part of this entire process. Jewel’s work never went out of print during the reign of Elizabeth: after his death in 1571, there were four new printings of the *Apology* in Latin, one in English and one in Welsh. The 1570 *Defence* was re-printed in 1571, and the controversy with Harding was translated into Latin and printed in 1578 and 1588.¹⁶² This in itself suggests that Jewel’s works were received by a wide audience, and his continued presence in debates over the nature of the church long after his death shows that his works had significance. Jewel played a vital role in the defence of the church, even after his death. As champion of the church, he was both sword and shield: a challenger to external enemies and a protector against internal enemies. Through his works and his personal piety, which were greatly publicized by Laurence Humphrey, Jewel steadily gained status as a worthy divine. His reputation added authority to the conformist arguments in favour

¹⁶¹ Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, 110-112.

¹⁶² According to *Early English Books Online*, the *Apologia* was printed in 1581, 1584, 1591 and 1599, the English *Apology* in 1600 and the Welsh *Apology* in 1595.

of the church he helped establish, and his work gave further legitimacy to the royal supremacy and the English church's self-portrayal as the inheritor of the primitive church. Thus, through both his person and his publications, Jewel influenced the direction of debate over the catholicity of the Church of England.

He also influenced its direction through the adversarial mentality that informed so much of his work. From his early years as an Edwardian divine, Jewel had been part of a community of reformers who operated with a dualistic point of view. They developed this point of view while in exile, and then brought it to bear on the Elizabethan settlement of 1559. After that, it informed the entire structure and tone of the Jewel-Harding controversy. It was only after the watershed year of 1571, when the puritan movement took hold and Jewel's death altered the plan of defence for the church, that that mentality began to soften. It was no longer so easy to recognize either allies or adversaries in the controversies that then arose.

This chapter has examined the reception and significance of Jewel during the reign of Elizabeth. It has taken a new approach by examining marginalia and library inventories to investigate how far Jewel's works penetrated into the culture of the day. The evidence shows that more study is needed, especially in the area of manuscript sources. Further investigation into churchwardens' accounts might solve the mystery of the listings that say only that 'one book' was purchased, and determine how many parishes actually owned a copy of Jewel's *Apology* or his *Defence*. This would help determine how many copies were on display and available for public use. Also, a study of commonplace books would help determine how they were read. Commonplace books were designed to help readers absorb what they read and provide relevance and context for it; it would thus prove very useful to see how many of their notations come from the works of the Jewel-Harding controversy.

This work could easily extend into the seventeenth century, because commonplace books grew more common in this century, and Jewel's works continued to have relevance for both clergy and laypeople. Also, in 1609 Richard Bancroft ordered Jewel's complete works to be placed in parish churches, making a continuation of the study of churchwardens' accounts relevant to the study of Jewel's reception and significance. As this chapter has shown, Jewel's influence over the catholicity of the Church of England did not end with his own death. Further study will show that neither did it end with the death of the sovereign to whom Jewel was so fervently and consistently loyal.

Conclusion

John Jewel defended a paradox for his entire career as an Elizabethan bishop, and inspired a generation of divines to do the same. By defining the Church of England as a national universal church, Jewel successfully infused catholicity with allegiance. This allowed him to promote the legitimacy and authority of the Church of England, and further its acceptance among the people of England. His fellow clerics followed his lead in this portrayal of the church, supporting him in print and in the pulpit. This support did not end with his death, but evolved to suit the changing religious atmosphere of the latter part of the sixteenth century.

Jewel succeeded in defending this paradox for two reasons. First, he furthered the re-definition of the term ‘catholic’ which had started during the Henrican Reformation. The nature of the ‘catholic’ church was a central concern in the religious culture of his time, because only the true ‘catholic’ church could offer salvation to its members. In order for the Church of England to prove itself legitimate, therefore, it had to prove itself a true ‘catholic’ church. This involved re-defining the term ‘catholic’ by emphasizing catholicity in the sense of universality rather than uniformity; or as a body of beliefs rather than a body of people, as John Bossy phrases it.¹ Jewel was at the centre of this re-definition. He insisted that the Church of England’s Biblically-based doctrine and right use of the sacraments proved that it had all the marks of a true universal church.

Second, Jewel employed his own particular methodology. He was one of many divines who saw the approach of the apocalypse in the religious conflict of the sixteenth century, and one of many who denounced the pope as Antichrist. However, he took a unique approach by underplaying his own learning in order to set up the people of England as judges of the traditions of the Roman Church. This was a practical application of his belief that the community of the faithful, the individual believers of England, needed to accept their own faith if they were to be saved. It was not enough to be instructed; they had to be able to understand.

Also, Jewel was among the first sixteenth-century polemicists to base his challenge on historical evidence. Rather than arguing from proof-texts, Jewel placed his sources and their arguments in their historical context. He applied humanist scholarship to various documents that had been used as authoritative evidence of the Roman Church’s supremacy, disproving some and questioning the legitimacy of

¹ John Bossy, *Christianity in the West 1400-1700* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 171.

others. As part of this strategy, Jewel created and defended a history for the Church of England, using a huge range of Biblical and patristic sources as evidence that its structure and beliefs reflected those of the primitive church. This knowledge of the early church was of prime importance in his defence, first against the Romanists, and later against the men who did not consider the church's episcopacy a legitimate structure for church government.

Jewel's paradox of the national universal church developed out of his adversarial mentality. To Jewel, the English Church represented the correct, balanced position between the immoderate extremes of its opponents. It was both part of the reformed faith of the continental churches, and yet distinct. It could define itself not only in terms of what it accepted, but what it rejected. This is an example of the sixteenth-century concept of moderation studied by Ethan Shagan, who identified the importance of ideological opposition to the development of religious identity.

It also contributes to Lucy Wooding's work on the Elizabethan Romanists. Wooding discovered that they stopped thinking of the church as the mystical body of Christ, and started to define it as the physical church militant, led by the pope.² Looking at the same controversy from the English Protestants' perspective completes this picture. It shows how Jewel appropriated membership in the mystical body of Christ, forcing both his opponents and his allies to examine the nature of the church and re-define what it meant to be 'catholic'.

For Jewel, this re-definition began with the break with Rome during Henry VIII's reign, while he was a student at Oxford. As we saw in chapter one, concepts of the church divided into the institution of the church and its membership. While the supporters of the Roman Church continued to insist that 'catholic' referred to the universality of their physical church, the reformers began to elevate spiritual universality over physical universality. This came about in part due to the need to justify the royal supremacy, which meant that Jewel learned early what the royal supremacy meant to the nature of the church, and what means could be used to defend it.

This chapter showed that Jewel's Oxford years fostered a sense of community in him. He and some of his fellow scholars formed a network of friends and patrons, and this scholarly network encouraged Jewel's training in rhetoric and

² Lucy Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 252.

his humanistic ‘ad fontes’ attitude towards patristic and Biblical studies. During the Edwardian Reformation, this scholarly network developed a common purpose: to further the cause of reform. It became more than a network, and yet less than a unified textual community. As discussed in chapter two, it is best described as a ‘community of reformers’. The members’ self-awareness and common re-definition of the term ‘catholic’ made them a recognizable unit, one which resisted papal authority and promoted individual faith.

After the accession of Mary, many of the members of this community went into exile, and there they came under the influence of many different reforming beliefs. During Jewel’s time on the continent, he defended the English liturgy and the royal supremacy against the Knoxian party in Frankfurt, which gave him his first practical experience in defining and defending a national church. He also worked with Peter Martyr, resisting not only the Roman Church, but heresies such as the ubiquitarians and the Anabaptists. His exposure to these various challenges greatly influenced his understanding of membership (and non-membership) in the universal church.

Jewel became involved in the definition and defence of the fledgling Church of England very quickly after Elizabeth took the throne, and his role was examined in chapter three. This chapter contributes to the debate in Reformation studies over why the Elizabethan Settlement endured. It has been called the ‘unsettled settlement’ by Norman L. Jones, and he is not the only historian to make note of the uncertainty surrounding the church establishment of 1559.³ Patrick Collinson and Diarmaid MacCulloch, for example, both emphasize that settlement was not definitive, and that its success was not inevitable.⁴ However, few historians have studied how it was defended and thus established, beyond a discussion of the legal systems that set it in place.

The chapter’s examination of Jewel’s controversy with Harding shows that both men agreed that the definition of the ‘catholic’ church was essential. Catholicity was connected to the issue of legitimacy and authority: Jewel insisted on the primacy of Biblical authority, while Harding emphasized the authority of the church. Their argument over this issue resulted in the gradual clarification of particular theological points, which was one of the key factors leading to the

³ Norman L. Jones, *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1993), 17.

⁴ Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1967), 14; Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England* (London: McMillan Education Ltd, 1990), 6.

development of demarcation lines between the two confessions. Jewel strengthened the association between nation and church, while Harding drew the Catholic Church more fully into the Roman fold.

For many members of his vast and varied audience, Jewel provided solid ground in a religious landscape of shifting sands. However, that is not to say that his work was universally accepted. As this thesis has shown, the Jewel-Harding controversy inspired great debate as well as great loyalty. Jewel was challenged on grounds that he misinterpreted his sources, made the Eucharist nothing but a bare sign, and enforced false limitations on Harding and his fellow Louvainists. They disagreed with his rejection of the authority of recent councils and the traditions of the medieval church, and found it hypocritical that Jewel rejected the pope as head of the worldwide church, only to accept Elizabeth as head of the English Church.

The wider influence of this controversy was discussed in chapter four, through an examination of the textual communities that revolved around Jewel and Harding. These groups fulfilled all the aspects of Brian Stock's original definition of the term 'textual communities': they each revolved around their charismatic leader, whose texts became part of a common culture. This led to community members making their own contributions to this culture through their supporting texts. By examining the terminology in those texts, it was possible to trace the changes in their concept of the nature of the church.

Harding's textual community, whose collaboration and cohesion were all the more enhanced by their close proximity in Louvain, held onto the belief that the 'catholic' church was the Roman Church. They based this on Christ's promise that he would be with his church until the end of time, and the unbroken succession of popes that had begun with St Peter. In contrast, Jewel's textual community gradually began to reject the term 'catholic'. They aligned their national church with the 'church of Christ' or the universal church, which they found in the faithful people of the various Protestant churches on the continent. Through this argument, they formed a Protestant identity.

In the top-down or bottom-up debate of Reformation studies, which questions when the Church of England became Protestant, the conversion of the divines who led the church is rarely considered. This chapter showed how particular clerics were converted to the doctrine and methodology of the Church of England, and the means by which they then attempted to convert others. Part of this was their acceptance of the concept of a national universal church. Also significant was their loyalty to this

definition: it endured far longer than one might expect, considering how greatly the problems within the church changed and multiplied after Jewel's death. This could be attributed to how thoroughly Jewel's definition had become part of religious culture. Being so immersed in Jewel's vision of a national universal church enabled its later defenders to adapt and improve upon his work without losing the spirit behind it.

This was examined in chapter five, through a chronological approach to later Elizabethan polemic. In the early 1570s, new internal enemies dissolved the unity that had marked the 1560s. These internal adversaries formed textual communities of their own around various different texts, but for many of them Jewel's work still played a role. In some cases, Jewel became the adversary against which to define their own position. In others, he maintained his status as defender and authoritative representative of the church. This remained true during the 1580s and 1590s, partly due to members of his textual community who worked to perpetuate his reputation and status as a divine worthy of emulation.

New adversaries meant new developments in the definition of the national universal church. No longer could defenders of the Church of England simply polarise between true and false churches. Under the influence of arguments over the structure of the visible church, these defenders had to develop the idea of particular churches, and allow for visible and invisible congregations within the true universal church. These new adversaries also forced the defenders of the Church of England into the role that the Roman Church had once fulfilled: that of the challenged authority. This changed their means of defence, and they often brought Jewel into the argument as an authority on church history to prove the authenticity of their stance.

This thesis marks the first time that the men who supported Jewel in his controversy have been studied as a distinct community, a team under his leadership with a similar vision for the church. This fresh approach has allowed a more detailed study of the 1560s than this decade has received in the historiography of the Elizabethan settlement heretofore. Whereas much of the existing scholarship focuses on the means of enforcement employed by the crown during the years following the settlement, this thesis has focused on the means of persuasion employed by the clergy. Jewel acknowledged the importance of conviction in creating a church that could truly be called the Church of England, and altered his strategies accordingly. The members of his textual community followed his example, both before and after

his death. From this perspective, it is possible to see Jewel as a representative of the second generation of reformers identified by Andrew Pettegree.

It also provides insight into the question of whether Elizabeth got what she wanted in the religious settlement of 1559. Her unwavering support of the settlement is not in doubt, since she fought to preserve it intact for the whole of her reign. However, her support of the settlement has never been connected to the works that were published with crown approval, such as the *Apology*, the *Reply*, and the two editions of the *Defence of the Apology*. Elizabeth, through Cecil, supported Jewel and his works throughout the controversy. John Parkhurst even boasted of her support to Rudolph Gwalter, reporting that she had read Jewel's 1567 *Defence* and thanked Jewel for his labours.⁵

Royal approval was also indicated through Jewel's inclusion in major events. He was chosen to participate in such defining moments as the Westminster disputation, the vestments and crucifix controversies, the celebrations after the Northern Rebellion, and the official response to the papal bull. He was also a frequent preacher at court, one who was never publicly censored by Elizabeth as reformers Edward Dering and Alexander Nowell were. This suggests that Elizabeth approved of Jewel's portrayal of the church as both national and universal. Thus, it is arguable that she did indeed get what she wanted in the Elizabethan Settlement; or at least, that she wanted what she got.

The broader implication of this is that the early Elizabethan church was not necessarily as divided as it has been portrayed. Its defenders did not all man their battle stations with reluctance, or look on their supreme governor as a weak point. Nor was the controversy over the vestments in the mid-1560s a clear sign of an irreparable rift that would later tear the church apart. Rather, it was merely one step in the process of defining the beliefs of an institution. By focusing on consensus rather than conflict, it is possible to study the development of these beliefs, and place the work of later defenders of the Elizabethan church into their cultural context.

It is also possible to take this study further, and gain new insight into the defence of the Jacobean church. Attitudes toward the Church of Rome changed during the early years of James' reign, and a new desire for continuity with the pre-Reformation church developed. At the same time, the church's leadership maintained its adversarial mentality, which was often directed against the puritan

⁵ Ralph Houlbrooke, ed, *The Letter Book of John Parkhurst* (Norfolk Record Society, 1974 and 1975), 63.

movement. These challenges to the Jacobean church created new reasons to emphasize its catholicity, and Jewel's works were once again drawn into service.

The first example of this was during the drive for conformity that took place after the Hampton Court Conference of 1604. In 1607, an edition of Jewel's sermons was published to support this drive. Significantly, they were not the same sermons that had been published to support conformity in 1583, which had promoted the importance of individual participation and clerical devotion. The 'never before imprinted' collection of 1607 carried the distinct message that the clergy was bound to serve and obey. One worked from Romans 12, with a summary of the text written as: 'we desire you, that you all think one thing'.⁶ The contrast in content and purpose between these two sermon collections has not received sufficient scholarly attention, and needs further exploration.

This is true too of the edition of the complete works of John Jewel, which Richard Bancroft ordered placed in all parish churches in 1609, complete with a biography of Jewel written in English by Daniel Featley. Another edition followed in 1611, the same year as the release of the King James Version of the Bible. These editions included the *Defence*, the *Reply*, *A View of a Seditious Bull*, the Challenge Sermon, and several other lesser-known treatises. The 1583 sermon collection was also included, but the seven 'godly and learned sermons' published in 1607 were not, which might reflect a change in the way that Jewel's work was being used. Notably, the massive 1611 collection of Jewel's works was followed up by a return 'ad fontes' three years later, when a new edition of the Latin *Apologia* was published. This shows that Jewel's work continued to be relevant, and yet his role in the theology of the Jacobean church has not yet been explored.

In the majority of Elizabethan studies, consideration of Jewel's contribution to the church begins and ends with a statement of his pre-eminence in learning and piety, with a nod to the importance of his *Apology of the Church of England*. This is an injustice to the significance of his work and the quality of his opponents; even the prominent Louvainist Thomas Stapleton could acknowledge that Jewel presented a 'wise challenge' to his opponents 'in that worthy sermon at Paul's Cross'.⁷ Admittedly, at his death Jewel was not an innovative theologian as Luther and Calvin had been, nor was he a philosopher-theologian like Richard Hooker would be.

⁶ John Jewel, *Seven Godly and Learned Sermons* (London, 1607), N7v.

⁷ Thomas Stapleton, *A Fortress of the Faith* (Antwerp, 1565), 105; see also 9v, 90v.

The point to remember is that he did not intend to be. He had a far simpler goal, as he wrote in the *Apology*.

To yield up an account of our faith in writing, and truly and openly to make answer to those things wherewith we have been openly charged, to the end [that] the world may see the parts and foundations of that doctrine, in the behalf whereof so many good men have little regarded their own lives.⁸

Jewel did not try to create a new faith, but rather to defend the faith which the people of England already had. In print and in the pulpit, he aimed to change the way the English thought about the Church of England. In that, he succeeded.

⁸ John Jewel, *An apologie or answere in defence of the Church of Englande* (London, 1564), B2v.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Alesius, Alexander. *A treatise concernynge generall councilles, the byshoppes of Rome, and the clergy*. London, 1538.
- Alison, Richard. *A plaine confutation of a treatise of Brownisme*. London, 1590.
- Allen, William. *An apologie and true declaration of the institution and endeuours of the two English colleges*. Rheims, 1581.
- . *A defense and declaration of the Catholike Churchies [sic] doctrine, touching purgatory, and prayers for the soules departed*. Antwerp, 1565.
- . *A treatise made in defence of the laful power and authoritie of priesthod to remitte sinnes*. Louvain, 1567.
- Anderson, Marven, ed. *Peter Martyr: A Reformer In Exile (1542-1562)*. Nieuwkoop: B. De Graaf, 1975.
- Anon. *The declaracyon of the procedynge of a conference, begon at Westminster the last of Marche, 1559 concerning certaine articles of religion and the breaking vp of the sayde conference by default and contempt of certayne bysshops, parties of the sayd conference*. London, 1560.
- Anon. *An Answer for a Tyme*. Rouen, 1566.
- Arber, Edward, ed. *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles Begun in Frankfurt*. London: Elliot Stock, 1908.
- Ayre, John, ed. *Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*, vols 1-4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1835.
- , ed. *The Works of John Whitgift*, vol 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853.
- Backland, W.E. *The Parish Registers and Records of the Diocese of Rochester*. London: Mitchell Hughes and Clark, 1912.
- Bale, John. *The first examinacyon of Anne Askewe lately martyred in Smythfelde, by the Romysh popes vpholders, with the elucydacyon of Iohan Bale*. London, 1546.
- Bancroft, Richard. *Daungerous positions and proceedings published and practised within the iland of Brytaine, vnder pretence of reformation, and for the presbiteriall discipline*. London, 1593.
- . *A sermon preached at Paules Crosse the 9. of Februarie being the first Sunday in the Parleament*. London, 1588.

- . *A suruay of the pretended holy discipline. Contayning the beginniges, successe, parts, proceedings, authority, and doctrine of it: with some of the manifold, and materiall repugnances, varieties and vncertaineties, in that behalfe.* London, 1593.
- Barmby, James, ed. *Churchwardens' Accounts of Pittington and Other Parishes in the Diocese of Durham 1580-1700.* (Durham: Andrews and Co, 1888).
- Barthlet, John. *The pedegrewe of heretiques.* London, 1565.
- Bell, Thomas. *Thomas Bels motiues concerning Romish faith and religion.* London, 1593.
- Bridges, John. *A defence of the gouernment established in the Church of Englande for ecclesiasticall matters.* London, 1587.
- . *The supremacie of Christian princes ouer all persons throughout their dominions, in all causes so wel ecclesiastical as temporall.* London, 1573.
- Bristow, Richard. *A reply to Fulke, In defense of M. D. Allens scroll of articles, and booke of purgatorie.* Louvain, 1580.
- Brook, J.M.S. and A.W.C. Hallen, eds. *The Transcript of the Registers of the United Parishes of St Mary Woolnoth and St Mary Woolchurch Haw in the City of London...1538-1760.* London: Bowles and Sons, 1886.
- Bruce, John, ed. *Correspondence of Matthew Parker.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1853.
- Bullinger, Heinrich. *A Confutation of the Popes Bull.* London, 1572.
- Calfhill, James. *An aunswere to the Treatise of the Crosse.* London, 1566.
- Campion, Edmund. *Ten Reasons Proposed to his Adversaries.* London: Manresa Press, 1914.
- Carlile, Christopher. *A discourse of Peters lyfe, peregrination and death.* London, 1580.
- Cartwright, Thomas. *A second admonition to the parliament.* England, 1572.
- . *A replye to an answere made of M. Doctor Whitgifte.* England, 1573.
- . *The second reylie of Thomas Cartwright: agaynst Maister Doctor Whitgiftes second answer.* England, 1575.
- Cecil, William, Lord Burghley. *The execution of iustice in England for maintenaunce of publique and Christian peace.* London, 1583.
- Chaderton, Lawrence. *A fruitfull sermon, vpon the 3.4.5.6.7.and 8. verses of the 12. chapter of the Epistle of S. Paule to the Romanes very necessarie for these times to be read of all men.* London, 1584.

- Chandos, John, ed. *In God's Name: Examples of Preaching in England from the Act of Supremacy to the Act of Uniformity*. London: Hutchinson of London, 1971.
- Charke, William. *A treatise against the Defense of the censure, giuen upon the bookes of W.Charke and Meredith Hanmer, by an unknowne popish traytor in maintenance of the seditious challenge of Edmond Campion ... Hereunto are adjoynd two treatises, written by D.Fulke*. London, 1586.
- Church of England. *A declaration of certayne principall articles of religion*. London, 1561.
- Cole, Thomas. *A godly and learned sermon, made this laste Lent [before the Queen]*. London, 1564.
- Cooper, Thomas. *An admonition to the people of England wherein are answered, not onely the slaunderous vntruethes, reprochfully vttered by Martin the libeller, but also many other crimes by some of his broode*. London, 1589.
- . *An Answer to An Apologie of priuate masse*. London, 1562.
- Cranmer, Thomas. *A defence of the true and catholike doctrine of the sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Christ*. London, 1550.
- Crowley, Robert. *A briefe discourse against the outwarde apparel and ministring garmentes of the popishe church*. London, 1566.
- Coverdale, Miles. *A confutacion of that treatise, which one Iohn Standish made agaynst the protestacion of D. Barnes*. London, 1541.
- Dering, Edward. *A sparing restraint, of many lauishe vntruthes*. London, 1568.
- Donnelly, John Patrick, trans and ed. *Dialogue on the Two Natures in Christ*. The Peter Martyr Library, vol XXXI. Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 1995.
- , ed. *Life, Letters and Sermons: Peter Martyr Vermigli*. The Peter Martyr Library, vol XLII. Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 1999.
- Dorman, Thomas. *A disproufe of M. Nowelles reprove*. Antwerp, 1565.
- . *A proufe of certeyne articles in religion*. Antwerp, 1564.
- . *A Request to M Jewel that he keep his promise made by solemn protestation in his late sermon at Paul's Cross the 15 June 1567*. Louvain, 1567.
- Dymond, David, ed. *The Churchwardens' Book of Bassingbourn, Cambridgeshire*. Cambridge: Cambridge Records Society, vol 17, 2004.

- Elderton, William. *An epytaphe vppon the death of the right reuerend and learned father in God I. Iuell, doctor of diuinitie and bishop of Sarisburie*. London, 1571.
- Emmison, F.G., ed. *Catalogue of Essex Parish Records 1240-1874*. Chelmsford: J.H. Clarke and Co Ltd, 1966.
- Emsley, Dennis. *An answere in action to a Portingale pearle, called a pearle for a prince Geuen by a laye man in a legacie, which legacie he desireth to se executed before his death*. London, 1570.
- Evans, Lewis. *A briefe admonition vnto the nowe made ministers of Englande wherein is shewed some of the fruicte of this theyr late framed fayth*. Louvain, 1565.
- . *Certaine tables sett furth by the right reuerend father in God, William Bushopp of Rurimunde, in Ghelderland*. Antwerp, 1565.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Ecclesiastes; Or, The Preacher*. London: Rivington, Faulder, and Gardner, 1797.
- Fearon, William Andrewes, ed. *The Parish Registers and Parochial Documents in the Archdeaconry of Winchester*. London: Simpkin and Co Ltd, 1909.
- Featley, Daniel, ed. *The works of the very learned and reverend father in God John Iewel, not long since Bishop of Salisbury. Newly set forth with some amendment of diverse quotations: and a brief discourse of his life*. London, 1609.
- Fenner, Dudley. *An answere vnto the confutation of Iohn Nichols his recantation, in all pointes of any weight conteyned in the same*. London, 1583.
- . *A briefe and plaine declaration, concerning the desires of all those faithfull ministers*. London, 1584.
- . *A counter-poyson modestly written for the time*. London, 1584.
- Field, John. *An admonition to the Parliament*. London, 1572.
- Foster, J.E., ed. *Churchwardens' Accounts of St Mary the Great Cambridge*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co, 1905.
- Fowler, John. *An oration against the vnlawfull insurrections of the protestantes of our time, vnder pretence to refourme religion*. Antwerp, 1566.
- Foxe, John. *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online or TAMO* (1563 edition). Editorial commentary and additional information. (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed: 12.03.11]

- . *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online orTAMO* (1570 edition). Editorial commentary and additional information. (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed: 12.03.11]
- . *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online orTAMO* (1576 edition). Editorial commentary and additional information. (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed: 12.03.11]
- . *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online orTAMO* (1583 edition). Editorial commentary and additional information. (HRI Online Publications, Sheffield, 2011). Available from: <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [Accessed: 12.03.11]
- . *The whole workes of W. Tyndall, Iohn Frith, and Doct. Barnes, three worthy martyrs, and principal teachers of this Churche of England.* London, 1573.
- Fulke, William. *D. Heskins, D. Sanders, and M. Rastel, accounted (among their faction) three pillers and archpatriarches of the popish synagogue (vtter enemies to the truth of Christes Gospell, and all that syncerely professe the same) ouerthrowne, and detected of their seuerall blasphemous heresies.* London, 1579.
- . *A reioynder to Bristows replie in defence of Allens scroll of articles and booke of purgatorie Also the cauils of Nicholas Sander D. in Diuinitie about the supper of our Lord, and the apologie of the Church of England, touching the doctrine thereof.* London, 1581.
- . *Two treatises written against the papistes the one being an answere of the Christian Protestant to the proud challenge of a popish Catholicke: the other a confutation of the popish churches doctrine touching purgatory and prayers for the dead.* London, 1577.
- Garry, Francis A.N., ed. *The Churchwardens' Accounts of the Parish of St Mary's Reading 1550-1662.* London: Edward J. Blackwell, 1893.
- Gilby, Anthony. *A pleasant dialogue, betweene a souldior of Barwicke, and an English chaplaine.* London, 1581.
- Glassock, J.L., ed. *The Records of St Michael's Parish Church, Bishops Stortford.* London: Elliot Stock, 1882.
- Haddon, Walter. *A sight of the Portugall pearle, that is, the aunswere of D. Haddon maister of the requests vnto our soueraigne lady Elizabeth.* London, 1565.
- Hamner, Meredith. *The great bragge and challenge of M. Champion a Jesuite co[m]monlye called Edmunde Champion.* London, 1581.
- Harding, Thomas. *An answere to Maister Iuelles chalenge.* Louvain, 1564.

- . *A confutation of a booke intituled An apologie of the Church of England.* Antwerp, 1565.
- . *A detection of sundrie foule errours, lies, sclaunders, corruptions, and other false dealinges, touching doctrine, and other matters.* Louvain: 1568.
- . *A Reioindre to M. Iewels replie.* Antwerp, 1566.
- Heskyns, Thomas. *The parliament of Chryste auouching and declaring the enacted and receaved trueth of the presence of his bodie and bloode in the blessed Sacrament.* Antwerp, 1566.
- Hill, Adam. *The defence of the article: Christ descended into Hell with arguments obiected against the truth of the same doctrine.* London, 1592.
- Holinshed, Raphael. *The first and second volumes of Chronicles comprising 1 The description and historie of England, 2 The description and historie of Ireland, 3 The description and historie of Scotland.* London, 1587.
- Holland, W.A., ed. *Cratfield Parish Papers.* London: Jarrold and Sons, 1895.
- Hooker, Richard. *Of the lawes of ecclesiasticall politie eight bookes.* London, 1604.
- Horne, Robert. *An answeare made by Rob. Bishoppe of Wynchester, to a booke entituled, The declaration of suche scruples, and staies of conscience, touchinge the Othe of the Supremacy.* London, 1566.
- Houlbrooke, R.A., ed. *The Letter Book of John Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, Compiled during the Years 1571-1575.* Norfolk Record Society, 1974 and 1975.
- Hughes, Paul and James Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, vol 1. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.
- Hume, Alexander. *A reioynder to Doctor Hil concerning the descense of Christ into Hell.* Edinburgh, 1594.
- Humphrey, Laurence. *Ioannis Iuelli Angli, Episcopi Sarisburiensis vita et mors.* London: 1573.
- Hutton, Matthew. *A sermon preached at Yorke before the right Honorable, Henrie Earle of Huntington.* London, 1579.
- Jelf, Richard William, ed. *The Works of John Jewel, DD, Bishop of Salisbury*, vols 1-8. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1848.
- Jenkyns, Henry, ed. *The Remains of Thomas Cranmer*, vol 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1833.
- Jewel, John. *An apologie or answeare in defence of the Churche of Englande.* London, 1564.

- . *Certaine frivolous obiections against the government of the Church of England answered by John Jewel*. London, 1641.
- . *Certaine sermons preached before the Queenes Maiestie, and at Paules crosse, by the reuerend father Iohn Iewel late Bishop of Salisburie*. London, 1583.
- . *A defence of the Apologie of the Church of Englande conteininge an answere to a certaine booke lately set foorth by M. Hardinge Defense*. London, 1567.
- . *A defence of the Apologie of the Church of Englande conteininge an answere to a certaine booke lately set foorth by M. Hardinge*. London, 1570.
- . *An expositio[n] vpon the two epistles of the apostle S. Paul to the Thessalonians*. London, 1583.
- , *A replie vnto M. Hardinges answere by perusinge whereof the discrete, and diligent reader may easily see, the weake, and vnstable groundes of the Romaine religion*. London, 1565.
- . *A sermon made in latine in Oxenforde in the raigne of King Edwarde the sixt by the learned and godly father Iohn Iuel, late Bishop of Sarisburie, and translated into Englishe*. London, 1581.
- . *The true copies of the letters betwene the reuerend father in God Iohn Bisshop of Sarum and D. Cole vpon occasion of a sermon that the said Bishop preached before the Quenes Maiestie, and hir most honorable Counsel*. London, 1560.
- . *A viewe of a seditious bul sent into England, from Pius Quintus Bishop of Rome, anno. 1569*. London, 1582.
- . *The workes of the very learned and reuerend father in God Iohn Iewell, not long since Bishop of Sarisburie*. London, 1611.
- Jones, John. *The arte and science of preseruing bodie and soule in healthe, wisdom, and Catholike religion*. London, 1579.
- Joye, George. *Our sauour Iesus Christ hath not ouercharged his chirche with many ceremonies*. London, 1543.
- King, John. *Lectures vpon Ionas deliuered at Yorke in the yeare of our Lorde 1594*. London, 1611.
- Kitto, John V., ed. *St Martin-in-the-Fields: The Accounts of the Churchwardens*. London: Simpkin Marshall Kent Hamilton and Co Ltd, 1901.
- Knott, Betty, trans and ed. 'Copia: Foundations of the Abundant Style.' *The Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol 24. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.

- Litzenberger, C.J., ed. *Tewksbury Churchwardens' Accounts, 1563-1624*. Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, vol 7, 1994.
- Lloyd, Charles, ed. *Formularies of Faith Put Forth By Authority During the Reign of Henry VIII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1825.
- Marprelate, Martin. *Hay Any Work for Cooper*. London: John Petherham, 1845.
- Martiall, John. *A replie to M. Calfhills blasphemous answer made against the Treatise of the crosse*. Louvain, 1566.
- . *A Treatise of the Cross*. Antwerp, 1564.
- Massie, William. *A sermon preached at Trafford in Lancashire at the mariage of a daughter of the right worshipfull Sir Edmond Trafforde Knight*. London, 1586.
- Masters, Betty and Elizabeth Ralph, eds. *The Church Book of St Ewen's Bristol 1454-1584*. Printed for Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, 1967.
- McGregor, Brian, trans and ed. 'On the Method of Study.' *The Collected Works of Erasmus*, vol 24. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- McLelland, Joseph C. and Gervaise Duffield, eds. *The Life, Early Letters and Eucharistic Writings of Peter Martyr*. Abingdon: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1989.
- , trans and ed. *The Oxford Treatise and Disputation*. Peter Martyr Library, vol LVI. Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 2000.
- Medine, Peter, ed. *Thomas Wilson The Art of Rhetoric (1560)*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1994.
- Merbecke, John. *A booke of notes and common places*. London, 1581.
- More, Thomas. *The co[n]futacyon of Tyndales answere made by syr Thomas More knyght*. London, 1532.
- . *The second parte of the co[n]futacion of Tyndals answere in whyche is also confuted the chyrche that Tyndale deuyseth*. London, 1533.
- Nicholls, John. *The oration and sermon made at Rome by commaundement of the foure cardinalles, and the Dominican inquisitour, vpon paine of death*. London, 1581.
- North, Thomas, ed. *The Accounts of the Churchwardens of St Martins Leicester*. Leicester: Samuel Clarke, 1884.
- Nowell, Alexander. *A confutation, as wel of M. Dormans last boke entituled a disproufe*. London, 1567.

- . *A reprofte, written by Alexander Nowell.* London, 1565.
- . *The reprofte of M. Dorman his proufe of certayne articles in religion and continued by Alexander Nowell.* London, 1566.
- Osórius, Jerónimo. *A learned and very eloquent treatie [sic], writen in Latin by the famouse man Heironymus Osorius Bishop of Sylua in Portugal, wherein he confuteth a certayne aunswere made by M. Walter Haddon against the Epistle of the said bishoppe vnto the Queenes Maiestie.* Louvain, 1568.
- Parker, Matthew. *A briefe examination for the tyme, of a certayne declaration, lately put in print in the name and defence of certayne ministers in London, refusyng to weare the apparell prescribed by the lawes and orders of the realme.* London, 1566.
- . *A testimonie of antiquitie shewing the auncient fayth in the Church of England touching the sacrament of the body and bloude of the Lord here publikely preached, and also receaued in the Saxons tyme, aboue 600. yeares agoe.* London, 1566.
- Peel, Albert, ed. *Second Parte of a Register, vol 1 and 2.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915.
- Pilkington, James. *Aggeus and Abdias prophetes the one corrected, the other newly added, and both at large declared.* London, 1562.
- . *The burnyng of Paules church in London in the yeare of oure Lord 1561. and the iiii. day of Iune by lyghtnyng.* London, 1563.
- Porter, Rev A.S., ed. *The Churchwardens' Accounts of St Michael's in Bedwardine Worcester 1539-1603.* Worcester Historical Society, 1896.
- Poyntz, Robert. *Testimonies for the real presence of Christes body and blood in the blessed Sacrame[n]t of the aultar.* Louvain, 1566.
- Rainolds, John. *The Summe of a Conference.* London, 1584.
- Rastell, John. *A briefe shew of the false wares packt together in the named, Apology of the Church of England.* Louvain, 1567.
- . *A confutation of a sermon, pronou[n]ced by M. Iuell, at Paules crosse, the second Sondaie before Easter.* Antwerp, 1564.
- . *A replie against an answer (falslie intituled) in defence of the truth.* Antwerp, 1565.
- . *The third booke, declaring by examples out of auncient counceles, fathers, and later writers, that it is time to beware of M. Iewel.* Antwerp, 1566.
- . *A treatise intituled, Beware of M. Iewel.* Antwerp, 1566.

- Robinson, Hastings, ed. *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation*, vol 1 and 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846.
- , ed. *The Zurich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, with some of the Helvetian Reformers*, first and second series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842.
- Robinson, Richard. *The rewarde of wickednesse discoursing the sundrye monstrous abuses of wicked and vngodly worldelinges*. London, 1574.
- Salnar [Salvard, Jean-François]. *An harmony of the confessions of the faith of the Christian and Reformed Churches which purelie professe the holy doctrine of the Gospell in all the chiefe kingdomes, nations, and prouinces of Europe*. Cambridge, 1586.
- Sander, Nicholas. *The rocke of the Churche*. Louvain, 1567.
- . *The supper of our Lord set foorth according to the truth of the Gospell and Catholike faith*. Louvain, 1566.
- . *A treatise of the images of Christ*. Louvain, 1567.
- Shacklock, Richard. *A most excellent treatise of the begynnyng of heresydes in oure tyme*. Antwerp, 1565.
- Smith, G. Gregory, ed. *Elizabethan Critical Essays*, vol 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1904.
- Stallard, A.D., ed. *The Transcript of the Churchwardens' Accounts of the Parish of Tilney All Saints Norfolk*. London: Mitchell Hughes and Clarke, 1922.
- Stapleton, Thomas. *The apologie of Fridericus Staphylus*. Louvain, 1565.
- . *A counterblast to M. Hornes vayne blaste against M. Fekenham*. Louvain, 1567.
- . *A Fortress of the Faith*. Antwerp, 1565.
- . *The history of the Church of Englande. Compiled by Venerable Bede, Englishman*. Antwerp, 1565.
- . *Of the expresse worde of God*. Louvain, 1567.
- . *A returne of vntruthes vpon [M. Jewel]les replie*. Antwerp, 1566.
- Stevenson, Joseph, ed. *The Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, 1558-1589* vol. 4: 1561-1562. London: Longman, Green, Reader and Dyer, 1866.
- Strype, John. *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion In the Church of England*. London, 1738.

- . *Ecclesiastical Memorials Relating Chiefly to Religion, and the Reformation of It, and the Emergencies of the Church of England, Under King Henry VIII. King Edward VI. and Queen Mary the First. ... In Three Volumes. With a Large Appendix to Each Volume.* London, 1721.
- . *The life and acts of Matthew Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.* London, 1711.
- . *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer, vol 2.* Oxford: T. Combe, 1848.
- Sutcliffe, Matthew. *An answer to a certaine libel.* London, 1592.
- Sutton, J. *A newe reuenge for an olde grudge.* London, 1567.
- Swayne, Henry James Fowle, ed. *Churchwardens' Accounts of St Edmund and St Thomas, Sarum.* Salisbury: Printed by Bennet Brothers, 1896.
- Thomson, Laurence. *An answer to certein assertions of M. Fecknam, sometime abbot of Westminster.* London, 1570.
- Udall, John. *A demonstration of the trueth of that discipline which Christe hath prescribed in his worde for the gouernment of his Church.* East Molesey, 1588.
- Vermigli, Peter Martyr. *The Commonplaces of the Most Famous and Renowmed Diuine Doctor Peter Martyr.* London, 1583.
- . *Most Fruitfull [and] Learned Co[m]mentaries of Doctor Peter Martir Vermil Florentine, Professor of Deuinitie, in the Vniuersitye of Tygure [Judges].* London, 1564.
- . *Most Learned and Fruitfull Commentaries of D. Peter Martir Vermilius Florentine, Professor of Diuinitie in the Schole of Tigure, vpon the Epistle of S. Paul to the Romanes.* London, 1568.
- . *The Cohabitation of the Faithful with the Unfaithful.* Strasburg, 1555.
- Walter, Henry, ed. *An Answer to Thomas More's Dialogue.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1850.
- Watkinson, William. *A notable discourse of the happinesse of this our age, and of the ingratitude of men to God for his benefites: written in Latine by that godly learned man Iohn Riuius.* London, 1578.
- Wiburn, Percival. *A checke or reproofe of M. Howlets vntimely shreeching in her Maiesties eares with an answeare to the reasons alleadged in a discourse therunto annexed, why Catholikes (as they are called) refuse to goe to church.* London, 1581.

Willet, Andrew. *A Christian letter of certaine English protestants, vnfained fauourers of the present state of religion, authorised and professed in England: vnto that reverend and learned man, Mr R. Hooker.* London, 1599.

----- . *The foure principal pillers of papistrie.* London, 1593.

----- . *A General View of Papistry.* London, 1592.

Whitgift, John. *An answere to a certen libel intituled, An admonition to the Parliament.* London, 1572.

----- . *The defense of the aunswere to the Admonition against the replie of T.C.* London, 1574.

Wright, Thomas. *Churchwardens' Accounts of the Town of Ludlow.* The Camden Society, 1869.

Secondary Sources

Aers, David and Sarah Beckwith. 'The Eucharist.' In *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*, edited by Brian Cummings and James Simpson, 153-165. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Agnew, Lois. 'Rhetorical Style and the Formation of Character: Ciceronian Ethos in Thomas Wilson's *Arte of Rhetorique*.' *Rhetoric Review*, vol 17, no 1 (1998): 93-106.

Alford, Stephen. *Burghley: William Cecil at the Court of Elizabeth I.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

----- . *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

----- . 'Politics and Political History in the Tudor Century.' *The Historical Journal*, vol 42, no 2 (1999): 535-548.

Allen, Gemma. 'A Brief and Plain Declaration: Lady Anne Bacon's Translation of the *Apologia Ecclesie Anglicanae*.' In *Women and Writing 1340-1650: The Domestication of Print Culture*, edited by Anne Lawrence-Mathers and Philippa Hardman, 62-76. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer Ltd, 2010.

Alvarez-Recio, Leticia. *Fighting the Antichrist: A Cultural History of Anti-Catholicism in Tudor England.* Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2011.

Amos, Scott. 'Strangers in a Strange Land: The English Correspondence of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli.' In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank James III, 26-46. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso Editions, 1983.

- Anderson, Marven. 'Rhetoric and Reality: Peter Martyr and the English Reformation.' *Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol 19, no 3 (1988): 451-469.
- '. 'Vista Tigurina: Peter Martyr and European Reform (1556-1562).' *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol 83, no 2 (1990): 181-206.
- Anselment, Raymond A. *Between Jest and Earnest: Marprelate, Milton, Marvell, Swift, and the Decorum of Religious Ridicule*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979.
- Armstrong, C. D. C. "Gardiner, Stephen (c.1495x8–1555)." C. D. C. Armstrong In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/10364> (accessed May 18, 2012).
- Armstrong, David. *Horace*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Aulen, Gustaf. *Reformation and Catholicity*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.
- Aveling, J.C.H. *The Handle and the Axe: The Catholic Recusants in England from Reformation to Emancipation*. London: Blond and Briggs Ltd, 1976.
- '. *Rome and the Anglicans. Historical and Doctrinal Aspects of Anglican-Roman Catholic Relations*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982.
- Avis, Paul. 'Article Review: John Jewel: Anglicanism's Bane or Blessing?' *Ecclesiology*, vol 4 (2008): 345- 355.
- Babbage, Stuart Barton. *Puritanism and Richard Bancroft*. London: S.P.C.K., 1962.
- Backus, Irena. *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- '. *Life Writing in Reformation Europe: Lives of Reformers by Friends, Disciples and Foes*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
- '. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol 2. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Barnard, John and D.F. McKenzie, eds. *History of the Book in Britain*, vol 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Barnett, S.J. 'Where Was Your Church before Luther? Claims for the Antiquity of Protestantism Examined.' *Church History*, vol 68, no 1 (1999): 14-41.
- Barnett, Richard C. *Place, Profit and Power: A Study of the Servants of William Cecil, Elizabethan Statesman*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1969.

- Baschera, Luca. 'Aristotle and Scholasticism.' In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by Torrance Kirby et al, 133-159. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- '. 'Independent Yet Harmonious: Some Remarks on the Relationship between the Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli and John Calvin.' *Church History and Religious Culture*, vol 91, no 1-2 (2011): 43-57.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Tudor Apocalypse*. Oxford: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978.
- Baumann, Michael. 'Josiah Simler's Hagiography.' In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by Torrance Kirby et al, 459-465. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Bayne, C.G. *Anglo-Roman Relations 1558-1565*, vol 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Benedict, Philip. *Christ's Churches Purely Reformed: A Social History of Calvinism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Bennet, H.S. *English Books and Readers 1558-1603*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- '. *English Books and Readers 1475 to 1557*, second ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Bernard, G.W. 'The Making of Religious Policy, 1533-1546: Henry VIII and the Search for the Middle Way.' *The Historical Journal*, vol 41, no 2 (1998): 321-349.
- Betteridge, Thomas. *Tudor Histories of the English Reformations, 1530-1583*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1999.
- and Thomas S. Freeman, eds. *Henry VIII and History*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012.
- Bindoff, S.T. et al, eds. *Elizabethan Government and Society*. London: The Athlone Press, 1961.
- Birch, David. 'Early Reformation English Polemics.' *Elizabethan and Renaissance Studies*, vol 92, no 7 (1983): 1-131.
- Birt, Henry Norbert. *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement: A Study of Contemporary Documents*. London: George Bell and Sons, 1907.
- Black, J. William. 'From Martin Bucer to Richard Baxter: 'Discipline' and Reformation in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England.' *Church History*, vol 70, no 4 (2001): 644-673.

- Black, Joseph. "Marprelate, Martin (fl. 1588–1589)." Joseph Black In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: OUP, .
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/73908> (accessed March 14, 2013).
- . *The Martin Marprelate Tracts: A Modernized and Annotated Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Blench, J.W. *Preaching in England in the Late Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1964.
- Booty, John. 'The Bishop Confronts the Queen: John Jewel and the Failure of the English Reformation.' In *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History*, edited by F. Forrester Church and Timothy George, 215-231. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- . *John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England*. London: S.P.C.K., 1963.
- Bossy, John. 'Catholicity and Nationality in Northern Counter-Reformation.' In *Religion and National Identity*, edited by Stuart Mews, 285-296. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1982.
- . 'The Character of Elizabethan Catholicism.' *Past and Present*, vol 21 (1962): 39-59.
- . *Christianity in the West 1400-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Bowman, Glen. 'Elizabethan Catholics and Romans 13.' *Journal of Church and State*, vol 47 (2005): 531-544.
- Bowker, Margaret. "Cooper, Thomas (c.1517–1594)." Margaret Bowker In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/6229> (accessed September 26, 2012).
- Brayman-Hackel, Heidi. *Reading Material in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Brigden, Susan. 'Popular Disturbance and the Fall of Thomas Cromwell and the Reformers, 1539-1540.' *The Historical Journal*, vol 24, no 2 (1981): 257-278.
- Brodrick, George. *Memorials of Merton College*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1885.
- Bromily, G.W. *John Jewel*. Published by Church Book Room Press in 1960.
<http://www.churchsociety.org/index.asp>. Accessed Nov 21, 2010.

- Brook, V.J.K. *A Life of Archbishop Parker*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- . *Whitgift and the English Church*, second ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 1964.
- Burgess, Glen. *British Political Thought 1500-1660*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009.
- Burke, Peter. *The Fortunes of the Courtier*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania University Press, 1996.
- Burns, Edward McNall. *The Counter Reformation*. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company Inc, 1964.
- Bush, Douglas. *The Renaissance and English Humanism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.
- Bushnell, Rebecca W. *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.
- Caine, Barbara. *Biography and History*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.
- Callahan, Virginia. 'The *De Copia*: The Bounteous Horn.' In *Essays on the Works of Erasmus*, edited by Richard DeMolen, 99-109. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Cambers, Andrew. *Godly Reading: Print, Manuscript and Puritanism in England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Campbell, Kirsty. *The Call to Read: Reginald Pecock's Books and Textual Communities*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010.
- Campbell, Louise. 'A Diagnosis of Religious Moderation: Matthew Parker and the 1559 Settlement.' In *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, edited by Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie, 32-50. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.
- Campi, Emidio. 'Zurich: Professor in the Schola Tigurina.' In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by Torrance Kirby et al, 95-114. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Cape, Robert W. 'The Rhetoric of Politics in Cicero's Fourth Catilinarian.' *The American Journal of Philology*, vol 116, no 2 (1995): 255-277.
- Caplan, Harry. 'Classical Rhetoric and the Mediaeval Theory of Preaching.' *Classical Philology*, vol 28, no 2 (1933): 73-96.
- et al. 'The Classical Tradition: Rhetoric and Oratory.' *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, vol 27, no 2 (1997): 7-38.

- Cardwell, Edward. *A History of Conferences and other Proceedings in Connection with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1849.
- Carleton, Kenneth. *Bishops and Reform in the English Church, 1520-1559*. Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2001.
- Carter, Sydney. *The English Church and the Reformation*, second ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1925.
- Chantraine, Georges. 'The Ratio Verae Theologiae.' In *Essays on the Works of Erasmus*, edited by Richard DeMolen, 179-185. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Champlin, J.T. 'Review: The Oration of Demosthenes on the Crown.' *The North American Review*, vol 58, no 122 (1844): 240-243.
- Chavura, Stephen. *Tudor Protestant Political Thought 1547-1603*. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Charlton, Kenneth. *Education in Renaissance England*. London: Routledge, 1965.
- Churton, Ralph. *The Life of Alexander Nowell, Dean of St Paul's*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1809.
- Clebsch, William. *England's Earliest Protestants*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.
- Clegg, Cyndia Susan. *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Coffey, John. *Persecution and Toleration in Protestant England, 1558-1689*. Harlow: Longman Group, 2000.
- Collinson, Patrick. *Archbishop Grindal 1519-1583*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1979.
- '. 'Biblical Rhetoric: the English Nation and National Sentiment in the Prophetic Mode.' In *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England*, edited by Claire McEachern and Deborah Shuger, 15-45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- '. *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. New York: Palgrave, 1988.
- '. *Elizabethan Essays*. London: Hambledon Press, 1994.
- '. *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1967.
- '. 'English Reformations.' In *English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, edited by Michael Hattaway, 27-43. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

- '. 'The Fog in the Channel Clears.' In *The Reception of the Continental Reformation in Britain*, edited by Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson, xxvii - xxxvii. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- '. 'John Field and Elizabethan Puritanism.' In *Elizabethan Government and Society*, edited by S.T. Bindoff, 127-162. London: The Athlone Press, 1961.
- '. 'John Foxe and National Consciousness.' In *Foxe and His World*, edited by Christopher Highley and John N. King, 31-34. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2002.
- '. *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1983.
- '. *A Mirror of Elizabethan Puritanism: The Life and Letters of Godly Master Dering*. London: Dr William's Trust, 1964.
- '. 'The Politics of Religion and the Religion of Politics in Elizabethan England.' *Historical Research*, vol 82, no 215 (2009): 74-92.
- '. *The Religion of Protestants*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- ' et al, 'Religious Publishing in England 1557-1640.' In *History of the Book in Britain*, vol 4, edited by John Barnard and D.F. McKenzie, 29-66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- '. *Richard Bancroft and Elizabethan Anti-Puritanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- '. 'Sir Nicholas Bacon and the Elizabethan Via Media.' *The Historical Journal*, vol 23, no 2 (1980): 255-273.
- '. *This England: Essays on the English Nation and Commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011.
- Cooper, John P.D. *Propaganda and the Tudor State*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.
- Coppens, Christian. *Reading in Exile: The Libraries of John Ramridge, Thomas Harding, and Henry Joliffe, Recusants in Louvain*. Cambridge: L.P. Publications, 1993.
- Corda, Salvatore. *Veritas Sacramenti: A Study in Vermigli's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975.
- Cowell, Henry J. *The Four Chained Books: Being the Story of the Four Books Ordered to be Set Up in the Parish Churches of England*. London: The Kingsgate Press, 1938.

- Craig, John. 'Jewel, John (1522–1571).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14810> (accessed August 6, 2011).
- . *Reformation, Politics and Polemics: The Growth of Protestantism in East Anglian Market Towns*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2001.
- Crane, Mary Thomas. 'Early Tudor Humanism.' In *English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, edited by Michael Hattaway, 13-26. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- Crick, Julia and Elisabeth Van Houts, eds. *A Social History of England, 900-1200*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Crockett, Bryan. 'The Act of Preaching and the Art of Propheying.' *The Sewanee Review*, vol 105, no 1 (1997): 39-52.
- Cross, Claire. 'Oxford and the Tudor State from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary.' In *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol 3, edited by James McConica, 117-149. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- . 'Religious Cultures in Conflict: A Salisbury Parish During the English Reformation.' In *New Directions in Local History Since Hoskin*, edited by Christopher Dyer, 159-171. University of Hertfordshire Press, 2011.
- . *The Royal Supremacy in the Elizabethan Church*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1969.
- Cummings, Brian. *The Literary Culture of Reformation: Grammar and Grace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- and James Simpson. *Cultural Reformations: Medieval and Renaissance in Literary History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Curtis, Mark H. *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition 1558-1642*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- D'Alton, Craig. 'Renaissance Humanism and the Reformation.' In *Palgrave Advances in the European Reformations*, edited by Alec Ryrie, 149-168. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.
- . 'The Trojan War of 1518: Melodrama, Politics, and the Rise of Humanism.' *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol 28, no 3 (1997): 727-738.
- Dabbs, Thomas. 'Paul's Cross and The Echo of Print.' Paper presented at the Paul's Cross and the Culture of Persuasion Conference, 16-18 August 2012.
- Danner, Dan G. *Pilgrimage to Puritanism: History and Theology of the Marian Exiles at Geneva, 155-1560*. New York: Peter Lang, 1999.

- Davies, Horton. *Worship and Theology in England From Cranmer to Hooker*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Dawley, Powel Mills. *John Whitgift and the Reformation*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1955.
- Davies, Catharine. 'Poor Persecuted Little Flock' or 'Commonwealth of Christians'; Edwardian Protestant Concepts of the Church.' In *Protestantism and the National Church*, edited by Peter Lake and Maria Dowling, 78-102. London: Croom Helm, 1987.
- Davis, Thomas. *This is My Body: The Presence of Christ in Reformation Thought*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- . "The Truth of the Divine Words': Luther's Sermons on the Eucharist 1521- 28, and the Structure of Eucharistic Meaning.' *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol 30, no 2 (1999): 323-342.
- Dawson, Jane. 'The Apocalyptic Thinking of the Marian Exiles.' *Prophecy and Eschatology: Studies in Church History*, vol 10 (1994): 75-91.
- . "Goodman, Christopher(1521/2–1603)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/10975> (accessed June 11, 2013).
- Dean, D.M. and Norman L. Jones, eds. *The Parliaments of Elizabethan England*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1990.
- Demers, Patricia. 'Nether Bitterly Nor Brabblingly: Lady Anne Bacon's Translation of John Jewel's *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*.' In *English Women, Religion and Textual Production*, edited by Micheline White, 206-217. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2011.
- DeMolen, Richard. '*Opera Omnia Desiderii Erasmi*: Rungs on the Ladder to the Philosophia Christi.' In *Essays on the Works of Erasmus*, edited by Richard DeMolen, 1-50. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Dent, C. M. *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Dickens, A.G. *English Reformation*, second ed. London: B.T. Batsford, 1989.
- and John Tonkin. *The Reformation in Historical Thought*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1985.
- Dodds, Gregory D. *Exploiting Erasmus: The Erasmian Legacy and Religious Change in Early Modern England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.
- Dowling, Maria. *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*. London: Croom Helm, 1986.

- Duffy, Eamon. "Allen, William (1532–1594)." Eamon Duffy In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, October 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/391> (accessed December 3, 2012).
- '. 'The English Reformation After Revisionism.' *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol 59, no 3 (2006): 720-731.
- '. 'The Shock of Change: Continuity and Discontinuity in the Elizabethan Church of England.' In *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*, edited by Stephen Platten, 42-64. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003.
- '. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580*, second ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Dugmore, Clifford W. 'The First Ten Years.' In *The English Prayer Book 1549-1662*, edited by Clifford W. Dugmore et al, 6-30. London: S.P.C.K., 1963.
- '. *The Mass and the English Reformers*. London: MacMillan and Co, 1958.
- Dunn, Kevin. *Pretexts of Authority: The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Durston, Christopher and Jacqueline Eales. 'The Puritan Ethos.' In *The Culture of English Puritanism 1560-1700*, edited by Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales, 1-31. London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1996.
- Elton, G.R. *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Eppley, Daniel. *Defending Royal Supremacy and Discerning God's Will in Tudor England*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- '. 'Richard Hooker and Christopher St German: Biblical Hermeneutics and Princely Power.' In *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation*, edited by Torrance Kirby, 285-294. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.
- '. 'Royal Supremacy.' In *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by Torrance Kirby, 503-534. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Estes, James M. 'The Role of Godly Magistrates in the Church: Melancthon as Luther's Interpreter and Collaborator.' *Church History*, vol 67, no 3 (1998): 463-483.
- Ettenhuber, Katrin. 'The Preacher and Patristics.' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough et al, 34-53. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Euler, Carrie. *Couriers of the Gospel: England and Zurich 1531-1558*. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 2006.

- '. 'Heinrich Bullinger, Marriage, and the English Reformation: "The Christen State of Matrimonye" in England, 1540-53.' *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol 34, no 2 (2003): 367-393.
- Evans, Gillian R. *Problems of Authority in the Reformation Debates*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Evans, Mihail Dafydd. 'Morwen, Robert (1486?-1558).' In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: OUP, . <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19383> (accessed August 6, 2011).
- Evennett, H. Outram. *The Cardinal of Lorraine and the Council of Trent*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930.
- Farthing, John. 'Praeceptor Carissimus: Images of Peter Martyr in Girolamo Zanchi's Correspondence.' In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank James III, 3-25. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Fehrenbach, R.J. and E.S. Leedham-Green, eds. *Private Libraries in Renaissance England*, vol 1. Marlborough: Adam Matthew Publications, 1992.
- Fincham, Kenneth, ed. *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*. London: the MacMillan Press, 1993.
- '. *Prelate as Pastor: The Episcopate of James I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- and Peter Lake, eds. *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*. Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006.
- and Nicholas Tyacke. *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Fish, Stanley. *Is There A Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. London: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Firth, Katherine. *Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Fletcher, Anthony. 'The First Century of English Protestantism and the Growth of National Identity.' In *Religion and National Identity*, edited by Stuart Mews, 309-317. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1982.
- Fletcher, J.M. 'The Faculty of Arts.' In *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol 3, edited by James McConica, 157-199. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Fowler, Thomas. *The History of Corpus Christi College*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893.
- Fox, Alistair and John Guy. *Reassessing the Henrican Age*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1986.

- Francisco, Adam S. *Martin Luther and Islam: A Study in Sixteenth Century Polemics and Apologetics*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Frere, W. H. *The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I*. London: MacMillan and Co Ltd, 1911.
- Furey, Jane. 'John Foxe and the Defense of the English Church.' In *Protestantism and the National Church in the Sixteenth Century*, edited by Peter Lake and Maria Dowling, 162-192. London: Croom Helm, 1987.
- Gamble, Richard. 'Sacramental Continuity Among Reformed Refugees: Peter Martyr Vermigli and John Calvin.' In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank James III, 97-112. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Gee, Henry. *The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion 1558-1564*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1898.
- Gibbs, Lee W. 'Book Six of Hooker's Laws Revisited: The Calvin Connection.' In *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation*, edited by Torrance Kirby, 243-261. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.
- '. 'Life of Hooker.' In *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by Torrance Kirby, 1-25. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- '. 'Richard Hooker's via Media Doctrine of Scripture and Tradition.' *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol 95, no 2 (2002): 227-235.
- Ginsberg, David. 'Ploughboys versus Prelates: Tyndale and More and the Politics of Biblical Translation.' *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol 19, no 1 (1988): 45-61.
- Gordon, Bruce. 'Introduction.' In *Architect of Reformation: An Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi, 17-32. Michigan: Baker Academic, 2004.
- '. 'Introduction.' In *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth Century Europe*, vol 1, edited by Bruce Gordon, 1-22. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1996.
- '. *The Swiss Reformation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002.
- Graves, Michael. *Elizabethan Parliaments, 1559-1601*. London: Longman Group, 1987.
- Greaves, Richard L. *Society and Religion in Elizabethan England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981.
- Green, Ian. *The Christian's ABC: Catechisms and Catechising in England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

- . *Humanism and Protestantism in Early Modern English Education*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- Green, E. Tyrrell. *The Thirty-Nine Articles and the Age of the Reformation*, second ed. London: Wells Gardner, Darton and Co, 1912.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Greenberg, Devorah. 'Community of the Texts: Producing the First and Second Editions of the *Acts and Monuments*.' *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol 36, no 3 (2005): 695-715.
- Greengrass, Mark. 'Moderate Voices, Mixed Messages.' In *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, edited by Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie, 197-211. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.
- Greenslade, S.L. 'The Faculty of Theology.' In *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol 3, edited by James McConica, 295-334. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Gregory, Brad S. *Salvation at Stake*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Guy, John. *Tudor England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Haigh, Christopher. 'The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation.' In *The English Reformation Revised*, edited by Christopher Haigh, 176-208. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- . 'Introduction.' In *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, edited by Christopher Haigh, 1-25. Hampshire: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1984.
- . *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society Under the Tudors*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- , ed. *The English Reformation Revised*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- , ed. *The Reign of Elizabeth I*. Hampshire: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1984.
- Halasz, Alexandra. *The Marketplace of Print*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hall, Basil. *Humanists and Protestants*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990.
- Haller, William. *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1963.

- Hamilton, Donna. 'Theological Writings and Religious Polemic.' In *English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, edited by Michael Hattaway, 589-599. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- Hammer, Carl. 'Oxford Town and Oxford University.' In *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol 3, edited by James McConica, 69-116. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Harbison, E. Harris. *The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation*. Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1956.
- Hardwick, Charles. *A History of the Articles*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co, 1859.
- Harrison, William. 'The Church.' In *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by Torrance Kirby, 305-336. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Hartley, T.E. *Proceedings in the Parliaments of Elizabeth I*, vol 1. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1981.
- Haugaard, William. *Elizabeth and the English Reformation: The Struggle for a Stable Settlement of Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Head, R.E. *Royal Supremacy and the Trials of Bishops 1558-1725*. London: S.P.C.K., 1962.
- Heal, Felicity. 'Appropriating History: Catholic and Protestant Polemics and the National Past.' *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol 68, no1/2 (2005): 109-132.
- and Rosemary O'Day. *Church and Society in England: Henry VIII to James I*. London: MacMillan Press, 1977.
- and Clive Holmes. *The Gentry in England and Wales, 1500-1700*. London: MacMillan, 1994.
- . *Of Prelates and Princes: A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- . *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- . 'What can King Lucius do for you? The Reformation and the Early British Church.' *English Historical Review*, vol 120, no 487 (2005): 593-614.
- Henderson, Bernard. *Merton College*. London: F.E. Robinson, 1899.
- Hickerson, Megan. 'Negotiating Heresy in Tudor England: Anne Askew and the Bishop of London.' *Journal of British Studies*, vol 46, no 4 (2007): 774-795.
- Hickman, David. 'Religious Belief and Pious Practice among London's Elizabethan Elite.' *The Historical Journal*, vol 42, no 4 (1999): 941-96.

- Hicks, Leo. 'The Catholic Exiles and the Elizabethan Religious Settlement.' *The Catholic Historical Review*, vol 22, no 2 (1936): 129-148.
- Highley, Christopher. *Catholics Writing the Nation in Early Modern Britain and Ireland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- and John N King, eds. *John Foxe and His World*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2002.
- Hill, W. Speed, ed. *Studies in Richard Hooker: Essays Preliminary to an Edition of His Works*. Cleveland: The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1972.
- Hirschfield, Heather. 'Early Modern Collaboration and Theories of Authorship.' *PMLA*, vol 116, no 3 (2001): 609-622.
- Hobbs, R. Gerald. 'Strasburg and the Senior School.' In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by Torrance Kirby et al, 35-70. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Hodler, Beat. 'Protestant Self-Perception and the Problem of Scandalum: A Sketch.' In *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth Century Europe*, vol 1, edited by Bruce Gordon, 23-30. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1996.
- Holmes, Peter. *Resistance and Compromise: The Political Thought of the Elizabethan Catholics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Holt, Mack. 'The Social History of the Reformation: Recent Trends and Future Agendas.' *Journal of Social History*, vol 37, no 1 (2003): 133-144.
- Honeygosky, Stephen R. *Milton's House of God: The Invisible and Visible Church*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1993.
- Horie, Hirofumi. 'The Lutheran Influence on the Elizabethan Settlement, 1558-1563.' *The Historical Journal*, vol 34, no 3 (1991): 519-537.
- Houliston, Victor. 'Fallen Prince and Pretender of the Faith: Henry VIII As Seen by Sander and Persons.' In *Henry VIII and History*, edited by Thomas Betteridge and Thomas S. Freeman, 119-134. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012.
- Hsia, R. Po-Chia. *The World of Catholic Renewal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Hudson, Winthrop S. *The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1980.
- Hughes, Philip. *Reformation in England, Part Three: 'True Religion Now Established'*. London: Hollis and Carter, 1954.
- Hunt, Arnold. *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and their Audience, 1590-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

- '. 'Preaching the Elizabethan Settlement.' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough et al, 366-386. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Ingram, James. *Memorials of Oxford*, vol 1 and 2. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1837.
- Ives, Eric. *Lady Jane Grey: A Tudor Mystery*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Jacob, William. 'The Development of the Anglican Communion.' In *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*, edited by Stephen Platten, 192-206. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003.
- James, Frank III. 'Nunc Peregrinus Oberat: Peter Martyr in Context.' In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank James III, xxii-xxv. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- James, Jan. 'Establishing an English Bible in Henry VIII's England: Translation, Vernacular Theology, and William Tyndale.' Ph.D Thesis, University of York, 2011.
- Janelle, Pierre. *The Catholic Reformation*. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1963.
- Jewell, Helen. *Education in Early Modern England*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1998.
- Jenkins, Gary. *John Jewel and the English National Church*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- Jenkins, Gary. 'Peter Martyr and the Church of England after 1558.' In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank James III, 47-69. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Jones, Norman L. 'Elizabeth's First Year: The Conception and Birth of the Elizabethan Political World.' In *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, edited by Christopher Haigh, 27-53. Hampshire: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1984.
- '. *The Birth of the Elizabethan Age*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- '. *Faith By Statute: Parliament and the Settlement of Religion*. London: Royal Historical Society, 1982.
- Jorgenson, Allen. 'Luther on Ubiquity and a Theology of the Public.' *International Journal of Systematic Theology*, vol 6, no 4 (2004): 351-368.
- Kathman, David. "Barker, Christopher (1528/9–1599)." David Kathman In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, September 2013. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/1390> (accessed March 4, 2014).

- Kennedy, W.P.M. *Archbishop Parker*. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons Ltd, 1908.
- . *Studies in Tudor History*. London: Constable and Company Ltd, 1916.
- Kesselring, Krista. ‘‘A Cold Pye for the Papistes’’: Constructing and Containing the Northern Rising of 1569.’ *Journal of British Studies*, vol 43, no 4 (2004): 417-443.
- . *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics and Protest in Elizabethan England*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007.
- Kidd, B. J. *The Counter-Reformation*. London: S.P.C.K., 1958.
- Kilroy, Gerard. ‘Paul’s Pigeon Refuses to Preach.’ Paper presented at the Paul’s Cross and the Culture of Persuasion Conference, 16-18 August, 2012.
- King, John N. *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Kingdon, Robert. ‘Ecclesiology: Exegesis and Discipline.’ In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by Torrance Kirby et al, 375-386. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . ‘Peter Martyr Vermigli and the Marks of the True Church.’ In *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History*, edited by F. Forrester Church and Timothy George, 198-214. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- . *The Political Thought of Peter Martyr Vermigli*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980.
- Kinney, Arthur. *Humanist Poetics: Thought, Rhetoric, and Fiction in Sixteenth Century England*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1986.
- Kirby, Torrance. ‘Angels Descending and Ascending: Hooker’s Discourse on the ‘Double Motion’ of Common Prayer.’ In *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation*, edited by Torrance Kirby, 111-129. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.
- et al, eds. *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . ‘Introduction.’ In *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by Torrance Kirby, xxvii-xxxvii. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . ‘The Public Sermon: Paul’s Cross and the Culture of Persuasion in England, 1534–1570.’ *Renaissance and Reformation*, vol 30, no 4 (2006-2007): 3-30.
- . *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

- Kirk, James, ed. *Humanism and Reform: the Church in Europe, England, and Scotland 1400-1643. Essays in Honour of James K. Cameron.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1991.
- Kittelton, James M. 'Humanism and the Reformation in Germany.' *Central European History*, vol 9, no 4 (1976): 303-322.
- Kleinhans, Robert G. 'Ecclesiastes sive de Ratione Concionandi.' In *Essays on the Works of Erasmus*, edited by Richard DeMolen, 253-266. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Knappen, Marshall M. *Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism.* Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1963.
- Knopp, Sherron. 'Poetry as Conjuring Act: The "Franklin's Tale" and "The Tempest".' *The Chaucer Review*, vol 38, no 4 (2004): 337-354.
- Kristeller, Paul Oskar. 'Rhetoric in Medieval and Renaissance Culture.' In *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, edited by James Murphy, 1-19. Berkeley: University of California, 1983.
- Lake, Peter. *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker.* London: Unwin Hyman, 1988.
- '. 'The Anglican Moment? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s.' In *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition*, edited by Stephen Platten, 90-121. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003.
- '. 'Business as Usual? The Immediate Reception of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity.' *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol 52, no 3 (2001): 456-486.
- '. *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- and Maria Dowling, eds. *Protestantism and the National Church.* London: Croom Helm, 1987.
- Lander, Jesse. *Inventing Polemic: Religion, Print and Literary Culture in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- LeBas, Charles. *The Life of Bishop Jewel.* London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1835.
- Leedham-Green, Elisabeth and Teresa Webber, eds. *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*, vol 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

- Lehmberg, Stanford. "Nowell, Alexander (c.1516/17–1602)." Stanford Lehmberg In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/20378> (accessed December 1, 2012).
- Lewis, C.S. *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Lewycky, Nadine and Adam Morton, eds. *Getting Along? Religious Identities and Confessional Relations in Early Modern England – Essays in Honour of Professor W.J. Sheils*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012.
- Loach, Jennifer. 'Reformation Controversies.' In *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol 3, edited by James McConica, 363-396. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Loades, David M. 'The Origins of English Protestant Nationalism.' In *Religion and National Identity*, edited by Stuart Mews, 297-308. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1982.
- '. 'The Piety of the Catholic Restoration in England, 1553-1558.' In *Humanism and Reform: the Church in Europe, England, and Scotland 1400-1643. Essays in Honour of James K. Cameron*, edited by James Kirk, 289-304. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1991.
- '. *Politics and the Nation 1450-1660*. London: William Collins and Sons, 1974.
- '. *Politics, Censorship, and the English Reformation*. London: Pinter Publishers, 1991.
- Lock, Julian. 'Plantagenets Against the Papacy: Protestant England's Search for Royal Heroes.' In *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth Century Europe*, vol 1, edited by Bruce Gordon, 153-173. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1996.
- Logan, F. Donald. 'The First Royal Visitation of the English Universities, 1535.' *The English Historical Review*, vol 106, no 421 (1991): 861-888.
- Louthan, Howard P. and Randall C. Zachman. *Conciliation and Confession: The Struggle for Unity in the Age of Reform*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004.
- Löwe, Andreas. *Richard Smyth and the Language of Orthodoxy*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Maas, Korey D. *The Reformation and Robert Barnes: History, Theology, and Polemic in Early Modern England*. Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2010.

- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "Cranmer, Thomas (1489–1556)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. Lawrence Goldman, May 2011 <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/6615> (accessed December 18, 2011).
- . *The Later Reformation in England 1547-1603*. London: MacMillan Education Ltd, 1990.
- . 'The Latitude of the Church of England.' In *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 41-59. Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006.
- . 'The Myth of the English Reformation.' *The Journal of British Studies*, vol 30, no 1 (1991): 1-19.
- . 'Putting the English Reformation on the Map.' *Transactions of the RHS*, vol 15 (2005): 75-95.
- . *Reformation: Europe's House Divided*. London: The Penguin Press, 2003.
- . 'Richard Hooker's Reputation.' In *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by Torrance Kirby, 563-610. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- . *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*. London: The Penguin Press, 1999.
- Macek, Ellen. *The Loyal Opposition: Tudor Traditionalist Polemics*. New York: Peter Lang, 1996.
- . 'Richard Smith: Tudor Cleric in Defense of Traditional Belief and Practice.' *The Catholic Historical Review*, vol 72, no 3 (1986): 383-402.
- Mack, Peter. *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Maclure, Millar. *The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.
- MacMahon, Luke. "Wotton, Sir Edward (1489?–1551)." Luke MacMahon In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: OUP, . <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/29998> (accessed March 11, 2013).
- Mallet, Charles Edward. *A History of the University of Oxford*, vol 2. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1968.

- Magnusson, Lynne. "Bacon [Cooke], Anne, Lady Bacon (c.1528–1610)." Lynne Magnusson In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: OUP, .
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/987> (accessed May 18, 2012).
- Marotti, Arthur. 'The Intolerability of English Catholicism.' In *Writing and Religion in England, 1558-1689*, edited by Roger Sell and Anthony Johnson, 47-72. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- Marsh, Christopher. *Popular Religion in Sixteenth-Century England: Holding their Peace*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1998.
- Marshall, John S. *Hooker and the Anglican Tradition*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1963.
- Marshall, Peter. 'Is the Pope Catholic? Henry VIII and the Semantics of Schism.' In *Catholics and the Protestant Nation*, edited by Ethan Shagan, 22-48. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- and Alec Ryrie. 'Introduction.' In *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, edited by Peter Marshall and Alec Ryrie, 1-13. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . 'The Debate over Unwritten Verities in Early Reformation England.' In *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth Century Europe*, vol 1, edited by Bruce Gordon, 60-77. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1996.
- , ed. *The Impact of the English Reformation*. London: Hodder Headline Group, 1997.
- . '(Re)defining the English Reformation.' *The Journal of British Studies*, vol 48, no 3 (2009): 564-586.
- . 'Religious Exiles and the Tudor State.' In *Discipline and Diversity, Studies in Church History*, vol 43, edited by Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory, 263-284. Chippenham: Boydell and Brewer, 2007.
- Martin, Jessica. *Walton's Lives: Conformist Commemorations and the Rise of Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Masek, Rosemary. 'The Humanistic Interests of the Early Tudor Episcopate.' *Church History*, vol 39, no 1 (1970): 5-17.
- Matheson, Peter. *The Rhetoric of the Reformation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Mayer, Thomas and D.R. Woolf, eds. *The Rhetorics of Life-Writing in Early Modern Europe*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- McClendon, Muriel et al, editors. *Protestant Identities: Religion, Society, and Self-Fashioning in Post-Reformation England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

- McConica, James. *English Humanists and Reformation Politics Under Henry VIII and Edward VI*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- '. 'Humanism and Aristotle in Tudor Oxford.' *The English Historical Review*, vol 94, no 371 (1979): 291-317.
- '. 'Preface.' *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol 3, edited by James McConica, X. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- '. 'The Rise of the Undergraduate College.' *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol 3, edited by James McConica, 1-68. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- '. 'The Social Relations of Tudor Oxford.' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, fifth series, vol 27 (1977): 115-134.
- McCullough, Peter et al, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- '. *Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean Preaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- McEachern, Claire and Debora Shuger, eds. *Religion and Culture in Renaissance England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- McGing, Brian. *Polybius' Histories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- McGrath, Patrick. *Papists and Puritans Under Elizabeth I*. London: Blandford Press, 1967.
- McLaren, Anne. 'Reading Sir Thomas Smith's *De Republica Anglorum* as Protestant Apologetic.' *The Historical Journal*, vol 42, no 4 (1999): 911-939.
- McLelland, Joseph C. *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- Medine, Peter, ed. *Thomas Wilson The Art of Rhetoric (1560)*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1994.
- Milton, Anthony. 'Anglicanism by Stealth: The Career and Influence of John Overall.' In *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, edited by Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 159-176. Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2006.
- '. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought: 1600-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Milward, Peter. *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age: A Survey of Printed Sources*. London: the Scholar Press, 1977.

- Mitchell, Thomas N. *Cicero: The Senior Statesman*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- Mitchell, W. Fraser. *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson*. London: S.P.C.K., 1932.
- Morey, Adrian. *The Catholic Subjects of Elizabeth I*. New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1978.
- Morgan, Irvonwy. *The Godly Preachers of the Elizabethan Church*. London: The Epworth Press, 1965.
- Morris, Christopher. *Political Thought in England: Tyndale to Hooker*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Morrissey, Mary. 'The Challenge Controversy and the Question of Authority.' In *The Search for Authority in the Reformation*, edited by Elaine Fulton et al, 1-24. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2014.
- . *Politics and the Paul's Cross Sermons*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Morse, Ruth. 'Medieval Biography: History as a Branch of Literature.' *Modern Language Review*, vol 80 (1985): 257-268.
- Moseley, C.W.R.D. 'Andrew Willett's Emblem Book: A Reconsideration.' *The Yearbook of English Studies*, vol 20 (1990): 182-207.
- Moss, Ann. *Printed Commonplace Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Mühling, Andreas. 'Heinrich Bullinger as Church Politician.' In *Architect of the Reformation: Introduction to Heinrich Bullinger*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Emidio Campi, 243-253. Michigan: Baker Academic, 2004.
- Mullett, Michael A. *The Catholic Reformation*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Neale, John. *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1958.
- Neelands, W. David. 'Christology and the Sacraments.' In *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by Torrance Kirby, 369-401. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . 'Richard Hooker on the Identity of the Visible and Invisible Church.' In *Richard Hooker and the English Reformation*, edited by Torrance Kirby, 99-110. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.
- New, John F. H. *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of their Opposition, 1558-1640*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1964.
- Newman, John Henry. *The Via Media of the Anglican Church: Illustrated in Lectures, Letters and Tracts*, vol 1 and 2. Westminster: Christian Classics Inc, 1978.

- Nugent, Donald G. 'The Cardinal of Lorraine and the Colloquy of Poissy.' *The Historical Journal*, vol 12, no 4 (1969): 596-605.
- O'Connell, Marvin R. *The Counter Reformation*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- O'Day, Rosemary. *The Debate on the English Reformation*. London: Methuen, 1986.
- . *Education and Society 1500-1800: The Social Foundations of Education in Early Modern Britain*. London: Longman Group, 1982.
- O'Malley, John W. 'Content and Rhetorical Forms in Sixteenth-Century Treatises on Preaching.' In *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, edited by James Murphy, 238-252. Berkeley: University of California, 1983.
- . *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era*. London: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- . *Religious Culture in the Sixteenth Century: Preaching, Rhetoric, Spirituality and Reform*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1993.
- Oates, Rosamund. 'For the Lack of True History: Polemic, Conversion and Church History in Elizabethan England.' In *Getting Along? Religious Identities and Confessional Relations in Early Modern England – Essays in Honour of Professor W.J. Sheils*, edited by Nadine Lewycky and Adam Morton, 133-152. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2012.
- Ong, Walter. *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology*. London: Cornell University Press, 1971.
- . 'Tudor Writings on Rhetoric.' *Studies in the Renaissance*, vol 15 (1968): 39-69.
- Orme, Nicholas. 'An Early-Tudor Oxford Schoolbook.' *Renaissance Quarterly*, vol 34, no 1 (1981): 11-39.
- . *Education in the West of England*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1976.
- Ostovich, Helen et al, eds. *The Mysterious and the Foreign in Early Modern England*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008.
- Overell, M.A. *Italian Reform and English Reformations, c 1535-1585*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
- . 'Peter Martyr in England 1547-1553: An Alternative View.' *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, vol 15, no 1 (1984): 87-104.

- Owen, H. Gareth. 'Paul's Cross: The Broadcasting House of Elizabethan London.' *History Today*, vol 11, no 12 (1961): 836-842.
- Ozment, Steven. *Protestants: the Birth of a Revolution*. London: Fontana Press, 1992.
- Palliser, D. M. *The Age of Elizabeth: England Under the Later Tudors*, second ed. London: Longman Group, 1992.
- Parker, T.H.L. *English Refomers*. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- Parker, T.M. 'The Problem of Uniformity.' In *The English Prayer Book 1549-1662*, edited by Clifford W. Dugmore, 31-55. London: S.P.C.K., 1963.
- Parry, G.J.R. *A Protestant Vision: William Harrison and the Reformation of Elizabethan England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Patrick, J. Max et al, eds. *Style, Rhetoric and Rhythm: Essays by Morris W. Croll*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Patterson, Brown. 'The Anglican Reaction.' In *Discord, Dialogue and Concord*, edited by Lewis W Spitz. and Lohff Wenzel, 150-165. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- '. 'William Perkins as Apologist for the Church of England.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol 57, no 2 (2006): 252-269.
- Pasquarello, Michael. 'John Jewel: Preaching Prelate.' *Anglican and Episcopal History*, vol 69, no 3 (2000): 276-294.
- Pearson, A.F. Scott. *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism*. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1966.
- Perrott, M.E.C. 'Richard Hooker and the Problem of Authority in the Elizabethan Church.' *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol 49, no 1 (January, 1998): 29-60.
- Pettegree, Andrew. "Day , John (1521/2–1584)." Andrew Pettegree In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/7367> (accessed May 15, 2012).
- '. 'The Latin Polemic of the Marian Exiles.' In *Humanism and Reform: the Church in Europe, England, and Scotland 1400-1643. Essays in Honour of James K. Cameron*, edited by James Kirk, 305-329. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1991.
- '. *Marian Protestantism: Six Studies*. Hants: Scholar Press, 1996.

- . *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . "Wolfe, Reyner (*d.* in or before 1574)." Andrew Pettegree In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, September 2011.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/29835> (accessed May 18, 2012).
- Pierce, William. *A Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1908.
- Pincombe, Mike. *Elizabethan Humanism*. Harlow: Longman Group, 2001.
- Pineas, Rainer. 'John Bale's Nondramatic Works of Religious Controversy.' *Studies in the Renaissance*, vol 9 (1962): 218-233.
- . 'Thomas More's Use of the Dialogue Form as a Weapon of Religious Controversy.' *Studies in the Renaissance*, vol 7 (1960): 193-206.
- . 'William Tyndale's Use of History as a Weapon of Religious Controversy.' *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol 55, no 2 (1962): 121-141.
- Porter, H.C. *Puritanism in Tudor England*. London: MacMillan, 1970.
- Powicke, Maurice. *The Reformation in England*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Prickard, A.O. *New College Oxford*. London: J.M. Dent and Co, 1906.
- Primus, John Henry. *The Vestments Controversy*. Amsterdam: J.H. Kok N.V. Kampen, 1960.
- Pritchard, Arnold. *Catholic Loyalism in Elizabethan England*. London: Scolar Press, 1979.
- Profitt, Edward. 'Review: Is There a Text in this Class?' *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, vol 17, no 2 (1983): 123-125.
- Quantin, Jean-Louis. *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: the Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Questier, Michael. *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England 1580-1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Racaut, Luc and Alec Ryrie. 'Between Coercion and Persuasion.' In *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, edited by Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie, 1-12. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.

- . *Hatred in Print: Catholic Propaganda and Protestant Identity During the French Wars of Religion*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2002.
- Racine, Matthew. 'A Pearl for a Prynne: Jeronimo Osorio and the Early Elizabethan Catholics.' *The Catholic Historical Review*, vol 87, no 3 (2001): 401-427.
- Ramm, Bernard. *Varieties of Christian Apologetics*. Michigan: Baker Book House, 1976.
- Rashdall, Hastings and Robert Rait. *New College*. London: F.E. Robinson and Co, 1901.
- Read, Conyers. *Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1957.
- Reardon, Bernard. *Religious Thought in the Reformation*. London: Longman Group, 1981.
- Rex, Richard. *Henry VIII and the English Reformation*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.
- Rhodes, Neil, ed. *English Renaissance Prose: History, Language and Politics*. Arizona: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1997.
- . *The Power of Eloquence and English Renaissance Literature*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1992.
- Richards, Jennifer and Fred Schurink. 'The Textuality and Materiality of Reading in Early Modern England.' *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol 73, no 3 (2010): 345-361.
- Rosendale, Timothy. *Liturgy and Literature in the Making of Protestant England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Rosenberg, Eleanor. *Leicester, Patron of Letters*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
- Rosman, Doreen. *From Catholic to Protestant: Religion and the People in Tudor England*. London: Gower Press, 1996.
- Rummel, Erika. *Erasmus*. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Ryan, Lawrence. 'The Haddon-Osorio Controversy (1563-1583).' *Church History*, vol 22, no 2 (1953): 142-154.
- Ryrie, Alec. *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- . *The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

- , ed. *Palgrave Advances in the European Reformations*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.
- , 'The Problems of Legitimacy and Precedent in English Protestantism 1539-47.' In *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth Century Europe*, vol 1, edited by Bruce Gordon, 78-92. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 1996.
- Sauer, Elizabeth. *'Paper-Contestations' and Textual Communities in England 1640-1675*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Scarisbrick, J.J. *The Reformation and the English People*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1984.
- Robert Scholes, 'Who Cares about the Text?' *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol 17, no 2 (1984): 171-180.
- Schurink, Fred. 'Manuscript Commonplace Books, Literature, and Reading in Early Modern England.' *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol 73, no 3 (2010): 453-469.
- Sedinger, Tracey. 'And Yet Woll I still Say That I am I: *Jake Juggler*, The Lord's Supper, and Disguise.' *ELH*, vol 74, no 1 (2007): 239-269.
- Sell, Roger, and Anthony Johnson, eds. *Writing and Religion in England, 1558-1689*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2009.
- Seregina, Anna. 'Religious Controversies and History Writing in Sixteenth Century England.' In *The Medieval Chronicle VII*, edited by Erik Kooper, 223-238. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011.
- Selderhuis, Herman. 'Expounding Psalms: *Preces Sacrae*.' In *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, edited by Torrance Kirby et al, 249-266. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Shagan, Ethan. 'The Battle for Indifference in Elizabethan England.' In *Moderate Voices in the European Reformation*, edited by Luc Racaut and Alec Ryrie, 122-144. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.
- , 'Beyond Good and Evil: Thinking with Moderates in Early Modern England.' *Journal of British Studies*, vol 49 (2010): 488-513.
- , 'English Catholic History in Context.' In *Catholics and the Protestant Nation*, edited by Ethan Shagan, 1-21. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.
- , 'The English Inquisition: Constitutional Conflict and Ecclesiastical Law in the 1590s.' *The Historical Journal*, vol 47, no 3 (2004): 541-565.
- , *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

- Sharpe, Kevin and Steven N. Zwicker. 'Introduction.' In *Writing Lives: Biography and Textuality, Identity and Representation in Early Modern England*, edited by Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, 1-26. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Sheils, William J. 'Erecting the Discipline in Provincial England: The Order of Northampton, 1571.' In *Humanism and Reform: the Church in Europe, England, and Scotland 1400-1643. Essays in Honour of James K. Cameron*, edited by James Kirk, 331-345. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1991.
- '. 'Polemic as Piety: Thomas Stapleton's *Tres Thomae* and Catholic Controversy in the 1580s.' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol 60, no 1 (2009): 74-94.
- Sherman, William H. *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995.
- '. *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008.
- Shuger, Debora K. *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- '. *Sacred Rhetoric: The Christian Grand Style in the English Renaissance*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Siegel, Paul. 'English Humanism and the New Tudor Aristocracy.' *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol 13, no 4 (1952): 450-468.
- Slights, William W.E. *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2001.
- Smith, Lacey Baldwin. *Tudor Prelates and Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.
- Smyth, C.H. *Cranmer and the Reformation Under Edward VI*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926.
- Snow, Vernon F. *Parliament in Elizabethan England: John Hooker's Order and Usage*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977.
- Southern, A.C. *Elizabethan Recusant Prose (1559-1582)*. London: Sands and Co, 1950.
- Southgate, Wyndham. *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Stewart, Alan. 'The Voices of Anne Cooke, Lady Anne and Lady Bacon.' In *'This Double Voice': Gendered Writing in Early Modern England*, edited by Danielle Clarke and Elizabeth Clarke, 88-102. London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 2000.

- Stock, Brian. *The Implications of Literacy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Chained Library: A Survey of Four Centuries in the Evolution of the English Library*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.
- Taplin, Mark. *The Italian Reformers and the Zurich Church c 1540-1620*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2003.
- Telle, Emile V. 'Erasmus' Ciceronianus: A Comical Colloquy.' In *Essays on the Works of Erasmus*, edited by Richard DeMolen, 211-220. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Thompson, Craig R. *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1958.
- Thompson, J.V.P. *Supreme Governor: A Study of Elizabethan Ecclesiastical Policy and Circumstance*. London: S.P.C.K., 1940.
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh. *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans: Seventeenth Century Essays*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1987.
- . *Renaissance Essays*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1985.
- Trimble, William. *The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England*. Massachusetts: The Belknap Press, 1964.
- Trinkaus, Charles. 'The Question of Truth in Renaissance Rhetoric and Anthropology.' In *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, edited by James Murphy, 207-220. Berkeley: University of California, 1983.
- Trinterud, Leonard, ed. *Elizabethan Puritanism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Trousdale, Marion. 'Rhetoric.' In *English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, edited by Michael Hattaway, 623-633. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- Trueman, Carl. 'Preachers and Medieval and Renaissance Commentary.' In *The Oxford Handbook of the Early Modern Sermon*, edited by Peter McCullough, 54-71. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Turrell, James F. 'Uniformity and Common Prayer.' In *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, edited by Torrance Kirby, 337-366. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. *Aspects of English Protestantism 1530-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- . 'The Puritan Paradigm of English Politics.' *The Historical Journal*, vol 53, no 3 (2010): 527-550.

- Usher, Brett. "Bartlett, John (fl. 1562–1567)." Brett Usher In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: OUP, . <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/1576> (accessed October 29, 2013).
- . *William Cecil and Episcopacy, 1559-1577*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2003.
- Veech, Thomas McNevin. *Dr Nicholas Sander and the English Reformation*. Louvain: Bureaux du Recueil, 1935.
- Venema, Cornelius. *Heinrich Bullinger and the Doctrine of Predestination*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Vickers, Brian. 'The Power of Persuasion: Images of the Orator, Elyot to Shakespeare.' In *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, edited by James Murphy, 411-435. Berkeley: University of California, 1983.
- . *Rhetoric Revalued: Papers from the International Society for the History of Rhetoric*. New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1982.
- Vidmar, John. 'John Lingard's History of the English Reformation: History or Apologetics?' *The Catholic Historical Review*, vol 85, no 3 (1999): 383-419.
- De Vocht, H. 'Thomas Harding.' *The English Historical Review*, vol 35, no 138 (1920): 233-244.
- Wabuda, Susan. *Preaching During the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England*. New York: The Boydell Press, 1993.
- . 'The Spider and the Bee: The Perils of Printing for Refutation in Tudor England.' In *Tudor Books and Readers*, edited by John N. King, 163-190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Ward, John O. 'Renaissance Commentators on Ciceronian Rhetoric.' In *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, edited by James Murphy, 126-173. Berkeley: University of California, 1983.
- Weiser, David. 'The Prose Style of John Jewel.' *Salzburg Studies in English Literature* 9. Austria: Insitut Fur Englische Sprache Und Literatur, 1973.
- Weiss, Roberto. *Humanism in England During the 15th Century*, second ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1957.
- Wenig, Scott. 'John Jewel and the Reformation of the Diocese of Salisbury, 1560-1571.' *Anglican and Episcopal History* 73, no 2 (2004). <http://www.questia.com/read/1P3-821758191>.

- . *Straightening the Altars*. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.
- Whiting, Robert. *The Blind Devotion of the People: Popular Religion and the English Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Whiting, Robert. *Local Responses to the English Reformation*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd, 1998.
- Whitney, J.P. *The Episcopate and the Reformation: Our Outlook*. London: Robert Scott Roxburghe House, 1917.
- Wiedermann, Gotthelf. "Alesius [Allane or Alan], Alexander (1500–1565)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, May 2008.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/320> (accessed February 1, 2012).
- à Wood, Anthony. *Athenae Oxonienses*, vol 1 and 2. London: P.C. and J. Rivington, 1813.
- . *The History and Antiquities of the Colleges and Halls in the University of Oxford*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1835.
- Wood, Ellen Meiksins and Neal Wood. *A Trumpet of Sedition: Political Theory and the Rise of Capitalism*. London: Pluto Press, 1997.
- Woodhouse, H.F. *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology*. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.
- Wooding, Lucy. *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Woodward, William Harrison. *Desiderius Erasmus Concerning the Aim and Method of Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904.
- Woolfson, Jonathan, ed. *Reassessing Tudor Humanism*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002.
- Wright, Stephen. "Garbrand, John (1541/2–1589)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: OUP, 2004. Online ed., edited by Lawrence Goldman, January 2008.
<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/10342> (accessed March 4, 2014).
- Yates, Nigel, ed. *Anglicanism: Essays in History, Belief and Practice*. Lampeter: Trivium Publications, vol 38, 2008.
- Zlatar, Antoinina Bevan. *Reformation Fictions: Polemical Protestant Dialogues in Elizabethan England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.